

**HANFORD REACH NATIONAL MONUMENT
FEDERAL PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Summary: Session # 16
Thursday, January 15, 2004
Washington State University Tri-Cities
Consolidated Information Center, Rooms 120 & 120A
Richland, WA**

The Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee met on Thursday, January 15, 2004 from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the Washington State University Tri-Cities Consolidated Information Center in Richland, Washington.

The purpose of the meeting was to hear final recommendations from subcommittees and act on formal advice regarding the draft Monument management objectives.

Welcome and Introductions

Paula Call, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) Acting Designated Federal Official (DFO), Hanford Reach National Monument, opened the meeting and welcomed Committee members, the public and other attendees. Ms. Call introduced Steve Wisness as the representative for the US Department of Energy (DOE). Ms. Call briefed the Committee on the status of the re-charter process. The re-charter package is still in Washington D.C., and the Monument has had no new news on the progress of the reappointment process.

Alice Shorett, facilitator, reviewed the day's agenda, noting that the purpose of the day's session was to hear from each of the subcommittees on how they responded to Committee comments from the December meeting. After the presentations and Committee discussion, the Committee would take action on advice to the Service and DOE regarding Monument management objectives.

Jim Watts, Committee Chair, 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 to immediately follow the opening of the meeting and Committee business. 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.

Meeting Minutes from Session #15

Mr. Watts asked the Committee for any changes to the summary from Session #15 as drafted. There were no suggestions. The Committee approved a motion to adopt the meeting summary.

<p>Action: Committee members adopted the meeting summary from Session #15 as drafted.</p>
--

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

NEPA Analysis Process Review

Dan Haas, Lead Planner, addressed the Committee on the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and planning processes (Attachment A). He presented to the Committee the similarities between NEPA analysis and planning phases, and how they both feed into adoption and implementation of a final plan. Mr. Haas also revisited the planning stages of developing goals, objectives and strategies, and the differences in those planning steps. He reiterated that the Committee was currently providing advice on management objectives. From those objectives, the Service would be developing strategies for implementation of the preferred alternative. The objective statements serve as a measurement for management to identify their success rate with respect to a particular management issue.

Report on Refuge Activities

Paula Call addressed day-to-day management topics. She asked Jenna Gaston, Cultural Resources Manager to address the Committee. Ms. Gaston reported that the Service had successfully conducted a pilot project on an historical re-enactment at the White Bluffs town site. The Service will be looking to secure funding to reproduce the program during the White Bluffs town reunion during the summer of 2004. The staff also worked with volunteers to drape a tarp over the structure of the White Bluffs bank during the cold season to protect it from further deterioration during inclement weather. The Service is looking to secure funding for restoration and rehabilitation work on the historic bank structure.

Dave Smith, Natural Resource Manager, also addressed the Committee. He reported that the team had been hard at work over the winter on several resource restoration projects. One of the most recent restoration projects was focused on the burned area from last summer's fire. Rehabilitation efforts have been successful to this point. The recent snowfall will help the young plants' critical growth during the spring. He added that he expected approximately 40,000 plants from a local nursery (plants previously grown from local native seeds), but the Monument unfortunately received about 1800 plants. Staff will be collecting more local native seeds and distributing those to nurseries for another propagation. Finally, he described a recent volunteer effort in December to place 600 native plants around the entrance signs to the Monument.

Ms. Call explained that the Monument staff recently welcomed three new employees, bringing the total to twenty-three full-time and part-time staff. Since the last Committee meeting in December, the Service has been working with the State of Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) on the issues related to the elk herd. The two agencies have decided to hold an "elk summit" bringing together the agencies, affected landowners, interested parties and the public. Committee members will also be invited to attend. The purpose of the summit is to get all the facts straight, open lines of communication between all parties on the issue, and come to a collective agreement on a list of actions to address the issues in the short-term. For the long-term, the Service is working on a step-down management plan for elk management. Ms. Call added that no date had been set for the summit.

The Committee questioned whether the step-down management plan would be developed with the WDFW to look at the entire life cycle of the elk, or would it only focus on elk management on the Monument. Ms. Call responded by saying that the step-down management plan for elk

would look at management issues beyond the Monument boundaries, but would only make decisions on actions or suggest specific actions that the Service could take within their jurisdiction.

Mr. Watts encouraged the Committee members to attend the summit. He stated that in order for the Committee to give appropriate advice on the long-term management issues with respect to elk, it is important to understand the stakeholders' input from the summit.

