

**HANFORD REACH NATIONAL MONUMENT
FEDERAL PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Meeting Summary: Session # 11
Tuesday, January 7, 2003
Washington State University Tri-Cities
Consolidated Information Center, Rooms 120 & 120A
Richland, WA**

The Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee met on Tuesday, January 7, 2003 from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. at the Washington State University Tri-Cities Consolidated Information Center in Richland, Washington.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

1. Develop advice to the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and Department of Energy (DOE) on a draft vision statement and goals for the Monument.
2. Hear an update on the planning process from the Service.
3. Discuss the Committee annual report.

Welcome and Introductions

Greg Hughes, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Designated Federal Official (DFO) and Project Leader, Hanford Reach National Monument, opened the meeting and welcomed Committee members, the public, and other attendees. Mr. Hughes turned the meeting over to the Committee Chair, Jim Watts.

Mr. Watts reviewed the public comment process and reminded those making public comment that there was a five-minute time limit. He stated that the public comment period was scheduled for 11:30 a.m., just prior to the noon lunch. A public comment sheet was available at the sign in table for those interested in giving comment. He also reviewed the Committee's purpose and charter.

Alice Shorett, facilitator, reviewed the day's agenda, noting that the purpose of the day's session was to discuss Committee advice on the draft vision and goals for the Monument, hear from subcommittee members on the Resource Review Reports, hear an update on the planning process from the Service and discuss the Committee's annual progress report.

Meeting Minutes from Session #10

Mr. Watts asked the Committee for any changes to the summary as drafted. There were a few suggested changes to the content of the summary. It was moved and approved to adopt the meeting summary with the proposed changes.

Action: Committee members adopted the meeting summary #10, with amendments.

Report and Discussion on Draft Vision and Goals

Ms. Shorett recapped the background on drafting the advice from the Committee on the vision statement and goals for the Monument. She explained that after the last Committee session using break out groups to draft advice to the Service, a small sub-group of one member from each of the break out session groups continued to develop and draft the advice on the vision statement and goals. The Committee was presented with the draft product for discussion. Members from the small subgroup explained the process they went through to help develop the draft Committee product.

The Committee entered into discussion on the draft products. The discussion initially focused on compatibility between the Proclamation, Vision and Goals. One Committee member commented that language in the vision regarding “minimizing impact” on the Monument is difficult to enforce, and suggested using the language “compatible use.” The Committee proceeded to discuss the notion of protecting cultural resources, and how that differs from protecting historic resources. The Committee discussed the meaning of protection and suggested alternative language. Mr. Watts reminded the Committee that the vision needs to inspire. The Committee is not dealing with specific management or science in the vision statement, rather that specificity comes out in the goals and in even more detail in the objectives. The Committee decided to continue the discussion on the vision statement after looking at the goals.

Ms. Shorett reviewed the draft goals with the Committee. One Committee member suggested combining the first two goals to make them more general rather than highlighting certain species or habitat while omitting others. The Committee discussed the need to have specific goals that step down from the vision statement, and that specificity is what is needed in order to further objectives and management alternatives. In addition, Mr. Watts suggested that it is important to highlight specific species and habitats to which the public can relate. Another Committee member suggested some issues that the subcommittees addressed in their issue reports, which were not specifically addressed in the goals.

After a short break, the Committee reconvened to discuss two additional goals proposed to address: (a) treaty rights, and (b) natural visual character, solitude and tranquility. The Committee discussed the need to establish goals with which they can hold the Service accountable, and the difficulty in managing for the different perspectives of tranquility and solitude. A motion was made and seconded to add a twelfth goal addressing treaty rights.

Action: The Committee approved adding Goal #12 addressing treaty rights.

The discussion continued on adding a thirteenth goal that addressed natural visual character, solitude and tranquility. The Committee asked the Service for guidance on the feasibility of implementing management objectives that deal with natural visual character, solitude and tranquility. Greg Hughes responded by reminding the Committee that objectives and management alternatives specify how the Service will implement goals. The objectives and alternatives will further define what solitude, tranquility and natural visual character mean. A motion was made and approved to add a thirteenth goal.

Action: The Committee approved adding Goal #13 addressing natural visual character, solitude and tranquility. The Committee approved adoption of the 13 goals included as Attachment B.

Public Comment

Don Rose from the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) addressed the Committee. He brought to the attention of Committee members three topics:

1. BPA is concerned with the Committee's discussion on adding a goal regarding the protection of "natural visual character." While the Proclamation does address solitude and tranquility, it does not specifically mention natural visual character. The BPA is granted specific valid existing rights to maintain power lines and perhaps add new ones. The goal for protecting natural visual character is likely the most restrictive goal with which the Committee is currently working.
2. Mr. Rose suggested the Committee look at goal #10 and add "federal" to the list of governments with which to cooperate in the discharge of statutory responsibility.
3. The Committee was grappling with the wording in the last paragraph of the draft vision statement, where the Monument embodies respect. Mr. Rose stated that he took part in the Planning Workshop #1, and while he has a sense of ownership from that three-day session, also believes the wording elicits pride in those associated with the Monument lands. He recommended the Committee leave the wording in the last paragraph of the vision statement to maintain the poetry and character.

