

Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop II



February 10-13, 2003
Richland, WA

FINAL REPORT



Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop II

February 10-13, 2003
Richland, WA



FINAL REPORT

A Collaborative Workshop:

United States Fish & Wildlife Service
The Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (SSC/IUCN)



A contribution of the IUCN/SSC Conservation Breeding Specialist Group in collaboration with the United States Fish & Wildlife Service.

The CBSG, SSC and IUCN encourage workshops and other fora for the consideration and analysis of issues related to conservation, and believe that reports of these meetings are most useful when broadly disseminated. The opinions and recommendations expressed in this report reflect the issues discussed and ideas expressed by the participants in the workshop and do not necessarily reflect the opinion or position of the CBSG, SSC, or IUCN.

© Copyright CBSG 2003

CBSG (eds). 2003. *Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop II. FINAL REPORT.* IUCN/SSC Conservation Breeding Specialist Group: Apple Valley, MN.

Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop II

February 10-13, 2003
Richland, WA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
1. Executive Summary	7
A. Introduction and Workshop Process	
B. Working Vision	
C. Working Goals	
D. Draft Management Alternatives	
E. Draft Objectives	
2. Development of Management Alternatives	43
3. Development of Draft Objectives	81
Appendix I: Plenary Notes	111
Appendix II: Presentations	123
Appendix III: Issue Statements Analysis	129
Appendix IV: Participant Introduction Questions	133
Appendix V: List of Participants	141
Appendix VI: Workshop Invitation and Invitation List	149
Appendix VII: Glossary	159
Appendix VIII: About CBSG	167

Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop II

February 10-13, 2003
Richland, WA

FINAL REPORT

Section 1 Executive Summary



Executive Summary

A. Introduction and Workshop Process

Introduction to Comprehensive Conservation Planning

This workshop is the second of three designed to contribute to the Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) of Hanford Reach National Monument. The Plan is a required element of the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1997 which states that all refuges will be managed in accordance with an approved CCP that when implemented will achieve the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System (System) and the Refuge purpose.

The National Wildlife Refuge System was created to conserve fish, wildlife, and plants and their habitats and this conservation mission will be facilitated by providing Americans opportunities to participate in compatible wildlife-dependent recreation (National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1997). For the purposes of the Act:

- (1) The term ‘compatible use’ means a wildlife-dependent recreational use or any other use of a refuge that, in the sound professional judgment of the Director, will not materially interfere with or detract from the fulfillment of the mission of the System or the purposes of the Refuge.
- (2) The terms ‘wildlife-dependent recreation’ and ‘wildlife-dependent recreational use’ mean a use of a refuge involving hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, or environmental education and interpretation.

The Mission of the System

“The Mission of the System as defined by the Improvement Act is to administer a national network of lands and waters for the conservation, management and, where appropriate, restoration of the fish, wildlife and plant resources and their habitats within the United States for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans.”

Hanford Reach National Monument and its Purpose

The Hanford Reach National Monument (Monument) encompasses approximately 195,000 acres, of which approximately 166,000 acres are currently managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) as the Saddle Mountain National Wildlife Refuge under its authority pursuant to the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 668dd-ee), and through agreements with the DOE. The entire Monument is superimposed over a portion of the 375,040-acre DOE Hanford Site, in Richland, Washington. The Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) administers 800 acres of the Monument through a permit with the DOE. The DOE administers the remaining acreage and currently retains primary ownership or control on all acreage. The Service-managed acreage within the Monument area is part of the National Wildlife Refuge System under permits and agreements with the DOE. By Federal law, all lands within the National Wildlife Refuge System are to be managed in a manner consistent with an approved CCP. The Service is the lead agency for planning and management

of the Monument and development of the CCP. Service planning for Monument lands is subject to review and approval by the DOE.

The Monument is divided into six administrative units: 1) Wahluke Unit encompassing 57,000 acres of riparian and shrub-steppe habitats; 2) Fitzner/Eberhardt Arid Lands Ecology Reserve Unit which is a 77,000-acre unit on the southwest side of the Columbia River, including Rattlesnake Mountain; 3) Saddle Mountain Unit, 32,000-acres made up of dense stands of sagebrush; 4) McGee Ranch/Riverlands Unit, encompassing 9,000 acres and including a former pioneer ranch area and rare plants such as Umtanum buckwheat which exists nowhere else in the world; 5) Vernita Bridge Unit, approximately 800 acres along the Columbia River northwest of the Vernita bridge administered by WDFW; and 6) River Corridor Unit, encompassing 25,000 acres on the south and west banks of the Columbia River, including the Columbia River Islands, and Hanford Dune Field. Of the total 195,000 acres within the Monument, 60,000 acres and 45 miles of the Columbia River are currently open to the public.

The purpose for establishment of the Monument is defined in Presidential Proclamation 7319 (2000). The Monument was established to conserve a unique and biologically diverse landscape, encompassing an array of scientific and historic objects. The six units described above functioned historically as protective buffer zones surrounding the Hanford Site. They encompass some of the most pristine shrub-steppe habitat in the Columbia Basin. In addition to the sagebrush/grassland communities, a host of forbs, grasses, wetland and riparian plants and fragile microbiotic soil crusts have been preserved. Several sensitive species and rare plants such as the White Bluffs bladderpod and Umtanum desert buckwheat exist in the Monument. The Monument provides habitat for a wide variety of wildlife, including mule deer, elk, beaver, coyote, waterfowl and upland birds, and raptors as well as migratory and non-migratory fish. In addition to species that reside on the Monument year round, migrating salmon, birds, and hundreds of other native plant and animal species rely on the Monument's natural ecosystem. In addition to its natural and historic resources, the area contains one of the most extensive, intact, American Indian occupation and traditional use areas in the region. The diversity, density, and preservation of these sites is unparalleled in the Pacific Northwest. The Monument also contains historic structures and other remains from more recent human activities, including homesteads from small towns established along the riverbanks in the early 20th century.

Introduction to the Workshop

This workshop was organized to assist the Hanford Reach National Monument staff and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) continue the CCP process by building on the first workshop, which developed a vision for the future of the Monument and drafted management goals. The second workshop was designed to identify alternatives for future management of the refuge, and create objectives for reaching the goals.

Participants were invited from a variety of organizations including representatives from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, (Washington DC Office, Regional Office, Hanford Reach National Monument), Department of Energy, Federal Advisory Committee members, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Bonneville Power Administration, County Commissioners and Administrators, The

Nature Conservancy, local public, Native American Tribes and individuals and organizations that had expressed interest (See Appendix V).

The goals of this workshop were to: 1) identify and explore key alternative management scenarios for achieving refuge goals; and 2) begin the process of developing objectives for each alternative. This report presents the results of the enormous amount of effort and energy the participants contributed to the workshop. It is important to note that this is the second in a three-workshop process. The results presented here are preliminary and subject to review and revision based on review by the Federal Advisory Committee and the outcomes of the third workshop.

Workshop Process

The workshop was organized at the request of the Pacific Northwest Regional Office (Region 1) of the U S Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) in collaboration with the Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (CBSG) of the Species Survival Commission of the World Conservation Union. To assure credible, fair, and independent conduct of the workshop and of the workshop results, CBSG was requested to design the workshop process, provide facilitation for the workshop, and to assemble and edit the report. Editing of the draft report was done with the assistance of the workshop participants. Outside review by non-participants was not part of the process. No content changes were made by the editors and the participants checked that accurate presentations were made of the work they had done during the workshop.

The workshop was conducted February 10-13, 2003 in Richland, WA. This site was chosen because it is near the Hanford Reach National Monument and allows easy access to the workshop by invited members of the local community. The workshop extended over 3 ½ days with all lunches brought into the meeting room for maximum use of the time available. There were 51 participants with most present the entire duration of the workshop. This provided for sustained interactions and the benefit of full attention to the goals and process of the workshop. Participants in the workshop were divided into five groups, identified as Group 1, Group 2, etc., throughout this report. Groups were assigned with an effort to have members from different organizations and the public distributed evenly throughout.

The CBSG team designed a planning process to achieve the organizer's stated outcomes identified for the workshop. The intent was that the management alternatives, information and analysis generated in this workshop would feed back into the Federal Advisory Committee process in preparation for the next workshop, Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop III, tentatively scheduled for late May or early June 2003.

Before getting started with the first task of this workshop, participants were asked to introduce themselves and write out and then read aloud answers to three introductory questions. This process allows for expression of individual perspectives without being immediately influenced by previous responses. This process indicates potential areas of common ground and provides a first insight into the diversity of perceived issues present in the group. The process also provides a check on whether the workshop deliberations respond to the concerns and issues that are raised. Answers to these questions can be found in Appendix III of this report.

B. The Working Vision

In the first workshop of this series, participants created a draft vision statement based on themes identified in the futures exercise. Following Workshop I, this statement was reviewed by the FAC committee, and then the Fish and Wildlife Service. Below is the current working version of the vision presented to and accepted by participants in this workshop. This version is still subject to wording changes, but not conceptual changes.

The Hanford Reach National Monument Vision Statement

The Hanford Reach National Monument is a biologically diverse landscape, embracing a remarkable natural and historic legacy. The Hanford Reach, the last free-flowing non-tidal stretch of the Columbia River, is the ribbon that weaves shrub-steppe and riverine communities together, defining an irreplaceable landscape—a place to discover the richness of life, to reflect upon history, and to experience nature in solitude.

The Monument's diversity of plants and wildlife are critical to the biological integrity of the Columbia Basin. The unique combination of an expansive and increasingly rare shrub-steppe ecosystem, the free-flowing river, and the last major salmon spawning grounds in the Columbia River create a diverse and precious mosaic of habitats. The Monument is a refuge for a multitude of species, many new to science.

The Monument is a natural gathering place to learn, to experience and celebrate cultures, where stories are protected and passed on. Its history of immigrant settlement and the dawning of the atomic era is acknowledged, as well as its continuing physical and spiritual sustenance of the Native Americans who have used the area and those who came later.

The Monument is a testimonial to the past and the sacrifices of our ancestors. The Monument is also a vision into the future where visitors, neighbors and partners are valued and respected; where natural and historic resources are protected; and where all may come to experience the Monument and its magnificent resources.