Subcommittee Recommendations in Response to Committee Comments and Committee Discussion

Mr. Watts asked each subcommittee chair to present to the Committee how the subcommittee addressed comments and concerns from the December Committee meeting. He explained that a discussion would follow each subcommittee presentation, and that the goal would be to come to agreement on each of the reports as the meeting proceeds. At the end of the discussion, he would ask the Committee for a motion to adopt the subcommittee reports as drafted or revised as Committee advice on Monument management objectives. He asked Ms. Shorett to facilitate the presentations and discussion.

Ms. Shorett explained to the Committee the process for presentation and discussion. First, the subcommittee chair would present to the Committee how the subcommittee members addressed comments from the December meeting (Attachment B). Second, the Committee would discuss the subcommittee report and seek conclusion on the discussion before closing out the discussion. Lastly, once the Committee has reached agreement on the subcommittee reports, changes would be made to the reports and set aside for formal action on advice later in the meeting.

She also reminded the Committee that the purpose of the meeting today was to take action on formal advice regarding management objectives. She reported that there was plenty of time for discussion. At the end of the meeting, the Committee would formalize their advice, and a cover letter, to be forwarded to the Service and DOE. She added that in the event agreement could not be reached on an issue, a minority report would be attached to the advice cover letter reflecting the disagreement. It would then be up to the Service to make the final determination on the issue, and articulate how they addressed the issue and how the Committee's advice was used.

Valid Existing Rights

Derek Van Marter, co-facilitator, explained that the subcommittee met via email and made a few suggestions regarding the four goals they were responsible for evaluating. The consensus of the Committee at the December meeting was that valid existing and treaty rights superceded goals of the Service in managing the Monument, and that these rights should be addressed up front in the Plan.

Subcommittee member Nancy Craig added to the presentation on the subcommittee report. She stated the main message was that the responsibilities of the Service to valid existing rights remain the same, regardless of goals in the Plan and the alternatives selected. Additionally, she stated that the Service has a responsibility to understand the needs and historic practices of valid existing rights holders. She presented specific suggestions for edits to the subcommittee report for the Committee to consider. The subcommittee suggested a redraft of the second objective

under goal 10. The Committee responded by requesting the specific suggestions be presented in writing. Mr. Van Marter said he would type them up during the lunch break for a Committee discussion.

Cultural & Historical Resources (subcommittee chair Michele Gerber)

Ms. Gerber reported how the subcommittee considered Committee comments from the December meeting. She explained that there were essentially only two comments from the last meeting. The first was that the time line for establishing a “Monument Watch” program should be earlier rather than later. The subcommittee handled this by adding clarifying language to implement the program as soon as was realistically possible. Additionally, Ms. Gerber reminded the Committee that they had agreed with the subcommittee’s suggestion to address treaty and valid existing rights in the beginning of the Plan.

The Committee discussion on the subcommittee report focused on clarification of what “Section 106” is in reference to; calling out historic structures and features not on Monument land; the purpose behind collecting geological and paleontological data, and for whom it would be made available; why Locke Island was removed from the objective to seek resolution on White Bluffs sloughing; and the implementation timing of a “Monument Watch” program. The Committee asked subcommittee members to report back to the Committee after the lunch break regarding these concerns.

Aquatic Natural Resources (subcommittee chair Leo Bowman)

In subcommittee chairman Bowman’s absence, Mr. Van Marter gave a facilitator’s report on how the subcommittee responded to Committee comments from the December meeting. The subcommittee met via email, primarily focusing on the definition of “cursory” as discussed at the last meeting. He stated that the subcommittee suggested revising the statement to convey the message that all resource inventories and monitoring programs would be comprehensive, but that the focus of those projects would depend upon the alternative.

For example, under the resource emphasis alternative (B), the comprehensive inventory and monitoring would occur across the Monument. Under the concentration of facilities alternative (C), the comprehensive inventory and monitoring would occur first where activities and facilities would be concentrated. Similarly, the Service would focus on public use areas and facilities for a comprehensive inventory and monitoring program under the public use emphasis alternative (D).

Mr. Watts asked for any comments to the report. The Committee had no other comments and agreed with the subcommittee recommendations.

Terrestrial Natural Resources (subcommittee chair Rick Leaumont)

Mr. Leaumont gave a brief overview of the subcommittee’s report. He explained that the subcommittee met once in person to discuss the Committee comments from the December meeting. The subcommittee members felt the two most significant issues that came up had to do with developing research standards and restoring habitat to a historic level. He also stated that the subcommittee did not specifically address the Committee comment regarding protection of

foods and medicines collected on the Monument from chemical treatment for invasive species. Mr. Leumont suggested some language in the appropriate objective to address that concern.

The Committee discussed the need to specifically call out in the objective what the research standards will require. After discussion on the topic, the Committee agreed to include a footnote to the objective stating the intentions to ensure the research area is cleaned and restored to pre-project conditions. The Committee also suggested that recreation and use should be monitored and managed under the first objective, goal number one.

