

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

**Working Session Summary: Session # 6
Thursday, May 2, 2002
Consolidated Information Center
Washington State University Tri-Cities
Richland, WA**

The Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee met in a working session Thursday, May 2, 2002 from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. in the Consolidated Information Center at Washington State University Tri-Cities, Richland, Washington.

The purpose of the working session was to:

1. Hear subcommittee reports on issues, concerns and opportunities; and
2. Complete discussion on subcommittee issues statements.

Welcome and Introductions

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

Jim Watts reviewed the public comment process and reminded those that would like to make public comment that there was a five-minute time limit. He also reviewed the Committee's purpose and charter. He explained the Federal Register Notice had not been published in the required time line of 14 days prior to the working session date, and as such the Committee could not make recommendations or provide advice to the USFWS. This meeting will be a "Working Session" of the Federal Planning Advisory Committee, rather than a decision-making meeting. No Committee decisions would be made at the session today.

Meeting Summary from Session # 5

There were no comments for change on the draft meeting summary from Session #5. The Committee will recommend adopting the summary as it stands at the next Committee working session on May 29, 2002.

Overview of Committee product and process

Alice Shorett gave a brief overview of the Committee product and the process to reach that product. She explained that most of the day would be spent hearing and shaping the draft products the subcommittees would report on. The Committee would hear reports from each of the subcommittee chairs, each followed by a question and answer session from the Committee.

Alice Shorett explained that at the last meeting the subcommittees were tasked with developing a draft issues statement in each of their topics: (a) Public Use and Access, (b) Resource Protection, (c) Valid Existing Rights, and (d) the Ad Hoc subcommittee on conflict resolution. The purpose of the product is to help the Committee identify issues and provide the USFWS with advice on the public scoping process. The purpose of public scoping is to educate and engage the public about the Comprehensive Conservation Plan process, to provide a preliminary summary of planning issues, and to seek public input. The Committee is to provide official advice to the USFWS on these draft issues statements to be used in preparing the Issues and Opportunities Workbook for the public scoping process. The purpose of the subcommittee reports today would be to identify cross-cutting issues, discuss the issues identified by the subcommittees, and consolidate the reports to get out to everyone prior to the next meeting.

Ms. Shorett also clarified the time line with relation to the planning process and where the Committee was to date. The first advice given to the USFWS would be on May 29th, on the issues statements for the Issues and Opportunities Workbook. The USFWS would use the Workbooks for intensive public scoping sessions, which will likely be this summer, approximately July-August. The Committee would then come back together after the intensive public scoping sessions and review the input provided by the public.

Subcommittee Reports on issues

The subcommittee chairmen proceeded to provide highlights of each subcommittee report and take questions for discussion from Committee members.

Valid Existing Rights Subcommittee Report

Jeff Tayer gave an overview of the subcommittee report. The subcommittee raised the need for a process to identify each valid existing right and to evaluate the implication of each valid existing right to Monument management.

Jim Watts pointed out that the last sentence on the first page may help identify that need. He also mentioned that the subcommittee identified a variety of potential valid existing rights in the report table, and it points out the need for someone to clarify each of those rights.

Q: Can the USFWS provide a consultant to look into these rights much deeper than this subcommittee or Committee can?

R: Jim Watts replied with his experience of what happened on the Hanford Future Site Uses Committee. The Department of Energy had their legal team look into valid and existing rights over the entire reservation.

Bob Rosselli indicated he would look into those findings, and provide any documents to the Committee.

Jeff Tayer also said he would like to see any previous work that has been done to document these rights. He mentioned there may be the need to set up a process to help clarify where there are existing responsibilities identified in the preliminary report.

Resource Protection Subcommittee Report

Rick Leumont opened by thanking the subcommittee members. He reported that he was very pleased with how the subcommittee members worked together. They started out by adding more to the initial background statement, as it did not seem to go far enough. They added historical, cultural, and geological resources to the background. One issue they dealt with throughout the report was addressing the value of opportunities for serenity and solitude on the Monument, which is very difficult to quantify or qualify.

The subcommittee worked on the premise that management of these resources should be based on good science. It was the subcommittee's overall assessment that the Monument is an important intact ecosystem, and should be managed through a holistic ecosystem management approach. The approach is to allow public uses, but should always be compatible with long-term protection of the resource.

The subcommittee addressed several issues and opportunities in the issues document. "Fire management" focused on prevention and response. The Committee will need to identify where equipment and resources are needed. This is a priority, and he added that the subcommittee members would like to see more coordination with other existing agencies.

"Cleanup and Restoration" dealt with what the subcommittee thinks the Monument and Hanford should look like after the cleanup and restoration processes are complete.

"Operation and Maintenance" addressed issues around operation and maintenance of existing utility facilities in the Monument. The Proclamation states that nothing in the Proclamation shall interfere with operation and maintenance of these facilities. Operation and maintenance activities should be carried out in such a way as to minimize impacts to important resources.