C. The Working Goals

In the first workshop, working groups developed draft goals using the themes identified in the vision statement formulation exercise. Goals are a framework for action on how to create the desired future working with the resources and opportunities of today. Following Workshop I, the FAC committee and the Fish & Wildlife Service reviewed these goals. The working version, which was presented to and accepted by participants in this workshop, is below. These goals are still subject to wording change, but not conceptual change.

Goals

The Monument's goals were developed through the cooperation and assistance of many people, agencies, tribes and organizations, and reflect the basis for a management plan that will benefit everyone while protecting the Monument's resources. Development of the management plan—and the implementation of these goals—will honor valid existing rights and comply with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service policies and procedures; the Hanford Reach National Monument Proclamation; and applicable laws.

- 1) Conserve and restore the plants, animals and shrub-steppe and other upland habitats native to the Columbia Basin.
- 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) Enhance Monument resources by establishing and maintaining connectivity with neighboring habitats.
- 4) Protect the distinctive geological and paleontological resources of the Monument.
- 5) 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.
- 6) Provide a rich variety of educational and interpretive opportunities for visitors to gain an appreciation, knowledge and understanding of the Monument, compatible with resource protection.
- 7) Provide access and opportunities for high-quality recreation compatible with resource protection.
- 8) Protect the natural visual character and promote the opportunity to experience solitude on the Monument.
- 9) Honor treaty rights in accordance with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Native American policy.

- 10) Foster, support and respect cooperative partnerships that preserve valid existing rights while protecting the purposes of the Monument. Recognize and cooperate with tribal, state and local governments and federal agencies in the discharge of statutory responsibilities. Enhance relationships and partnerships with community organizations and neighbors furthering management goals.
- 11) Facilitate research compatible with resource protection, emphasizing research that contributes to management goals of the Monument.
- 12) Establish and maintain a cooperative fire management program that protects facilities, resources and neighbors and fulfills natural resource management objectives.
- 13) Provide infrastructure, operations and maintenance capabilities that are in harmony with Monument purposes.

D. Draft Management Alternatives

An alternative is a potential conceptual direction for management. Each alternative will help fulfill the Refuge System mission and resolve identified issues facing Hanford Reach and each will require a set of objectives and strategies or means of achieving the monument vision and goals.

Fish and Wildlife Service staff summarized alternative 1, which is the current management of the Monument. Each working group drafted additional alternative scenarios for future management and shared these in a plenary session during which there was extensive interaction among the groups. All comments were incorporated by the working group so that the views of all participants were reflected in the draft alternatives being developed. Then a synthesis group, made up of one person from each working group, integrated the alternatives into the following list. These alternatives will be reviewed and revised by the FAC, Fish and Wildlife Service, and the public and the final versions will be presented at Workshop III.

Alternative 1 - Current Management

The Hanford Site Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) designated parts of the Hanford Site as conservation/preservation status. As a result of the CLUP and associated EIS, management of buffer lands was transferred to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Under this alternative the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) manages the Monument/Refuge areas under permit management from Department of Energy (D.O.E.) (with a 30-day revocable clause). The Monument/Refuge is managed primarily under National Wildlife Refuge System policy. However, many of the administrative areas transferred to the management of the Service had existing uses and designations, which the Service has respected. The Service has made a conscious decision to not make major management changes pending the completion of the Monument Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP). The Arid Lands Ecology Reserve Unit, a Research Natural Area (RNA), has been managed primarily for research and education, and is closed to the general public with access by permit only. The Wahluke Unit was managed by the state department of fish and wildlife as a public recreation area and continues to be managed for public access. It is open year-round from 2 hours before sunrise to 2 hours after sunset. Saddle

Mountain National Wildlife Refuge Unit has been managed as a wildlife sanctuary and is closed to the public, for both wildlife protection and for security buffer for facilities on Central Hanford. The River Corridor Unit has been open to public boating and fishing since the 1970's with no restrictions on number or types of boats in the Reach. Fishing regulations are determined by the State of Washington. The McGee Ranch/Riverlands area is currently managed by the D.O.E. and is closed to the public, except in the area between the Midway road and the Columbia River, which has been opened "de facto" since the closure was never enforced. The situation is similar in the Vernita area which is owned by D.O.E. and managed by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and is technically closed, but is "de facto" open for overnight camping and boating and fishing access because the closure was never enforced.

Alternative 2 – Full Resource Protection/Managed Access

This alternative focuses on protection and conservation of natural, cultural and historic resources. This alternative uses science-based landscape analysis of the entire Monument, which may result in different management units from present designations. Management priorities include monitoring, restoration, fire management and invasive species management. These activities will be based on best available science and will take into consideration the diversity of plants, animals and communities native to the site. Partnerships will be sought to enhance connectivity for biological communities and develop opportunities for cooperative management. Research emphasis will be on rare species, communities and other research that benefits management of the resources. The focus of public use will be education and interpretation. Only recreational activities that assist visitors to experience the natural, cultural and historic legacy of the site while causing the least disturbance to resources will be allowed.

Alternative 3 – Care: Conservation, appreciation, recreation and education

This alternative focuses on conservation but also provides for recreation and education within the Monument and appreciation of the Monument's values. It would use a science-based landscape analysis approach to identify and characterize all natural, native and cultural resources and existing and potential public uses. Best science would be used to protect, preserve and conserve the biodiversity of the Monument. The priorities include monitoring, restoration, and invasive species management. Provide access and opportunities for recreation, interpretation and education revolving around appreciation of distinctive Monument resources. Recreation and education activities would be offered that foster a sense of appreciation to support conservation and preservation of these resources. Interpretive trails and facilities and educational programs would be developed for individuals and groups. Recreational public access would generally be limited to daylight hours. Partnerships would be sought to enhance connectivity of biological communities and to create cooperative management opportunities. Additional law enforcement and fire management resources will be developed to accompany the increased level of activity across the landscape.

Alternative 4 – Expanded Public Use

This alternative emphasizes opportunities for the public to experience, learn about, and appreciate the diverse array of resources. Management direction will follow a science-based landscape analysis of the Monument's ecological, geologic, paleontological, and cultural resources. Infrastructure and facilities will be developed in a manner compatible with natural

and cultural resource patterns on the landscape and with the goal of exposing the public to the widest possible array of the Monument's native biological communities and cultural and historic sites. Increase interpretation and education opportunities including development of interpretive centers. This alternative allows the broadest range of education and research opportunities. Programs to protect, restore, and monitor native habitats and communities will be developed or maintained, and will provide opportunities for volunteer participation. Invasive species management will be a high priority. Additional resource impact monitoring, law enforcement and fire management resources will be developed to respond to the increased level of activity across the landscape. Concessionaires, and commercial vendors located at strategic points will provide supplies and support services for visitors.

E. Draft Objectives

According to 602 FW 1.6 and the Goals and Objectives Handbook, an objective is a concise statement of what we want to achieve, how much we want to achieve, when and where we want to achieve it, and who is responsible for the work. Objectives derive from goals and provide the basis for determining strategies, monitoring refuge accomplishments, and evaluating the success of strategies. Each working group was responsible for developing objectives for 3 goals across all alternatives and then, if time allowed, applying the SMART criteria to each objective making it attainable, time-specific, and measurable. The goals were assigned as follows:

Group 1: Goals 4, 6 and 13

Group 2: Goals 1, 11 and 12

Group 3: Goals 2, 3 and 10

Group 4: Goals 5, 8 and 9

Group 5: Goals 4, 7 and 8

Some goals were assigned to 2 groups. In the following table, those goals have 2 different sets of objectives. Some groups were particularly interested in a goal not assigned to them so they developed objectives for that goal as well. All objectives were presented in a long and very active plenary session and then the groups revised them, incorporating comments received, into the final draft objectives for Workshop II, found in the table below. To see the detailed comments on the objectives see Section 3 and Appendix I of this report. Consensus was not reached on these objectives, and they will be reviewed and revised by the FAC, Fish and Wildlife Service and the public, and then brought back to Workshop III.