Report from Subcommittees on Resource Review Reports

Each subcommittee chair addressed the Committee regarding their feedback on the Resource Review Reports. The Resource Protection subcommittee presented examples of disagreement in the Wildlife and Habitat Resource Review Report, for example the use of hunting elk on the Arid Lands Ecology (ALE) Reserve as a management tool. The Valid Existing Rights subcommittee

stated their only concern was that the valid existing rights should be identified and defined so that Committee members can understand those rights with respect to other uses. The subcommittee members would like to work with the planners to identify, define and understand those existing rights. The Public Use and Access subcommittee failed to coordinate a meeting prior to the holidays, instead providing feedback electronically to the subcommittee chair. The subcommittee members will forward lists of suggestions regarding the Resource Review Reports to the Service.

Continued Discussion on Vision Statement

After a lunch break, the Committee reconvened to finalize their discussion and advice on the vision statement. Prior to lunch, one Committee member suggested specific changes by leaving the first two paragraphs unchanged, edits to the third and fourth paragraphs to combine them, and adding a new fourth paragraph regarding a summary of the Monument vision. Discussion on the first two paragraphs focused on the feasibility that the Service can manage for “biological integrity.” Heidi Newsome, Wildlife Biologist at the Monument, clarified that the Service does have a policy on biological integrity that helps them define the integrity of the plant and animal communities. After further discussion on the proposed changes to the vision statement, it was moved and approved to adopt the vision statement with proposed changes.

Action: The Committee adopted the vision statement with proposed changes. The vision statement is included as Attachment A.

A final motion was made to include “federal” in goal #10 as suggested during public comment. The Committee seconded and approved that motion.

Action: The Committee moved and approved adding “federal” to the list of governmental entities in goal #10.

Mr. Watts congratulated the Committee on its work and noted that the Committee’s advice regarding vision and goals would be transmitted in a letter to the Service and the DOE for consideration.

Planning Team Updates

Dan Haas, Lead Planner, addressed the Committee with planning updates. He stated that, due to the holiday break, not much progress had been made in the time between the last Committee meeting on December 3rd and today. However, he did respond to the Committee’s request at the last meeting to provide a description of the difference between the terms “monument” and “refuge,” referring to the one-page description in the Committee folders. Mr. Haas explained that the Committee also had in their packets the final scoping report for their review. This report

is a result of the scoping process, from June 12, 2002 until October 12, 2002, and a summary of the comments received during that time. The web site is in need of updating, and the Monument welcomes suggestions, as well as input from experts in specific topic areas who may wish to contribute language for the web page. The web site address is <http://hanfordreach.fws.gov>. Mr. Haas stated that the Service would meet with Cooperating Agencies on January 8th, and that the Planning Workshop #2 is scheduled for February 10-14, 2003, for which the Committee was presented with a draft agenda. He also stated that, while the invitation letter strongly encourages attendance for the entire three-day session, the Service is making exceptions for Committee members in hopes of attracting as many Committee members that can attend all or part of the three-day sessions. This would hopefully facilitate good discussion and review of the next draft product to come out of Planning Workshop #2.

Committee Annual Progress Report

Ms. Shorett shared with the Committee copies of the draft Committee Annual Progress Report for 2002, and asked Committee members to review and comment on the draft. The Progress Report is a reflection of Committee progress to date and is a way to memorialize the effort each Committee member has invested in the Monument. Committee members, the Service and DOE will receive copies of the final Progress Report.

Report on Refuge Activities

Greg Hughes took the opportunity to thank the current Committee members on their last two years of hard work. He stated that the re-charter package is in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, and that they plan to have it signed by the January 11th expiration date. However, he added that he has no details on the composition of the Committee re-charter.

Heidi Newsome addressed the Committee regarding the Burned Area Emergency Rehabilitation project on the ALE. The project first concentrated on native grass re-establishment by aerial spraying invasive species, then aerial seeding with native grass mixes based on elevation level. Three planting crews worked simultaneously to plant 700,000 sagebrush seedlings that were cultivated locally from seed sources on the Monument. The seedlings were planted in islands in hopes that would foster regeneration and spread out over the next five to ten years. This also helps them defend the seedlings in the event of a fire. The Nature Conservancy is working with the Service to monitor the long-term success of the project. She stated that as part of the project, they were also replacing lines of fencing along Highway 240, from four-strand barbed wire to single-strand. This would facilitate passage of tumbleweed and other heat-intensive brush that currently collect along the fence line.

Recap and Next Steps

Mr. Watts explained that due to the uncertainty of the re-charter process at this time, it would be presumptuous to discuss next steps. He asked Ms. Shorett to summarize the meeting's activities.

He added that once the Service has details on the Committee re-charter, those details would be passed along to Committee members.

Ms. Shorett summarized the meeting progress, re-stating the goals for the meeting, and the activities conducted during the meeting. She also thanked the Committee for their hard work over the last two years.