"Management Actions that Impact Shrub-Steppe Habitat" dealt with the issues around the need to preserve shrub-steppe habitat.

"Cultural and Historic Resources" identifies a very difficult balancing act. The resources need to be protected, and treaty rights respected.

Another issue identified by the subcommittee was "Solitude and Tranquility", which would need to be expanded. This is very difficult to define but is crucial to protect when management decisions are made.

Other issues identified by the subcommittee include “Offsite Activities”, and protecting water quality and “Air Quality.”

Q: Are you assuming table-top exercises for fire management?

R: Yes.

The Committee continued with a discussion on fire management. Committee members distinguished between fire prevention and containment. Several members pointed out the impossible task of prevention, while maintaining that some fire is essential to the quality of the shrub-steppe habitat.

It was also noted that one of the main issues that would occur on fire management is education.

The Committee discussed noxious weeds. Mr. Leaumont explained that they did not specifically address noxious weeds as an issue because they felt that threats like noxious weeds would fall under the larger issues of maintaining natural ecosystems. The Committee also discussed the issue of monitoring impacts.

Public Use & Access Subcommittee Report

Rich Steele described the subcommittee process and what they developed in their report. He explained that the report was divided into three geographic areas: Arid Lands Ecology Reserve (ALE), Wahluke Slope and Columbia River corridor. Karen Wieda added that once they began identifying public use and access, they realized how large a task it was to be all-inclusive. For that reason, they split the assessment into the three geographical areas, which have differing issues around public access.

Conflict Resolution Subcommittee Report

Leo Bowman congratulated the rest of the subcommittees on their work. Two issues the subcommittee identified as a group were sloughing of White Bluffs and water flows. The subcommittee would gather the information around one of the two topics, and facilitate what would happen with that information and how it would address the issue.

Use of Committee’s Advice

Greg Hughes clarified with the Committee the process by which USFWS would use the issues advice, once adopted, from the Committee. The Committee is taking small steps now to what will eventually lead to public scoping. All of the Committee’s advice would be given to the core planning team and reviewed. The planning team would take all these issues and develop something that can go out to the public which will help engage and educate about the issues being addressed in the Comprehensive Conservation Plan.

Following lunch, there was a discussion on filling vacancies on the Committee. Greg Hughes

explained that he is filling out the correct forms and putting together a final package to send up to the Secretary of the Interior. The USFWS recognizes the need to fill the vacancies, while also keeping in mind the need to recharter the full Committee in January 2003.

Full Committee review of issue statements

Alice Shorett reviewed with the Committee those cross-cutting issues she heard from Committee's discussion about the subcommittee reports. Those are:

1. Balance protection of resources with public access.
2. Organize the plan/scoping/issues around 3-5 geographic areas.
3. Management issues across boundaries (i.e. Fire protection issues affect inside Monument, neighbors, vegetation management, wildlife).
4. Initial education of the public about the valid existing rights, Proclamation and boundaries of the Monument.

Ms. Shorett asked the Committee to help identify any other cross-cutting issues they may have heard.

Q: Will this document focus on ideas brought up in the morning such as management agencies versus resources protection versus access issues? How will this be dealt with in a document?

R: For public scoping, the focus would be to get the issue out in front of the public. After the public scoping process, the Committee would eventually need more of an in-depth analysis on each of the issues.

Comprehensive Conservation Plan Scoping and Timeline

Glenn Frederick from the USFWS Regional Planning Office addressed the Committee regarding the current time line for planning and scoping. He explained they are currently putting together a planning team that would do the bulk of writing the Comprehensive Conservation Plan. The planning team would put together the Issues and Opportunities Workbook based on the work done by the subcommittees, and the advice provided by the full Committee. Once the Notice of Intent is published, the public scoping process would be initiated and would continue until USFWS releases a draft report. The USFWS would be taking public comment throughout public scoping, but that there would be an "intensive" public scoping process to include several public workshops this summer. A contractor would help them pull together all the information after the intensive public scoping process, which, together with Committee and subcommittee work and input, will go into developing a range of alternatives, sometime in the fall. Mr. Frederick also briefly talked about the "Field Guide to Outreach" created by the USFWS, which would be presented to the Committee in more detail at the May 29th working session.

Protocol for Committee/subcommittee presentations

Ms. Shorett described the proposed protocol for hearing informational presentations at future Committee working sessions. At the March 19th working session, the Committee asked for a

protocol to address the various interest groups wanting to address the Committee with information that may be pertinent to long-range management decisions. The protocol information presented to the Committee outlined three thresholds for the Committee to use in deciding the importance of a particular topic. The proposed protocol and presentation matrix is included as Attachment A. A discussion followed with a number of suggestions for revisions to be taken up at the next meeting on May 29th.

Q: Can we get information from groups as part of the scoping process?

R: Ms. Shorett responded by saying it is common practice to use focus groups in the public scoping process. The focus groups will allow you to obtain specific information to that interest group.