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education	Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use
Goal 1. Conserve and restore the plants, animals and shrub-steppe and other upland habitats native to the Columbia Basin			
	<p>1. Inventory all plant communities, plants and animals within upland habitat in the Monument and identify critical and sensitive areas and conservation targets within five years. <i>Strategy Note: Conduct vegetation mapping using protocol developed by YTC for consistency. Incorporate locations of plants and animals into GIS.</i></p> <p>2. Inventory, map (GIS), and prioritize treatment areas for all invasive species in upland habitats within five years.</p> <p>3. Write an integrated pest management plan within two years after completion of the CCP</p> <p>4. Restore the historic</p>	<p>1. Inventory all plant communities, plants and animals within upland habitat in the Monument and identify critical and sensitive areas and conservation targets within five years. <i>Strategy Note: Conduct vegetation mapping using protocol developed by YTC for consistency. Incorporate locations of plants and animals into GIS.</i></p> <p>2. Inventory, map (GIS), and prioritize treatment areas for all invasive species in upland habitats within five years.</p> <p>3. Write an integrated pest management plan within two years after completion of the CCP</p> <p>4. Restore the historic</p>	<p>1. Inventory all plant communities, plants and animals within upland habitat in the Monument and identify critical and sensitive areas and conservation targets within five years. <i>Strategy Note: Conduct vegetation mapping using protocol developed by YTC for consistency. Incorporate locations of plants and animals into GIS.</i></p> <p>2. Inventory, map (GIS), and prioritize treatment areas for all invasive species in upland habitats within five years.</p> <p>3. Write an integrated pest management plan within two years after completion of the CCP</p> <p>4. Restore the historic</p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
	<p>community structure of Monument upland habitat. Increase the cover of native plant/animal communities from x to x percent, and native plant/animal species richness from x to x species over the next 15 years. <i>(We refer to the definition presented by Jane to address the issues related to historic condition)(We also feel the word “restore” is an “active” enough word to include implementation)</i> <i>NOTE: In alternative 2, more emphasis would be placed in reintroduction of some species, particularly threatened and endangered. Alternatives 3 and 4 would have less emphasis on reintroduction of species.</i></p> <p>5. Develop and implement a habitat management plan to identify critical areas for protection and prioritize areas for restoration projects within five years.</p>	<p>community structure of Monument upland habitat. Increase the cover of native plant/animal communities from x to x percent, and native plant/animal species richness from x to x species over the next 15 years. <i>(We refer to the definition presented by Jane to address the issues related to historic condition)(We also feel the word “restore” is an “active” enough word to include implementation)</i> <i>NOTE: In alternative 2, more emphasis would be placed in reintroduction of some species, particularly threatened and endangered. Alternatives 3 and 4 would have less emphasis on reintroduction of species.</i></p> <p>5. Develop and implement a habitat management plan to identify critical areas for protection and prioritize areas for restoration projects within five years.</p>	<p>community structure of Monument upland habitat. Increase the cover of native plant/animal communities from x to x percent, and native plant/animal species richness from x to x species over the next 15 years. <i>(We refer to the definition presented by Jane to address the issues related to historic condition)(We also feel the word “restore” is an “active” enough word to include implementation)</i> <i>NOTE: In alternative 2, more emphasis would be placed in reintroduction of some species, particularly threatened and endangered. Alternatives 3 and 4 would have less emphasis on reintroduction of species.</i></p> <p>5. Develop and implement a habitat management plan to identify critical areas for protection and prioritize areas for restoration projects within five years.</p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
<p>6. Develop and implement monitoring plans that contribute to management decisions, and evaluate monitoring results. Use adaptive management to modify actions within five years of the completion of the CCP. (that incorporates/provides data or information on restoration efforts, ecosystem health wildlife populations and user impacts.) (identify different types of monitoring goals and their respective timeframes.) Notes: Monitoring would need to monitor success of restoration projects, trends of plant and animal communities, and be coordinated with fire and other resource programs. Effects of people on natural resources would be better captured under the public use goals</p>	<p>6. Develop and implement monitoring plans that contribute to management decisions, and evaluate monitoring results. Use adaptive management to modify actions within five years of the completion of the CCP. (that incorporates/provides data or information on restoration efforts, ecosystem health wildlife populations and user impacts.) (identify different types of monitoring goals and their respective timeframes.) Notes: Monitoring would need to monitor success of restoration projects, trends of plant and animal communities, and be coordinated with fire and other resource programs. Effects of people on natural resources would be better captured under the public use goals</p>	<p>6. Develop and implement monitoring plans that contribute to management decisions, and evaluate monitoring results. Use adaptive management to modify actions within five years of the completion of the CCP. (that incorporates/provides data or information on restoration efforts, ecosystem health wildlife populations and user impacts.) (identify different types of monitoring goals and their respective timeframes.) Notes: Monitoring would need to monitor success of restoration projects, trends of plant and animal communities, and be coordinated with fire and other resource programs. Effects of people on natural resources would be better captured under the public use goals</p>	<p>6. Develop and implement monitoring plans that contribute to management decisions, and evaluate monitoring results. Use adaptive management to modify actions within five years of the completion of the CCP. (that incorporates/provides data or information on restoration efforts, ecosystem health wildlife populations and user impacts.) (identify different types of monitoring goals and their respective timeframes.) Notes: Monitoring would need to monitor success of restoration projects, trends of plant and animal communities, and be coordinated with fire and other resource programs. Effects of people on natural resources would be better captured under the public use goals</p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
<p>7. Develop a treatment and monitoring program based on identified priorities and implement annually. <i>Strategy note: As strategies include levels of staffing, materials, and equipment needs.</i></p>	<p>7. Develop a treatment and monitoring program based on identified priorities and implement annually. <i>Strategy note: As strategies include levels of staffing, materials, and equipment needs.</i></p>	<p>7. Develop a treatment and monitoring program based on identified priorities and implement annually. <i>Strategy note: As strategies include levels of staffing, materials, and equipment needs.</i></p>	<p>7. Develop a treatment and monitoring program based on identified priorities and implement annually. <i>Strategy note: As strategies include levels of staffing, materials, and equipment needs.</i></p>
<p>Goal 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.</p>			
	<p>1. Implement fall Chinook research program to quantify relationship between physical conditions and productivity. 2. Implement monitoring program to determine trend in population relative to physical conditions. 3. To further restoration of fall Chinook productivity, provide results of research and monitoring to ecological services and fishery resources</p>		

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
	<p>to work in river management forums. Also manage land-based activities that could have impact on Chinook productivity.</p> <p>4. Conservation (?) over 15 years (because it is in goal statement).</p> <p>5. Conduct geographic baseline inventory of riparian plant and animal communities.</p> <p>6. Conduct monitoring program (for “before” time period) to determine changes in riparian community before and after restoration is conducted</p> <p>7. Within 5 years, write restoration plan based on baseline inventory.</p> <p>8. Conserve and maintain diversity of native aquatic and riparian species.</p>		

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education	Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use
	<p>9. Conduct baseline inventories of water quality, distribution and abundance of macro-invertebrate populations and native and non-native fish and aquatic plant communities and their habitats.</p> <p>10. Monitor trends in water quality, and native and non-native fish communities and their habitats.</p> <p>11. Use results of studies to provide quantitative data for management of non-native fish communities, and for use in river management forums.</p>		
Goal 3. Enhance Monument resources by establishing and maintaining connectivity with neighboring habitats.			
	<p>1. Enhance Monument resources and connectivity by establishing working groups of interested, involved agencies and the public within 1 year. Meet quarterly.</p>		

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education	Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use
	<p>2. Identify funding opportunities from alternative sources, and identify funding needs within 2 years.</p> <p>3. Work with other partners to annually achieve a minimum increase of 10% of identified critical, connective properties.</p> <p>4. As an ongoing activity meet with 3-4 adjacent landowners annually to discuss common habitat/management objectives and future possibilities. (Comment: This may be a strategy rather than an objective)</p>		
Goal 4. Protect the distinctive geological and paleontological resources of the Monument.			
	<p>1. Identify, classify, and map G&P resources.</p> <p>2. Conduct threats analysis on resources.</p> <p>3. Design and implement a</p>	<p>1. Identify, classify, map G&P resources.</p> <p>2. Conduct threats analysis on resources.</p> <p>3. Design and implement a</p>	<p>1. Identify, classify, and map G&P resources.</p> <p>2. Conduct threats analysis on resources.</p> <p>3. Design and implement a</p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
	<p>threat abatement strategy that focuses on active protection and restoration.</p> <p>1: Conduct a structured, scientific inventory of existing data related to geologic and paleontologic resources of the Monument and maintain/consolidate in one repository.</p> <p>2: Identify and fill data gaps in knowledge of geology and paleontology, for example: knowledge of fossil locations and flood features.</p> <p>3: All management activities, for example surface disturbing activities, will require a geological and paleontological clearance prior to implementation to ensure resource protection.</p> <p>4: Monitor impacts on geological and paleontological</p>	<p>threat abatement strategy that focuses on stabilizing critical resource sites</p> <p>1: Conduct a structured, scientific inventory of existing data related to geologic and paleontologic resources of the Monument and maintain/consolidate in one repository.</p> <p>2: Identify and fill data gaps in knowledge of geology and paleontology, for example: knowledge of fossil locations and flood features..</p> <p>3: All management activities, for example surface disturbing activities, will require a geological and paleontological clearance prior to implementation to ensure resource protection.</p> <p>4: Monitor impacts on geological and paleontological</p>	<p>threat abatement strategy that focuses on monitoring and minimizing human impacts.</p> <p>1: Conduct a structured, scientific inventory of existing data related to geologic and paleontologic resources of the Monument and maintain/consolidate in one repository.</p> <p>2: Identify and fill data gaps in knowledge of geology and paleontology, for example: knowledge of fossil locations and flood features.</p> <p>3: All management activities, for example surface disturbing activities, will require a geological and paleontological clearance prior to implementation to ensure resource protection.</p> <p>4: Monitor impacts on geological and paleontological</p>

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education	Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use
	resources from visitor use and other processes. Report annually on the condition and status of “key” indicator resources.	resources from visitor use and other processes. Report annually on the condition and status of “key” indicator resources.	resources from visitor use and other processes. Report annually on the condition and status of “key” indicator resources.
Goal 5. 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.			
	<p>1. Within 2 years of CCP completion gather oral and written histories on pre-Hanford and Manhattan Project eras. (what little history is available on Midway needs to be captured ASAP- a lot of room for stakeholder involvement- need to capture info soon because people are dying.)</p> <p>2. Begin to develop an integrated historic information and education program for the Monument with stakeholder, volunteer and Tribal involvement. <i>Strategy notes: collect, organ.</i></p>	<p>1. Within 2 years of CCP completion gather oral and written histories on pre-Hanford and Manhattan Project eras. (what little history is available on Midway needs to be captured ASAP- a lot of room for stakeholder involvement- need to capture info soon because people are dying.)</p> <p>2. Begin to develop an integrated historic information and education program for the Monument with stakeholder, volunteer and Tribal involvement. <i>Strategy notes: collect, organ.</i></p>	<p>1. Within 2 years of CCP completion gather oral and written histories on pre-Hanford and Manhattan Project eras. (what little history is available on Midway needs to be captured ASAP- a lot of room for stakeholder involvement- need to capture info soon because people are dying.)</p> <p>2. Begin to develop an integrated historic information and education program for the Monument with stakeholder, volunteer and Tribal involvement. <i>Strategy notes: collect, organ.</i></p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
	<p><i>Share- include electronic, paper, kiosks, flyers websites).</i></p> <p>3. Develop action plan to determine the protection and stabilization of cultural and historic sites with stakeholder and Tribal involvement.</p> <p>4. Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) will be inventoried and evaluated in collaboration with Tribes in the region to develop a restoration, access, and utilization plan within 5 years of CCP completion.</p> <p>5. Develop and maintain agreements between the USFWS, federal, Tribes, Counties, DOE, City, State and private sources regarding the use, sharing, collection and protection of information on historic sites on the Monument.</p>	<p><i>Share- include electronic, paper, kiosks, flyers websites).</i></p> <p>3. Develop action plan to determine the protection and stabilization of cultural and historic sites with stakeholder and Tribal involvement.</p> <p>4. Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) will be inventoried and evaluated in collaboration with Tribes in the region to develop a restoration, access, and utilization plan within 5 years of CCP completion.</p> <p>5. Develop and maintain agreements between the USFWS, federal, Tribes, Counties, DOE, City, State and private sources regarding the use, sharing, collection and protection of information on historic sites on the Monument.</p>	<p><i>Share- include electronic, paper, kiosks, flyers websites).</i></p> <p>3. Develop action plan to determine the protection and stabilization of cultural and historic sites with stakeholder and Tribal involvement.</p> <p>4. Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) will be inventoried and evaluated in collaboration with Tribes in the region to develop a restoration, access, and utilization plan within 5 years of CCP completion.</p> <p>5. Develop and maintain agreements between the USFWS, federal, Tribes, Counties, DOE, City, State and private sources regarding the use, sharing, collection and protection of information on historic sites on the Monument.</p>