Greg Hughes adjourned the meeting at 2:10 p.m.

Certified By:

Greg Hughes, DFO

Jim Watts, Chair

MEETING ATTENDANCE

Committee Seat	Member	Alternate
K-12 Education		Royace Aikin
Cities	Bob Thompson	<i>vacant</i>
Conservation/Environmental Counties	Rick Leaumont	Mike Lilga Frank Brock
Economic Development	Jim Watts	Harold Heacock
Outdoor Recreation	Rich Steele	
Public-at-Large	Kris Watkins	
Scientific/Academic		Eric Gerber
	David Geist	
	Gene Schreckhise	
State	Jeff Tayer	Ron Skinnarland
Tribal	Rex Buck	<i>vacant</i>
Utilities/Irrigation		<i>vacant</i>
Designated Federal Official	Greg Hughes	

Participants and Invited Speakers

U.S. Department of Energy	Dana Ward
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Heidi Newsome
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Dan Haas

Facilitators

Triangle Associates, Inc.	Alice Shorett	Derek Van Marter
---------------------------	---------------	------------------

Meeting Support

U.S. Department of Energy	Janine Becho
---------------------------	--------------

Observers

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Paula Call
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Mike Marxen
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Jenna Gaston
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Norman Henrikson
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Naomi Sherer
U.S. Department of Energy	Tom Ferns
CTUIR	John Cox
BPA	Bill Erickson
BPA	Don Rose
Congressman Hastings Office	Joyce Olson
WA Dept of Fish & Wildlife	Paul LaRiviere

*Hanford Reach National Monument
Federal Planning Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary*

Final
January 7, 2003

Benton County
Grant County Tourism
Energy Northwest
Backcountry Horsemen of WA
Richland Rod & Gun
Richland Rod & Gun
Tri-City Herald
B-Reactor Museum Assoc.
Public

Adam Fyall
Terese Schrom
John Arbuckle
Linda Smith
Eugene Van Liew
Eddie Manthos
John Stang
Del Ballard
Marve Hyman
Alan Stellwagen

DISTRIBUTED MATERIALS

Committee's Packet of Materials

Meeting Agenda (January 7, 2003)

Draft Meeting Summary: Session #10 (December 3, 2002)

National Wildlife Refuges & National Monuments

Suggestions for Monument Vision Statement and Goals

Public Scoping Report

Planning Workshop #2 Agenda

ATTACHMENT A

Vision Statement

The Hanford Reach National Monument is a unique and biologically diverse landscape, encompassing an irreplaceable legacy of natural, scientific and historic objects. The Reach, the last free flowing, non-tidal stretch of the Columbia River, is the ribbon that weaves shrub-steppe and riverine communities together, defining a magnificent landscape – a place to discover the richness of life and experience nature in solitude. It has provided physical and spiritual sustenance for Native Americans since time immemorial.

The Monument's diverse communities of plants and wildlife are critical to the biological integrity of the Columbia Basin. The unique combination of the rare and expansive shrub-steppe ecosystem, the free flowing river, and the last major salmon spawning grounds surviving on the Columbia, combine to create diverse and rich mosaics of habitat. The Monument is a refuge for a multitude of species, some of which are new to science.

The Monument is a natural gathering place to experience, learn and reflect on the past. The Monument embodies respect for the value of natural and cultural resources, existing users, neighbors, partners and visitors.

The vision for the Monument is to be a place where natural, cultural and historic resources are preserved and protected, and where public access is provided where compatible with the Monument's resources.

ATTACHMENT B

Goals

1. Conserve and restore the plants, animals, and shrub-steppe habitats native to the Hanford Reach National Monument.
2. Conserve and restore the communities of fish and other aquatic and riparian-dependent plant and animal species native to the Hanford Reach National Monument.
3. Protect and acknowledge the Native American, settler, atomic and Cold War histories of the Monument to ensure present and future generations recognize the significance of the area's past.
4. Protect the distinctive geological and paleontological resources of the Monument.
5. Provide a rich variety of educational and interpretive opportunities for visitors to gain a deeper appreciation, knowledge and understanding of the Monuments diverse ecosystems, and its geological, cultural and historical events. These activities must be compatible with the resource protection needs of the Monument.
6. Provide access for recreational opportunities compatible with the resource protection needs of the Monument.
7. Allow scientific research that is compatible with the resource protection needs of the Monument.
8. Establish and maintain a cooperative fire management program that protects facilities, resources and neighbors, and fulfills natural resource management objectives.
9. Provide infrastructure, operations and maintenance capabilities that are in harmony with Monument purposes.
10. Foster, support, and respect cooperative partnerships that preserve valid and existing rights while protecting the purposes of the Monument. Recognize and cooperate with federal, state, local and tribal governments in the discharge of statutory responsibilities. Enhance relationships and partnerships with community organizations and neighbors furthering management goals.
11. Enhance Monument resources by establishing and maintaining connectivity with neighboring habitats.
12. Protect treaty rights and provide access for cultural and spiritual use for native people.
13. Protect the natural visual character and provide the opportunity to experience solitude on the Monument.