Recap and next steps

Greg Hughes addressed the Committee regarding recent day-to-day management decisions and actions on the Monument. The Core Planning Team emphasis would shift from responding to daily management issues, to long-term planning of the Monument with the hiring of a new Deputy Director to help with the daily management operations. He explained the Team was still coming on board, and that there was a lot of catch-up work in the planning process. There would be several stages needed prior to the public scoping process, which would be initiated by the publication of the Notice of Intent. For example, the Government-to-Government consultations with Tribal Governments, and dialogue will occur prior to public scoping. Mr. Hughes also encouraged the Committee to continually reach out to their constituencies, and reminded them that was a large part of the job for everyone present at the working session. With regard to fire management, Mr. Hughes explained the intergovernmental agreements which exist and the amount of work and cooperation it would take to continue this process.

Public Comment

Jay McConnaughey of the Yakama Indian Nation addressed the Committee. He was concerned about Tribal Nation involvement. He requested Greg Hughes contact Russell Jim in the next several days to discuss these issues.

Mr. Hughes responded that he had made telephone calls to Mr. Jim in the past and he would be meeting at the end of the month with Carroll Palmer, Yakama Indian Nation Natural Resources Department Director, and Anne Badgley, Regional Director of the USFWS, on Government-to-Government consultation.

Closing Remarks

Ms. Shorett reminded the Committee of the time line prior to the next Committee meeting, which will be held Wednesday, May 29th, from 12:00 - 4:00 p.m. at the City of West Richland Council Chambers. By May 10th, the subcommittee chairs should forward to Triangle Associates any changes made to their initial subcommittee reports. Prior to the next meeting, the subcommittee

chairs will have a conference call with Triangle Associates on the initial Committee product for public scoping. The Committee will provide advice on issues and public scoping outreach at the next meeting on May 29th.

Greg Hughes adjourned the working session at 3:00 p.m.

Certified By:

Greg Hughes, DFO

Jim Watts, Chair

WORKING SESSION ATTENDANCE

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

Participants and Invited Speakers

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| U.S. Department of Energy | Bob Rosselli, Deputy Manager for Business Services |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Glenn Frederick |

Facilitators

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

Working session Support

| | |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| U.S. Department of Energy | Sara Popp |
|---------------------------|-----------|

Observers

| | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Paula Call |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Mike Marxen |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Jane Bardolf |
| U.S. Department of Energy | Dana Ward |
| CTUIR | John Cox |
| Yakama Nation | Jay McConnaughey |
| Benton County | Adam Fyall |
| BPA | Mary Hollen |
| PNNL | Janice Parthree |
| City of Richland | Rita Mazur |
| Energy Northwest | John Arbuckle |

*Hanford Reach National Monument
Federal Planning Advisory Committee
Working Session Summary*

Final
May 2, 2002

Back Country Horsemen

WA Water Trails

Richland Rod & Gun

Congressman Hastings Office

Tri-City Herald

Public

Linda Smith

Everyll Davison

Reed Waite

Eddie Monthos

Eugene Van Liew

Joyce Olson

Mike Lee

Alan Stellwagen

Matt Taylor

Marve Hyman

DISTRIBUTED MATERIALS

Committee's Packet of Materials

Working session Agenda (May 2, 2002)
Revised Groundrules (March 19, 2002)
Draft Meeting Summary: Session #5 (March 19, 2002)
Decision-making Flow Process
Valid Existing Rights subcommittee report
Resource Protection subcommittee report
Public Use and Access subcommittee report
Suggested Presentation Protocol
Presentation Matrix
A Field Guide to Outreach

ATTACHMENT A

Suggested Presentation Protocol for Information

Hanford Reach National Monument
Federal Planning Advisory Committee

At the request of the Committee at its last session, the facilitation team reviewed all of the informational presentations that have been given to the Committee, dates provided, and requests that have been made to present information to the committee (see attached matrix). The Committee noted that, rather than respond to requests to give presentations to the committee in an ad hoc or scattershot fashion, the Committee should consider a protocol through which any request would be tested by the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Designated Federal Official.

We suggest the committee consider three thresholds of information:

First Threshold:

Does the committee need to understand the information to accomplish its mission in providing advice about a comprehensive plan for the Hanford Reach National Monument (for example, information regarding valid existing rights mentioned in the Proclamation, existing condition and uses at the site)? Does the whole committee need to receive this information? What is the best way for the committee to get the information?

Second Threshold:

Does the information provide necessary or important information to the work of a subject area subcommittee? For example, the public use and access subcommittee might hear about important historical sites from interest groups or request letters from them.

Third Threshold:

If the information is about an activity or set of activities that could potentially impact the Monument and where USFWS will be making formal comments regarding an activity, then the information could be provided to the Committee members for individually providing advice. These activities are likely not appropriate for presentation at a Federal Advisory Committee meeting. However, materials may be provided at a table during a full Committee meeting for those Committee members wanting more information on the subject.

All presentations should be limited to fifteen minutes unless otherwise arranged prior to a meeting. The "List of Possible Educational Presentations" is a running list of those whom have requested an opportunity to present information to the Committee.