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education	Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use
<p>Goal 6. Provide a rich variety of educational and interpretive opportunities for visitors to gain an appreciation, knowledge and understanding of the Monument, compatible with resource protection.</p>			
<p>We assume that all of the natural and cultural resources will go through an identification, classification, and mapping process.</p>	<p>1. Identify, classify, and map existing and potential regional and Monument educational and interpretive opportunities.</p> <p>2. Analyze needs.</p> <p>3. Provide educational and interpretive opportunities based on analysis of geology, paleontology, terrestrial and aquatic biology, and cultural features.</p> <p>4. Public Use limited by intensive management of techniques (increase offsite educational opportunities, limited onsite use zones and times. remote interpretation, web cam's, offsite visitor center.)</p>	<p>1. Identify, classify, and map existing and potential regional and Monument educational and interpretive opportunities.</p> <p>2. Analyze needs.</p> <p>3. Provide educational and interpretive opportunities based on analysis of geology, paleontology, terrestrial and aquatic biology, and cultural features.</p> <p>4. Use integrated management of visitors (guided opportunities, in-school Environmental Education, limit self guided trails to less than two mile interpretive trail that traverses representative habitats, offsite visitor center.)</p>	<p>1. Identify, classify, and map existing and potential regional and Monument educational and interpretive opportunities.</p> <p>2. Analyze needs.</p> <p>3. Provide educational and interpretive opportunities based on analysis of geology, paleontology, terrestrial and aquatic biology, and cultural features.</p> <p>4. Use interactive management of visitors (self-guided trails to include mini and longer, kiosks on site, cassette tapes tours, handouts)</p>

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education	Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use
Goal 7. Provide access and opportunities for high-quality recreation compatible with resource protection.			
Current Hunting: waterfowl, upland bird, big game in Wahluke	<p>Develop a recreation suitability analysis for all Monument areas to protect resources in the EIS process and identify access zones/areas and activities and facilities that are compatible with these zones.</p> <p>Zone Concept: Zones 1 - V are identified based on resource sensitivity, with the highest resource value being assigned class V and those areas that are irrevocably disturbed being assigned class 1. for example: Level I= existing development such as highways, Vermita Rest stop</p> <p>Level II= disturbed areas such as Riverlands, white area in BRMP</p> <p>Level III= gray area in BRMP such as</p> <p>Level IV= most of ALE</p> <p>Level V = Umtanum desert</p>	<p>Develop a recreation suitability analysis for all Monument areas to protect resources in the EIS process and identify access zones/areas and activities and facilities that are compatible with these zones.</p> <p>Zone Concept: Zones 1 - V are identified based on resource sensitivity, with the highest resource value being assigned class V and those areas that are irrevocably disturbed being assigned class 1. for example: Level I= existing development such as highways, Vermita Rest stop</p> <p>Level II= disturbed areas such as Riverlands, white area in BRMP</p> <p>Level III= gray area in BRMP such as</p> <p>Level IV= most of ALE</p> <p>Level V = Umtanum desert</p>	<p>Develop a recreation suitability analysis for all Monument areas to protect resources in the EIS process and identify access zones/areas and activities and facilities that are compatible with these zones.</p> <p>Zone Concept: Zones 1 - V are identified based on resource sensitivity, with the highest resource value being assigned class V and those areas that are irrevocably disturbed being assigned class 1. for example: Level I= existing development such as highways, Vermita Rest stop</p> <p>Level II= disturbed areas such as Riverlands, white area in BRMP</p> <p>Level III= gray area in BRMP such as</p> <p>Level IV= most of ALE</p> <p>Level V = Umtanum desert</p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
<p>buckwheat population, prehistoric burial sites This EIS will identify allowable activities by zones and strategies; criteria or stipulations by zone.</p> <p><i>No hunting-note: this is not considered realistic by Group 5 but probably does need to be included in one alternative to avoid lawsuit.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a measurement that assesses levels of resource protection tied with visitor experience. (Some level less than carrying capacity) 2. Survey visitors seasonally for a period of five years to determine quality of experience by activity, season, and area within the Monument. 3. Encourage alternative forms of transportation (i.e. vans, buses, boats, mules, horses, 	<p>buckwheat population, prehistoric burial sites This EIS will identify allowable activities by zones and strategies; criteria or stipulations by zone.</p> <p>Open xx to provide a range of high-quality opportunities waterfowl, big game and upland bird, safe</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a measurement that assesses levels of resource protection tied with visitor experience. (Some level less than carrying capacity) 2. Survey visitors seasonally for a period of five years to determine quality of experience by activity, season, and area within the Monument. 3. Encourage alternative forms of transportation (i.e. vans, buses, boats, mules, horses, 	<p>buckwheat population, prehistoric burial sites This EIS will identify allowable activities by zones and strategies; criteria or stipulations by zone.</p> <p>Open xx (more than Care)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a measurement that assesses levels of resource protection tied with visitor experience. (Some level less than carrying capacity) 2. Survey visitors seasonally for a period of five years to determine quality of experience by activity, season, and area within the Monument. 3. Encourage alternative forms of transportation (i.e. vans, buses, boats, mules, horses, 	<p>buckwheat population, prehistoric burial sites This EIS will identify allowable activities by zones and strategies; criteria or stipulations by zone.</p> <p>Open xx (more than Care)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a measurement that assesses levels of resource protection tied with visitor experience. (Some level less than carrying capacity) 2. Survey visitors seasonally for a period of five years to determine quality of experience by activity, season, and area within the Monument. 3. Encourage alternative forms of transportation (i.e. vans, buses, boats, mules, horses,