Public Use & Access (subcommittee chair Mike Lilga)

Mr. Lilga reported on the recent subcommittee work to the Committee in an effort to address comments from the December meeting. Mr. Lilga reported that the subcommittee met once to systematically go through each of the comments and discuss how it could address them. The most significant comments from the December Committee meeting addressed river access and elk hunting. Mr. Lilga reported that while the subcommittee members felt these were important issues, they believed the range of objectives they originally presented were sufficient for purposes of analysis in the Plan.

The Committee discussed the need to call out the visitors' center project in objectives. The discussion focused on whether it would be appropriate, or necessary, in an effort to secure potential funding for the project. The Committee agreed that it was a separate project and that it would be best not to tie it into the environmental analysis for the Monument. Also, the center is off Monument land, and not a Service-driven project. The Committee then discussed the first objective under goal 7, stating that the objective, as drafted, only described the range of alternatives. After discussion on the purpose of the objective as drafted, the Committee asked the subcommittee members to report back after the lunch break on their recommendation for modifying or deleting this objective.

Additional Public Comment

Michele Gerber, Richland citizen, addressed the Committee. She described a recent situation where she was describing the Monument to a friend who lives in another part of eastern Washington. Ms. Gerber commented that her friend's response was that the Government was just trying to keep everyone out of the Hanford Reach. Ms. Gerber explained that she was surprised to hear this sentiment still existed after four years, and suggested that the Service implement an aggressive outreach program to more broadly reach out to surrounding communities.

Ms. Call responded to the public comment by saying that she was also surprised to hear that sentiment still existed, and that the Service is trying to be as proactive as possible. She explained the outreach program they have in place, and stated that they were continuing efforts to visit various communities as the opportunities arise.

The Committee discussed the probable cause of such sentiment. Some Committee members stated that while the DOE clean up continued, it would be challenging to proactively reach out locally and regionally promoting the Monument. Some Committee members stated that the Visitors Center has the potential to positively impact the current image.

Action on Advice Regarding Monument Management Objectives

Discussion of Subcommittee Reports

After lunch break, the Committee continued discussion of the subcommittee reports, focusing on unresolved issues and concerns on the reports from the Valid Existing Rights, Cultural and Historical Resources and Public Use & Access subcommittees.

Valid Existing Rights

The Valid Existing Rights subcommittee projected their suggested changes on the screen for the Committee to view. Following discussion of the suggestions, the Committee agreed to the following redrafted language of the second objective under goal 10:

“Within one year of the CCP being adopted, evaluate operations and maintenance procedures of valid existing rights holders, and negotiate feasible changes to ensure protection of Monument resources.”

Additionally, the subcommittee suggested deleting goal 13 in support of the Service’s recommendation to weave the goal into the remaining goals and objectives. The Committee consented to this suggestion.

The Committee discussed who should be held responsible to evaluate the existence of valid existing rights. Committee members stated that the initial Valid Existing Rights subcommittee suggested identifying all the existing rights. The Proclamation is explicit on identifying various rights, but may not be inclusive of all valid existing rights. Ms. Call responded by saying that the Service is working with the Cooperating Agencies to write a section of the Plan describing valid existing rights. Tribal rights are also being addressed through consultations, existing law and policies.

Cultural and Historic Resources

The Cultural and Historic Resources subcommittee presented how they addressed the main concerns from the morning Committee discussion. First, Locke Island was stricken from the White Bluffs objective in an effort to separate island erosion objectives from the current White Bluffs sloughing study. Second, the subcommittee suggested specific language to clarify the purpose and need behind the geological and paleontological data collection objective. The subcommittee also clarified the language with respect to federal land requiring National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 cultural surveys. The subcommittee members suggested that the last objective under alternatives B and C, goal 5, be clarified to reflect that a Service strategy should be to interpret the nearby historic structures and features visible from the Monument. Finally, the subcommittee suggested that the timing of implementing a “Monument Watch” program should be a high priority.

Public Use & Access

The Public Use & Access subcommittee followed by presenting how they addressed unresolved Committee concerns from the morning. The morning Committee discussion focused on the need

to include the first objective statements under goal 7. The subcommittee suggested language that made the objective statements more action oriented rather than descriptive.

The Committee had a concern about leaving development open throughout the Monument under alternative D, first objective, goal 7. The Committee discussed the need to make sure that any development that occurs is compatible with Monument resources and the Proclamation. The Committee suggested adding a qualifier to make the objective statement compatible with resource protection.