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
	<p>wagon rides). <i>NOTE: Prepare transit/shuttle plan.</i></p> <p>4. Develop visitor services plan that integrates transportation needs.</p> <p>5. Use permit system for commercial vendors.</p>	<p>wagon rides). <i>NOTE: Prepare transit/shuttle plan.</i></p> <p>4. Develop visitor services plan that integrates transportation needs.</p> <p>5. Use permit system for commercial vendors.</p>	<p>wagon rides). <i>NOTE: Prepare transit/shuttle plan.</i></p> <p>4. Develop visitor services plan that integrates transportation needs.</p> <p>5. Use permit system for commercial vendors.</p>
<p>Goal 8. Protect the natural visual character and promote the opportunity to experience solitude on the Monument.</p>			
	<p>1. Within 2 years of CCP completion, USFWS will develop design standards for structures and utilities on the Monument in cooperation with impacted agencies and governments.</p> <p>2. FWS will advocate and build partnerships with air quality regulators to keep air clean to maintain visibility.</p> <p>3. Within 3 years of the plan being completed, a completed</p>	<p>1. Within 2 years of CCP completion, USFWS will develop design standards for structures and utilities on the Monument in cooperation with impacted agencies and governments.</p> <p>2. FWS will advocate and build partnerships with air quality regulators to keep air clean to maintain visibility.</p> <p>3. Within 3 years of the plan being completed, a completed</p>	<p>1. Within 2 years of CCP completion, USFWS will develop design standards for structures and utilities on the Monument in cooperation with impacted agencies and governments.</p> <p>2. FWS will advocate and build partnerships with air quality regulators to keep air clean to maintain visibility.</p> <p>3. Within 3 years of the plan being completed, a completed</p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
<p>inventory of all research and construction trash will be completed and DOE in cooperation with USFWS will complete cleanup, and all unnecessary structures from the Monument. Following completion of the CCP USFWS will coordinate periodic trash pickup to maintain the visual quality of the Monument.</p> <p>4. Within 6 months of plan adoption the FWS will file with the FAA for a 1,000 foot AGL flight restriction for all normal flight operations in order to prevent harassment of wildlife and protect solitude and the visual character of the Monument. (Normal flight operations as defined by FAA-special permits could be required for all other flights).</p> <p>5. The FWS will actively participate in planning efforts for off-site projects that could</p>	<p>inventory of all research and construction trash will be completed and DOE in cooperation with USFWS will complete cleanup, and all unnecessary structures from the Monument. Following completion of the CCP USFWS will coordinate periodic trash pickup to maintain the visual quality of the Monument.</p> <p>4. Within 6 months of plan adoption the FWS will file with the FAA for a 1,000 foot AGL flight restriction for all normal flight operations in order to prevent harassment of wildlife and protect solitude and the visual character of the Monument. (Normal flight operations as defined by FAA-special permits could be required for all other flights).</p> <p>5. The FWS will actively participate in planning efforts for projects that could affect the</p>	<p>inventory of all research and construction trash will be completed and DOE in cooperation with USFWS will complete cleanup, and all unnecessary structures from the Monument. Following completion of the CCP USFWS will coordinate periodic trash pickup to maintain the visual quality of the Monument.</p> <p>4. Within 6 months of plan adoption the FWS will file with the FAA for a 1,000 foot AGL flight restriction for all normal flight operations in order to prevent harassment of wildlife and protect solitude and the visual character of the Monument. (Normal flight operations as defined by FAA-special permits could be required for all other flights).</p> <p>5. The FWS will actively participate in planning efforts for projects that could affect the</p>	<p>inventory of all research and construction trash will be completed and DOE in cooperation with USFWS will complete cleanup, and all unnecessary structures from the Monument. Following completion of the CCP USFWS will coordinate periodic trash pickup to maintain the visual quality of the Monument.</p> <p>4. Within 6 months of plan adoption the FWS will file with the FAA for a 1,000 foot AGL flight restriction for all normal flight operations in order to prevent harassment of wildlife and protect solitude and the visual character of the Monument. (Normal flight operations as defined by FAA-special permits could be required for all other flights).</p> <p>5. The FWS will actively participate in planning efforts for projects that could affect the</p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
<p>affect the Monument viewshed or solitude.</p> <p>6. New construction and uses will be consolidated to minimize the foot print of potential development wherever possible.</p> <p>7. Develop standards for noise within the Monument.</p> <p>8. Within 10 years of plan completion the CCP comprehensive transportation system plan will be implemented by USFWS and DOE in cooperation with other parties to remove all unneeded roads and plan for future access construction needs that protect visual quality and solitude.</p> <p>9. Treat invasive species that impact visual and ecological integrity in accordance with an overall Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan.</p>	<p>Monument viewshed or solitude.</p> <p>6. New construction and uses will be consolidated to minimize the foot print of potential development.</p> <p>7. Limit noise in the Monument below XXXX decibels.</p> <p>8. Within 10 years of plan completion the CCP comprehensive transportation system plan will be implemented by USFWS and DOE in cooperation with other parties to remove all unneeded roads and plan for future access construction needs that protect visual quality and solitude.</p> <p>9. Treat invasive species that impact visual and ecological integrity in accordance with an overall Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan. (strategy note: IPM plan will be</p>	<p>Monument viewshed or solitude.</p> <p>6. New construction and uses will be consolidated to minimize the foot print of potential development.</p> <p>7. Limit noise in the Monument below XXXX decibels.</p> <p>8. Within 10 years of plan completion the CCP comprehensive transportation system plan will be implemented by USFWS and DOE in cooperation with other parties to remove all unneeded roads and plan for future access construction needs that protect visual quality and solitude.</p> <p>9. Treat invasive species that impact visual and ecological integrity in accordance with an overall Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan. (strategy note: IPM plan will be</p>	<p>Monument viewshed or solitude.</p> <p>6. New construction and uses will be consolidated to minimize the foot print of potential development.</p> <p>7. Limit noise in the Monument below XXXX decibels.</p> <p>8. Within 10 years of plan completion the CCP comprehensive transportation system plan will be implemented by USFWS and DOE in cooperation with other parties to remove all unneeded roads and plan for future access construction needs that protect visual quality and solitude.</p> <p>9. Treat invasive species that impact visual and ecological integrity in accordance with an overall Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan. (strategy note: IPM plan will be</p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
<p>(strategy note: IPM plan will be ecologically not visually based). 10. Within 1 year of plan completion, the FWS will utilize available information and findings on the White Bluffs sloughing to initiate implementation of feasible recommendations that protect the integrity of the White Bluffs and Locke Island.</p>	<p>ecologically not visually based). 10. Within 1 year of plan completion, the FWS will utilize available information and findings on the White Bluffs sloughing to initiate implementation of feasible recommendations that protect the integrity of the White Bluffs and Locke Island. 11. If camping is allowed, USFWS will establish noise limits from dusk to dawn.</p>	<p>ecologically not visually based). 10. Within 1 year of plan completion, the FWS will utilize available information and USGS findings on the White Bluffs sloughing to initiate implementation of feasible recommendations that protect the integrity of the White Bluffs and Locke Island. 11. If camping is allowed, USFWS will establish noise limits from dusk to dawn.</p>	<p>ecologically not visually based). 10. Within 1 year of plan completion, the FWS will utilize available information and USGS findings on the White Bluffs sloughing to initiate implementation of feasible recommendations that protect the integrity of the White Bluffs and Locke Island. 11. If camping is allowed, USFWS will establish noise limits from dusk to dawn.</p>
<p>1. Complete inventory of visual resources to determine a range of visual classes from low to high sensitivity. Develop objectives for each class 2. Develop a landscape design standards plan to guide facility design to protect visual resource qualities.</p>	<p>1. Complete inventory of visual resources to determine a range of visual classes from low to high sensitivity. Develop objectives for each class 2. Develop a landscape design standards plan to guide facility design to protect visual resource qualities.</p>	<p>1. Complete inventory of visual resources to determine a range of visual classes from low to high sensitivity. Develop objectives for each class 2. Develop a landscape design standards plan to guide facility design to protect visual resource qualities.</p>	<p>1. Complete inventory of visual resources to determine a range of visual classes from low to high sensitivity. Develop objectives for each class 2. Develop a landscape design standards plan to guide facility design to protect visual resource qualities.</p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
	<p>3. Partner with local agencies and other federal agencies to identify important visual and aesthetic resources on the Monument and avoid/reduce impacts from off-Monument development. <i>Strategy note-participate in other organization's NEPA processes.</i></p> <p>4. Provide X areas on the Monument that are free from high public use, excessive noise, stench and intrusive development. Areas would favor natural pristine landscapes.</p>	<p>3. Partner with local agencies and other federal agencies to identify important visual and aesthetic resources on the Monument and avoid/reduce impacts from off-Monument development. <i>Strategy note-participate in other organization's NEPA processes.</i></p> <p>4. Provide X areas on the Monument that are free from high public use, excessive noise, stench and intrusive development. Areas would favor natural pristine landscapes.</p>	<p>3. Partner with local agencies and other federal agencies to identify important visual and aesthetic resources on the Monument and avoid/reduce impacts from off-Monument development. <i>Strategy note-participate in other organization's NEPA processes.</i></p> <p>4. Provide X areas on the Monument that are free from high public use, excessive noise, stench and intrusive development. Areas would favor natural pristine landscapes.</p>
<p>Goal 9 Honor treaty rights in accordance with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Native American policy.</p>			
	<p>1. The USFWS and DOE will establish and implement a regular schedule of Government-to-Government meetings with the Tribes to (exercise) implement treaty</p>	<p>1. The USFWS and DOE will establish and implement a regular schedule of Government-to-Government meetings with the Tribes to (exercise) implement treaty</p>	<p>1. The USFWS and DOE will establish and implement a regular schedule of Government-to-Government meetings with the Tribes to (exercise) implement treaty</p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
	<p>rights on the Monument. 2. Following completion of the plan, the FWS and USDOE in coordination with the Tribes will develop and implement an on-going public education program on treaty rights. 3. Following plan completion, establish policies and procedures for artifact collection, inadvertent discovery of human remains and areas at risk for potential damage through erosion and vandalism).</p>	<p>rights on the Monument. 2. Following completion of the plan, the FWS and USDOE in coordination with the Tribes will develop and implement an on-going public education program on treaty rights. 3. Following plan completion, establish policies and procedures for artifact collection, inadvertent discovery of human remains and areas at risk for potential damage through erosion and vandalism).</p>	<p>rights on the Monument. 2. Following completion of the plan, the FWS and USDOE in coordination with the Tribes will develop and implement an on-going public education program on treaty rights. 3. Following plan completion, establish policies and procedures for artifact collection, inadvertent discovery of human remains and areas at risk for potential damage through erosion and vandalism).</p>
<p>Goal 10. Foster, support and respect cooperative partnerships that preserve valid existing rights while protecting the purposes of the Monument. Recognize and cooperate with tribal, state and local governments and federal agencies in the discharge of statutory responsibilities. Enhance relationships and partnerships with community organizations and neighbors furthering management goals.</p>			
	<p>1. Maintain proactive communication with “rights holders” and concerned parties. Hold annual meetings to</p>	<p>1. Maintain proactive communication with “rights holders” and concerned parties. Hold annual meetings to</p>	<p>1. Maintain proactive communication with “rights holders” and concerned parties. Hold annual meetings to</p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
<p>discuss common issues.</p> <p>2. Establish system for communication and coordination regarding exercising of valid existing rights. (e.g. Establish standard operating procedures within 6 months-possible strategy).</p> <p>3. Make multimedia presentations available to community organizations describing Monument attributes within 2 years.</p> <p>4. Establish on-site community-based outreach program within one year of completion of CCP.</p>			
<p>Goal 11. Facilitate research compatible with resource protection, emphasizing research that contributes to management goals of the Monument.</p>			
	<p>1. Establish an ecologically based research and monitoring program to study the natural, physical and cultural resources (of the Monument).</p>	<p>1. Establish an ecologically based research and monitoring program to study the natural, physical and cultural resources (of the Monument).</p>	<p>1. Establish an ecologically based research and monitoring program to study the natural, physical and cultural resources (of the Monument).</p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
<p>2. Research emphasis will be on rare species and plant communities and research that contributes towards management of the Monument.</p> <p>3. Utilize new information from research and adapt management within two years of when information becomes available.</p> <p>4. Research conducted on the Monument must provide a report upon conclusion of the research and clean up and restore areas to original condition.</p> <p>5. Student involvement in field</p>	<p>2. A wide range of research relevant to Monument management is allowed with a strong emphasis on providing education opportunities. <i>Consider broadening the scope to include basic research other than research that contributes to Monument management.</i> <i>NOTE: Consider an advisory peer review committee to review and approve research proposals.</i></p> <p>3. Utilize new information from research and adapt management within two years of when information becomes available.</p> <p>4. Research conducted on the Monument must provide a report upon conclusion of the research and clean up and restore areas to original condition.</p> <p>5. Emphasize field studies by</p>	<p>2. A wide range of research relevant to Monument management is allowed with a strong emphasis on providing education opportunities. <i>Consider broadening the scope to include basic research other than research that contributes to Monument management.</i> <i>NOTE: Consider an advisory peer review committee to review and approve research proposals.</i></p> <p>3. Utilize new information from research and adapt management within two years of when information becomes available.</p> <p>4. Research conducted on the Monument must provide a report upon conclusion of the research and clean up and restore areas to original condition.</p> <p>5. Emphasize field studies by</p>	<p>2. A wide range of research relevant to Monument management is allowed with a strong emphasis on providing education opportunities. <i>Consider broadening the scope to include basic research other than research that contributes to Monument management.</i> <i>NOTE: Consider an advisory peer review committee to review and approve research proposals.</i></p> <p>3. Utilize new information from research and adapt management within two years of when information becomes available.</p> <p>4. Research conducted on the Monument must provide a report upon conclusion of the research and clean up and restore areas to original condition.</p> <p>5. Emphasize field studies by</p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
	<p>research would predominantly be university graduate students.</p>	<p>students from all grade levels and university.</p>	<p>students from all grade levels and university.</p>
<p>Goal 12. Establish and maintain a cooperative fire management program that protects facilities, resources and neighbors and fulfills natural resource management objectives.</p>			
	<p>1. Develop Fire Prevention and Education Program with relationship to Fire Management (including public education regarding prescribed fire, fire fighting, and fire safety and prevention, public safety {evacuation routes}) with in 5 years of the approval of CCP. Following development of this plan, implementation will occur for the next 10 year period. {the term of the CCP}{Including educational materials, signs, presentations, as strategies) Note: we are wondering if public education plan which was our original objective should instead be a strategy under fire prevention objective.</p>	<p>1. Develop Fire Prevention and Education Program with relationship to Fire Management (including public education regarding prescribed fire, fire fighting, and fire safety and prevention, public safety {evacuation routes}) with in 5 years of the approval of CCP. Following development of this plan, implementation will occur for the next 10 year period. {the term of the CCP}{Including educational materials, signs, presentations, as strategies) Note: we are wondering if public education plan which was our original objective should instead be a strategy under fire prevention objective.</p>	<p>1. Develop Fire Prevention and Education Program with relationship to Fire Management (including public education regarding prescribed fire, fire fighting, and fire safety and prevention, public safety {evacuation routes}) with in 5 years of the approval of CCP. Following development of this plan, implementation will occur for the next 10 year period. {the term of the CCP}{Including educational materials, signs, presentations, as strategies) Note: we are wondering if public education plan which was our original objective should instead be a strategy under fire prevention objective.</p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
	<p>2. Review, update and execute cooperative agreements every 5 years. Maintain open communication and foster partnerships with other cooperators (city, county, and other agencies). Potentially arrange an annual or more frequent meeting to discuss capabilities of each partner (as a strategy).</p> <p>3. Suppress fires and keep them to the smallest acreage that is feasible for fire fighter safety and resource protection. (We are wondering about SMART - with reference to time frame on this one)</p> <p>4. Review and update the Fire Management Plan every 5 years. Implement the plan. Integrate Fire Management into all Monument/Refuge programs to ensure consistency across management including; biological, cultural, public use</p>	<p>2. Review, update and execute cooperative agreements every 5 years. Maintain open communication and foster partnerships with other cooperators (city, county, and other agencies). Potentially arrange an annual or more frequent meeting to discuss capabilities of each partner (as a strategy).</p> <p>3. Suppress fires and keep them to the smallest acreage that is feasible for fire fighter safety and resource protection. (We are wondering about SMART - with reference to time frame on this one)</p> <p>4. Review and update the Fire Management Plan every 5 years. Implement the plan. Integrate Fire Management into all Monument/Refuge programs to ensure consistency across management including; biological, cultural, public use</p>	<p>2. Review, update and execute cooperative agreements every 5 years. Maintain open communication and foster partnerships with other cooperators (city, county, and other agencies). Potentially arrange an annual or more frequent meeting to discuss capabilities of each partner (as a strategy).</p> <p>3. Suppress fires and keep them to the smallest acreage that is feasible for fire fighter safety and resource protection. (We are wondering about SMART - with reference to time frame on this one)</p> <p>4. Review and update the Fire Management Plan every 5 years. Implement the plan. Integrate Fire Management into all Monument/Refuge programs to ensure consistency across management including; biological, cultural, public use</p>

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use</p>
	<p>and maintenance programs (including number of fire stations/locations, water sources, detection means and dispatch capabilities, fire fighting staff and amount of equipment, public educational needs, seasonal restrictions).</p> <p>5. Use prescribed fire to accomplish resource management objectives.</p> <p>6. Identify capital needs for facilities (including water sources, lookouts/detection means, buildings, facilities and equipment needs) for Fire Management and evaluate and describe for different levels across each alternative.</p> <p>7. Reduce hazardous fuels on the Monument by appropriate means. <i>Strategy notes: prescribed burns, mechanical, chemical, or other.</i> (Also question about SMART)</p>	<p>and maintenance programs (including number of fire stations/locations, water sources, detection means and dispatch capabilities, fire fighting staff and amount of equipment, public educational needs, seasonal restrictions).</p> <p>5. Use prescribed fire to accomplish resource management objectives.</p> <p>6. Identify capital needs for facilities (including water sources, lookouts/detection means, buildings, facilities and equipment needs) for Fire Management and evaluate and describe for different levels across each alternative.</p> <p>7. Reduce hazardous fuels on the Monument by appropriate means. <i>Strategy notes: prescribed burns, mechanical, chemical, or other.</i> (Also question about SMART)</p>	<p>and maintenance programs (including number of fire stations/locations, water sources, detection means and dispatch capabilities, fire fighting staff and amount of equipment, public educational needs, seasonal restrictions).</p> <p>5. Use prescribed fire to accomplish resource management objectives.</p> <p>6. Identify capital needs for facilities (including water sources, lookouts/detection means, buildings, facilities and equipment needs) for Fire Management and evaluate and describe for different levels across each alternative.</p> <p>7. Reduce hazardous fuels on the Monument by appropriate means. <i>Strategy notes: prescribed burns, mechanical, chemical, or other.</i> (Also question about SMART)</p>

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection with Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation appreciation recreation education	Alternative 4 Expanded Public Use
<p>Goal 13. Provide infrastructure, operations and maintenance capabilities that are in harmony with Monument purposes.</p>			
<p>Infrastructure = roads, wells, septic systems, parking lots, gates, powerlines, canals, dikes, alternative modes of transportation, boat launch guzzlers, visitor center, trails, fences, buildings, ponds, firebreaks, toilets, garbage etc.</p> <p>Also suggest using cameras for fire monitoring.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify, classify, and map current infrastructure. 2. Analyze Monument infrastructure needs, including transportation, to implement this alternative. 3. Maintain, improve, build or eliminate infrastructure based on protection needs, low-impact priorities, and aesthetics (reduce roads and parking areas; ensure firefighting capability, determine modes of access) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify, classify, and map current infrastructure. 2. Analyze Monument infrastructure needs, including transportation, to implement this alternative. 3. Maintain, improve, build, or eliminate infrastructure based on protection and visitation needs. (increased infrastructure likely including offsite visitor center, determine modes of access) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify, classify, and map current infrastructure. 2. Analyze Monument infrastructure needs, including transportation, to implement this alternative. 3. Maintain, improve, build, or eliminate infrastructure based on protection and visitation needs. (even more infrastructure needs likely including on site visitor center, determine modes of access)

Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop II

February 10-13, 2003
Richland, WA

FINAL REPORT

Section 2 Development of Management Alternatives



Development of Management Alternatives

An alternative is a potential conceptual direction for management. Each alternative will help fulfill the Refuge System mission and resolve identified issues facing Hanford Reach and each will require a set of objectives and strategies or means of achieving the monument vision and goals. Within the context of Comprehensive Conservation Planning, the Service defines alternatives as: “Different sets of objectives and strategies or means of achieving refuge purposes and goals, helping fulfill the Refuge System mission, and resolving issues.”

The purpose of this exercise was to develop a set of management alternatives within the context of the goals, vision and purpose of the Refuge. Specific tasks assigned to the work groups were: brainstorm alternatives reflecting different possible alternative futures, prioritize alternatives to identify those most promising, list these preliminary alternatives on a flip chart, and identify their most salient characteristics in relation to the agreed goal.

All groups approached the assignment very differently. Group 1 started by going unit by unit, but then mostly addressed access. Next each group member offered a theme of management: environmental education and interpretation, safety and security, cultural resource, protecting and restoring native habitat, public use and access, landscape scale management. They then created narratives describing each theme and ranked them as to how they fit with the goals.

Group 2 first decided they didn't have enough information about current management so took some time reviewing the management direction being used on the Monument today. They felt that this current management, with a little refinement, could be a viable alternative. They then looked at each alternative management theme relative to the status quo: less access than currently allowed with a focus on conservation, expanding current access, and totally open-extreme access. Other alternatives could apply these gradients differently to each unit.

Group 3 took the baseline (current management) and divided it by unit across the 13 goals to see if they meet the goals; the two that didn't fit currently were education and public use. Then they brainstormed 7 different potential uses, had high, medium, low and no use. They looked at the possibility of public use under all existing units in a matrix.

Group 4 started by thinking of different flavors of management. They looked at goals across the flavors of management and abandoned this approach because they were all so important. Next they developed a range of protection and use with high protection/low use and high use/low protection as the extremes. They matched the goals against these themes in a matrix and assigned scores of high, medium and low according to relevance to the goals.

Group 5 reorganized boundaries on the Monument map to make a North Unit, South Unit and River Unit (including dunes). They looked at each of the units in terms of maximum preservation and then looked at each under high use and recreation. Then they worked to find a middle ground. None of the alternatives would be purely preservation or use. There would always be at least a little of both. They defined what would happen under each gradient. All

options seemed to need more law enforcement either to keep people out or monitor people inside the monument.

Group 1 report

DAY 1

Step 1. We decided to look at each management unit and consider the alternatives for each.

ALE Alternatives

Considerations: Fabulous views on the ridge; Incredible biodiversity, some plants found nowhere else in the world; Native American traditional cultural values

Alt 1: More open than it is now, small area south end, Observation only (no hunting)

Alt 2: Open the road all the way to the top, corridor-limiting folks to just that narrow road.

Alt 3: Limit public access given the incredible biodiversity on ALE, research can determine better access options.

Alt 4: Variable access throughout ALE

Alt 5: Keep the area closed as is.

Step 2. After just covering items that are mostly goal 7- access, we decided to stick with access and work through access for the other management units.

McGee Ranch/Riverlands Alternatives

Considerations: Keep out grazers and vehicles and fire to protect Umptanam buckwheat; Current unauthorized use.

Alt 1: McGee Ranch: No vehicle access, just hiking trails w/trails excluded from sensitive sites.

Alt 2: As is

Alt 3: McGee Ranch: Hiking and horse trails excluding sensitive areas.

Step 3. Brainstorming session: We were concerned that the above process was going too slow and that we could not get this done in the allotted time so we decided to do some brainstorming of alternative themes.

Some unlimited public access

Create management zones with a variety of levels of biological management and public uses

Biodiversity protection

Wilderness designation

Restore native habitats

Cultural resource protection and interpretation
No access
Base management on critical thresholds

Step 4. We decided we were just recapitulating goal items in this brainstorming session and decided to discuss our process again.