The Committee also discussed the need to analyze opening up Vernita to more boat traffic and camping opportunities. The Committee felt that the existing objective statements represented a good range from one extreme to the other; they did not represent all the opportunities available to consider and analyze camping and boating along the river corridor. The Committee suggested an approach that keeps the status quo under alternative B, provides camping and boating access at the ends of the Monument (Vernita and Ringold) under alternative C, and develops boating and camping access that increases quantity and quality at intervals throughout the corridor under alternative D.

Ms. Shorett summarized the Committee's discussion and the proposed changes. She stated that the Committee would be taking action on formalizing the subcommittee reports as Committee advice. Mr. Watts asked for a motion from the Committee to adopt the subcommittee reports as amended. The Committee approved a motion to adopt the reports as advice. The reports, as revised, are included as Attachments C-G.

Action: The Committee approved a motion to adopt the subcommittee reports as advice on Monument management objectives, with amendments.

Discussion of Advice Cover Letter

Mr. Watts asked the Committee members to review the draft cover letter in their packets. The cover letter was drafted to reflect the themes from the subcommittee reports and the December Committee discussion on those reports. The Committee agreed that the themes represented in the cover letter were accurate. Committee members suggested a few minor changes to reflect the decisions made during the meeting. The Committee then approved motion to adopt the cover letter as drafted, with the suggested edits (Attachment H).

Action: The Committee approved a motion to adopt the cover letter for Advice #6: Monument Management Objectives, with amendments.

Summary and Next Steps

Mr. Watts asked Ms. Shorett to summarize the meeting proceedings. She reported that the Committee heard from the five subcommittees on their reports regarding preliminary management objectives for the thirteen goals of the Monument. The Committee suggested additional edits to the reports, which were made at the meeting and approved as Committee advice on Monument management objectives.

Ms. Shorett directed Committee members to send additional comments on the advice to Derek Van Marter at Triangle Associates. Any dissenting comments will be attached to the cover letter and forwarded with the advice package to the Service and DOE. Triangle will also circulate the revised cover letter to reflect the changes from the Committee meeting. Once approved, the package will be assembled and sent forward.

Ms. Shorett indicated that the next two Committee meetings were scheduled for the following dates, all at the WSU-CIC:

- Wednesday, February 25, 2004 from 9:30 – 4:30
- Thursday, April 29, 2004 from 9:30 – 4:30

Additional Committee Business

The Committee discussed the possibility and need to write a letter to the Secretary of the Interior regarding the failure to appoint new Committee members a year after being re-chartered. The Committee discussed the pros and cons of doing so. After a lengthy discussion on the topic, the Committee decided to move forward acting on official business, and continue to reach out to constituents throughout the planning process.

Paula Call thanked everyone for coming and adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

Approved by:

Greg Hughes, DFO

Jim Watts, Chair

MEETING ATTENDANCE

Committee Seat	Member	Alternate
K-12 Education	Karen Weida	Royace Aikin
Cities		<i>vacant</i>
Conservation/Environmental	Rick Leaumont	Mike Lilga
Counties		Frank Brock
Economic Development	Jim Watts	Harold Heacock
Outdoor Recreation	Rich Steele	
Public-at-Large	Kris Watkins	
Scientific/Academic	Michele Gerber	Eric Gerber
	David Geist	
	Gene Schreckhise	<i>vacant</i>
State	Jeff Tayer	Ron Skinnerland
Native American		<i>vacant</i>
Utilities/Irrigation	Nancy Craig	<i>vacant</i>
Designated Federal Official	Paula Call (<i>Acting</i>)	

Participants and Invited Speakers

U.S. Department of Energy	Steve Wisness
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Dan Haas
	Jenna Gaston
	David Smith

Facilitators

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

Meeting Support

U.S. Department of Energy

Observers

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Ron Crouse
U.S. Department of Energy	Tom Ferns
U.S. Department of Energy	Dana Ward
Yakama Nation	David Rowland
BPA	Mary Hollen
Benton County	Adam Fyall
City of Richland	Rita Mazur
Energy Northwest	John Arbuckle
BHI	Steve Weiss
CHI	Jenifer Linville
Backcountry Horsemen of WA	Everyll Davison
	Linda Smith
Public	Robert Slegel
	Maynard Plahuta

DISTRIBUTED MATERIALS

Committee's Packet of Materials

Meeting Agenda (January 15, 2004)

Draft Meeting Summary: Session #15 (December 4, 2003)

Subcommittee Reports on Monument Management Objectives:

- Cultural & Historical Resources
- Aquatic Natural Resources
- Terrestrial Natural Resources
- Public Use & Access

Discussion of Subcommittee Reports: Comments Compiled from December 4, 2003 FAC Meeting

Draft Cover Letter for Advice #6: Monument Management Objectives