Step 5. Onnie straightened us out and we started our brainstorming session over.

This is what we came up for alternative themes:

- Environmental Education and interpretation
- Safety and security
- Public Use and access
- Landscape scale management zones
- Cultural resource protection and interpretation
- Protect and restore native habitats

Step 6. We then further defined each alternative theme and assessed how it met the goals and vision.

Environmental Ed and Interpretation Alternative defined: to inform, educate, and provide for both indoor and outdoor educational experiences to promote an understanding and appreciation of the NM's vast resources and their importance. Implements goals 5, 6, 7. No conflict with all other goals. Meets part of but not all of the vision.

Safety and Security Alternative defined: No public access, access for safety and security purposes and DOE operations, research, public safety and cleanup. Goal 1 and 2: conserves but does not restore. Meets goals 4 & 5; partially meets 8; and does not meet goals 3, 9-13. Meets part of but not all of the vision.

Public Use and Access Alternative defined: Provide for recreational use on trails, roads, and waterways. Does not meet goals 1-5, 9, 11, 12. Meets goal 7 and could meet goals 6 and 8 as well. Partially meets goals 10 and 13. Meets part of but not all of the vision.

Landscape Scale Management Zones Alternative defined: segregates the monument by management zones which are filtered by attributes such as topography, critical habitat, cultural resource set asides/historical interpretation and preservation, recreation potential, wilderness designation. Meet all goals and the vision.

Cultural Resource Protection and Interpretation Alternative: Promote the conservation, protect, restore and interpretation, education cultural resources on the monument. Partially meets Goals 1, 2, 7, 8, 10; Meets 4, 5, 6, 9, 11; Does not meet goals 3, 12, 13.

Protect and Restore Native Habitats Alternative defined: Protect and restore native habitats and their associated species. Meets goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11; Does not meet 5, 13; Could meet 7, 8; Partially meets 12. Partially meets the vision statement.

DAY 2

Step 1: Greg went over a map of the Monument and briefly and quickly discussed the status quo Alternative.

Step 2: The group started to discuss the six alternatives that the group defined yesterday. We decided to develop 2 action alternatives that used the landscape management zone concept. One of these alternatives would have more Public Uses, Environmental Ed, and Safety & Security but also includes all of the natural and cultural resources management goals and the other would have more emphasis on Natural and Cultural resources and less emphasis on public uses.

Step 3. We liked the point we have gotten to and saw many similarities with the other groups as well as some differences.

Step 4. We were in the groan zone for a LONG TIME. We finally agreed, in theory, on 2 different alternatives but when we started to define one Alternative, our description started to look like both would be the same. Lots more discussion resulted in consensus for the 2 alternatives defined below, however we acknowledged they might need some more work. We did not agree on the title for alternative 2.

Protection of Natural and Cultural Resources Emphasis Alternative

Definition= Use science- based zoning approach to ~~map~~ identify and characterize all ~~critical~~ natural and cultural resources and abate threats to those resources. ~~Provide for minimal appropriate~~ Minimize public uses ~~that clearly do not interfere with resources to emphasize~~ environmental education and recreational opportunities that result in the least resource disturbance.

Public Uses Alternative or

Protect Natural and Cultural Resources and Provide for Public Uses Alternative

Use science-based zoning approach to ~~map~~ identify and characterize all natural and cultural resources, and existing and potential public uses. That ~~looks~~ seeks to provide for public access ~~that~~ promoting public understanding, awareness, and appreciation of Monument resources.

Final Version of Alternatives:

Protection of Natural and Cultural Resources Emphasis Alternative

Definition= Use science- based zoning approach to identify and characterize all natural and cultural resources and abate threats to those resources. Minimize public uses to emphasize environmental education and recreational opportunities that result in the least resource disturbance.

Public Uses Alternative or

Protect Natural and Cultural Resources and Provide for Public Uses Alternative

Use science-based zoning approach to identify and characterize all natural and cultural resources, and existing and potential public uses. Seek to provide for public access promoting public understanding, awareness, and appreciation of Monument resources.

Group 2 report

DAY 1

We started by reviewing current management / by unit = then shifted to developing management themes that would apply to the whole Monument.

We decided to try to define the Alternatives relative to current management.

Fitzner/Eberhardt Arid Lands Ecology Reserve: Current Management

Closed Area

RNA

Rare plants

Plant Communities of importance

Weed Management with mechanical and chemical control methods

Research

Oberservatory

Maintain and restore plant communities

Educational tours under permit

Roads are paved, improved gravel and some dirt roads

Fitzner/Eberhardt Arid Lands Ecology Reserve

Possible Alternatives:

Tours increase number of tours by bus or van/ increase public access

Restrictions on vehicles - perhaps having a vehicle that stays in the ALE

Restriction on when and how people could get out and visit in different areas

Other alternative - no one can get out of the vehicles

Other alternative - keep the ALE closed to public access (as current management)

Other alternative - tour with guides only

Other alternative - seasonal access provided to public

Over all management themes - possibilities

VERY restrictive

Current management

More open

Monument Alternative themes

1. VERY Restrictive
2. Current Management
3. More Access

4. Total access

David Geist had different perspective on alternatives

1. Conservation Alternative
2. Recreation Alternative
3. Education/Interpretation/Research Alternative
4. Status quo

We combined David's ideas - into the initial Themes

We started to try to develop a strategy to go through each of the themes using each goal / or go through each area and determine how use would be different in each area under each alternative.

Ended up with:

2. Less Access/Conservation
 - ALE totally closed
 - designated wilderness areas
 - connectivity of surrounding areas

1. Status quo/current management
3. Increased public access/Recreation public use
4. Totally open/increase public access
5. Education/interpretation/research

Theme ONE = Status Quo

Wahluke discussion on Status quo

currently open all days (365 per year) for 2 hours before sunrise to 2 hours after sunset)

can walk anywhere

riverbank fishing access

boat launch facility

utilization higher south of 24 highway

Saddle Mountain status quo

Closed

Wildlife sanctuary

Access for valid existing rights - irrigation district and BPA weed control efforts

McGee Ranch status quo

open north of Midway road

closed south of Midway road

Fishing along the river

valid existing rights access

River Corridor unit status quo

high public use

no restrictions except ESA issues

no access to south bank

mixed access to islands

Vernita unit status quo

boat launch
camping/public use
all hours access/day and night

Theme TWO = Conservation/ Less Access OVERALL THEME - strong focus on conservation and restoration in all areas, with strong monitoring / research to demonstrate effectiveness of conservation.

ALE Unit

Totally closed (except for administrative access by DOE and Service - primarily for emergencies)

designated wilderness area
emphasize conservation and restoration of upland habitats
connectivity to surrounding areas
remove all buildings from Rattlesnake and ALE
retire some roads
emphasize natural processes in plant communities
active weed management
Research continues with focus on conservation/restoration research / minimal research

Vernita Unit

boat launch open/develop boat launch with respect to natural and cultural resources in the area
day time hours only
no camping
restore area
manage weeds
Promote camping areas OFF Monument - in Mattawa, or other small community

Wahlake Unit

reduce number of parking lots
retire/re-vegetate some roads
Designate trails for hiking
Designated trails for horse riders
seasonal access fishing and hunting only
close to public for migratory bird nesting and fire season

Saddle Mountain Unit

generally the same as status quo
increase active restoration projects
enforce anti-poaching and no fishing regulations

McGee

direct boat traffic to Vernita rather than riverland area
no boat launching

continue to allow bank fishing / only open during fishing season for access / controlled fishing area

River Corridor

Limit number of power and non-motorized boats by permit, limit number of boats per day

No jet skis

season for non-motorized boats only when power boats are excluded

Research on aquatic and fisheries - and research to assess impacts from other uses

Research continues / and is evaluated on whether it has impacts to the resources or not (research only limited if shown to cause negative impacts)

THEME THREE: Increased access / recreation and public use

ALE

ALE would have seasonal access

tours with guides along trails

tours in vans/bus but can't get out

some restricted trail access

regular trips to observatory

keep communication towers

emphasize conservation but allow all kinds of research

provide restrooms / drinkable water

roadside interpretive signs

Hunting by permit or guide - added during day 2

Vernita unit

improve boat launch and enlarge

improve parking lot

restrooms/water provided

fires in fire rings but only during the non-fire season

improve campground

open year around

Wahluke unit

add primitive camping to White bluffs boat launch area

provide restrooms

improved parking and road areas (paved)

interpretive trail and kiosks

Hiking trails and horse trails

explore tours using transit opportunities (vans and busses)

open road through Wahluke to create a loop drive (one-way)

Self-guided interpretive tour route

Coordinated events with Visitor Center

Fewer but improved parking lots

Camping at Ringold area (work with the state)

boat access from Ringold

Interpretive center along loop road

Improve white bluffs boat launch

Saddle Mountain unit (after no longer needed for safety considerations)

Interpretive tours through Saddle Mountain - seasonal sensitive to wildlife
active weed management
road access into white bluff area with interpretive signs and either overlook or hiking trail

McGee area

Fishing allowed on the bank
Working with the state on access to the river and interpretive facilities at Vernita rest stop
improve boat launching facility
open part of closed area for trails

River Corridor

boat camping sites for non-motorized boaters
create a interpretive boat trail brochure that identifies key features

DAY 2

Today we have decided to finish fleshing out our alternatives, and then we will go through each goal and see how each alternative meets the goals.

We then looked at all issues to determine if we could vary the degree of recommendations and actions based around each issue.

We discussed including the issues in our descriptions of each alternative.

Overall Issues - that will perhaps vary across all alternatives

Law enforcement needs in each alternative

Tied to levels of interpretation for Geo/paleo/cultural

Monitoring the impact of visitors/monitoring contaminants/biological and cultural resources

Weed Management

We were concerned about how much we could vary the management actions in certain issues:

fisheries

white bluffs sloughing

contamination

Native American use

We began completing our Final Alternative - = increased, maximum access

By unit

ALE

open year round

improve/pave roads and parking lots

Consider additional roads - look at roads to maximize access to trails

develop trails for hiking use

potential primitive campground - Snively Spring or Rattlesnake spring
Restroom facilities
Wildlife viewing platforms
Designating research zones
Observatory with associated classroom facility
Keep some of the buildings and facilities for historical interpretation
Hunting during hunting season, following state laws for any game that is legal to harvest
Maintain restore, interpret shrub-steppe ecosystem
increased weed management

Vernita Area

Bigger campground with RV hook ups and shower area
Need to control fires - in fire rings or fire pits
Concessionaire, for food and perhaps other amenities, boat canoe and kayak rentals
Consider a caretaker for the campground/host
Improved boat launch and ramps, parking lot
open year around
Interpretive signs to provide information about the Monument and Reach
Establish boat tours service from Vernita

Wahluke

Improved camping and more campgrounds
Improved trail system
Improved roads, more roads considered
campgrounds at highway 24, White Bluffs, and Ringold all with bathrooms and water
restroom and improved parking at WB-10
improved horse stalls or corrals, hitching posts, stock tank (horse facilities)
Horseback riding rentals -
Concessionaire/boat rental at boat launch, fry bread stand
Lodge at saddle mountain
Historical river crossing, and town site - LOTS of interpretation
Potential museum/historical visitor center
2-way loop road
Expand hunting by including rifle season

Saddle Mountain Unit

primitive campground with restroom at the lake with fire rings
develop roads and trails
open year round
open hunting for licensed hunters
increased weed management
open fishing on Saddle Mountain Lake

McGee

Everything same as alternative #3 plus
Consider B-reactor tours start here at Rest Area

Rest Area also has associated visitor center
horse facilities
primitive camping

River corridor

everything same as alternative 3 plus
additional boat ramps and improved ramps
Bus from potential visitor center in town - through Monument - then back on a boat -
“Land and water tour” at Vernita or White Bluffs
Air plane tours
increased boat tours

We discussed creating a blend of Alternative 2, 3, 4 to create a couple of more alternatives.
In some areas increased access and more facilities would be appropriate where in others there
would be more conservation, less access or more controlled access.

Final Alternatives

Common to all of our Alternatives will be access/use/coordination for

Native American Rights/Treaty rights
Valid Existing Rights
Location of future utility corridors avoids sensitive areas/locate likely areas
Weed Management
Fire Management (potentially at different levels for each alternative)
Law Enforcement
Monitoring (potentially at different levels for each alternative)

Alternative #1

Current Management

Alternative #2 Conservation/Less Access

This alternative emphasis controlled and less access to some areas. This alternative reduces the number of access points and focuses on fewer access points, reduces the roads and facilities, encourages improvements and development off the Monument, focuses on natural and cultural resources by reducing and controlling human disturbance. The Monument creates and maintains a permit system for visitation. Limited interpretive facilities, with most interpretive work occurring off Monument through presentations in schools, etc.. Research emphasis on conservation and rare species, with lots of additional monitoring of natural systems. Potential to re-introduce endangered species. Seasonal limits on visitation for fire season. Increased “on-the-ground” restoration activities, both uplands and aquatic/riverine/riparian. Continued and increased active weed management. Monument staff active in developing partnerships to increase connectivity with neighboring lands, and to focus use in off Monument areas.

Meets and enhances goals 1-5, 8, 9, 11

Less focus on goals 6, 7, 13

Neutral on 10, 12, (potential for in community partnerships and partners for connectivity, but fewer partnerships for on the Monument work) (Fires would be less likely due to human causes

but with less roads etc. wildfire would be harder to control - also perhaps less prescribed fire management would be done)

Alternative #3 Increased Access for recreation and interpretation

This alternative increases public access to all units of the Monument, relative to existing current management. This increases the on Monument interpretive and educational opportunities, and visitor services and facilities, for example restrooms and parking lots. Transit, and transportation are improved by improving roads and increased access points. Facilities are improved in particular sites, but limited to those sites which are planned in less sensitive areas. Sensitive areas still remain closed, yet access is provided and managed either in less sensitive areas, or using guides and/or seasons. Monument staff active in developing partnerships to foster on Monument activities, volunteers, docents, etc.

Goals:

Meets and enhances 6, 7, 10, 11, 13 (enhances partnerships with many groups for on Monument activities, research will include all type of basic as well as ecological research, infrastructure is increased and maintained)

Less emphasis

Neutral on 1 -5, 8, 12 (because increased access has potential to cause increased disturbance or degradation, potential increase in fires due to human causes, but more access to fight fires)

For Goal 9, the Tribes would need to increase law enforcement and monitoring to protect resources

Alternative #4 Maximize public use and recreation opportunities

This alternative allows the most broad use of the area for the public. Increases visitor access and amenities with many facilities including improved campgrounds including RV's, visitor centers, restrooms, showers, etc. Enhances opportunities to explore the Monument both with and without guides, with many roads and routes through the Monument. Maximizes interpretive information for cultural, historical, geological, and paleontological resources. Also provides for concessionaires and commercial uses in several areas. Restricts research into smaller designated zones, and focuses research on impacts from use. Increased requirement for monitoring, law enforcement, and fire management. Increased recreation for all types of uses including hunting, fishing, hiking, camping, dog trials, horses, etc.

Goals:

Meets and enhances: 6, 7, 10

Less emphasis: 1-4, 8, 9, 11, 12 (increased risk of fires)

Neutral: 5, 13 (acknowledges more than protects cultural. Increased facilities and infrastructures throughout but perhaps not in "harmony" with Monument purpose??)

Alternative #5 Blended management - Adaptive Management

This alternative takes aspects from alternatives above and applies different features of conservation and access in different specific areas across the Monument. It is also flexible and has features that can be modified with additional information.

On Wahluke some areas currently open would be closed (after sensitive areas are evaluated), but access areas that remain would be controlled and enhanced. Enhancements including some interpretive trails and signs would be added, one-way driving loop would be developed, potential for primitive camping area would be considered, campfires would be aloud but limited by

season. The boat launch and parking area at White Bluffs would be improved. Camping on state lands at Ringold will be encouraged through partnership with the state. Focus on big 6 (hunting, fishing, photography, wildlife observation, and education and interpretation) recreation and enhancements on Wahluke. Wildlife monitoring and habitat management would also occur. Provide restrooms at key areas. Promote a pack-in and pack-put/Leave no trace ethic. Consider alternative transit for providing guides tours through Wahluke. Consider improving some of the main roads to define access points and trail access.

ALE would include emphasize the RNA, but would have guided tours for the public but with emphasis on ecology, so that it would not disturb research areas or wildlife. The area will continue to focus on continuing research programs. The area would not be open to hunting, which would be focused in other areas of the Monument (e.g. McGee or perhaps lands outside of the Monument (e.g. McQuarter).

Saddle Mountain Unit would also have limited access through guided tours (after the security was limited), which would be seasonal so that the area would still serve as a sanctuary.

Vernita area would require an improved boat launch to focus use, and reduce the current dispersed access and damage. This area (or across at McGee/Riverlands) another camping facility could be considered. Cooperate closely with the state in this area to both control weeds and patrol for law enforcement needs.

River Corridor. Consider some zoning of use along the river to limit erosion/or other damage. Consider limiting jet skis in the Reach. Consider using a permit process to manage guided trips/tours within River. Consider concessionaires that contract with the government to provide services (use short-term contracts (~5 year) with renewable clause so that the service provided could be reviewed and adapted). Need to do a study to evaluate the impacts of use on the river to determine where to put ramps and to provide access, and evaluate seasonal use.

Goals:

meets and enhances: 1-13

less emphasis

Neutral

Group 3 report

Introduction

This group recognized that some management goals might not be compatible with each other in a fixed geographic area (e.g., high-intensity recreation and conservation in habitat for a sensitive plant community). Therefore, we were not comfortable with one “fit-all” management strategy for the entire Monument. Perhaps not all 13 goals should be met in each unit--some goals could be emphasized in some areas, and other goals in other areas so that Monument-wide all 13 goals are met. Our alternatives apply to individual management units and are based on “management strategies” for those individual units.

Our guiding principle for selecting a management strategy for the management units was to let the past guide the future. Development should be focused on areas already disturbed by past and current activities. Conversely, more protection should be provided for pristine previously undisturbed areas.

The range of alternatives developed for an individual unit should be tied to a priority management strategy based on the guiding principle. Borrowing the continuum of max preservation to max use from Group 5, our range of alternatives would cluster towards preservation or use depending on the management strategy for the unit. For example, access to ALE has been highly controlled in the past and therefore high quality habitats remain. So our range of alternatives does not include high-intensity recreational use. Conversely, the Wahluke unit has a history of human access/disturbance so the range of alternatives is biased towards recreational use rather than conservation.

Because the existing management units have been managed differently in the past, the unit boundaries give some indication of disturbance history. So we found using existing units helpful, with two exceptions. We combined the River Corridor with Vernita, and McGee and Saddle Mountain (they have both been closed to access and are important for connectivity to the Yakima Training Center).

Areas of management emphasis will need to be tailored to the various geographic units of the Monument. Each unit has a history and long term use patterns that should be considered in the development of alternatives. Our approach followed this logic in an attempt to consider alternative options that made sense and were feasible. We combined several similar units. There were a number of detail issues we did not attempt to address such as contamination, cultural resources, fire management, transportation infrastructure, visual character, solitude, and connectivity, although these issues were touched on by alternative discussions and options. We also did not attempt to address tribal treaty rights or other valid and existing uses. We attempted to sum up the status quo, or no action alternative (Alternative 1) for each of the geographic units.

Assumptions

- 1) Areas of management emphasis will not necessarily fit all areas or units of the Monument.
- 2) Follow current patterns of activity in the various geographic areas of the Monument; e.g. use and development in currently disturbed area, low use in currently pristine areas.
- 3) Did not address tribal treaty rights or other valid and existing uses, specifically.
- 4) Alternative 1, or the no action alternative, is meant to be the status quo, or current management with an increased enforcement presence.

Discussion of Approach

Need to look at other goals for Monument and not focus so much on use, access, and recreation.

Do areas of management emphasis apply to all areas of the Monument? Probably not but may need to consider effect on all units.

Focus on areas or units and discuss management emphasis appropriate for each area as well as effects of other areas of emphasis.

Arid Lands Ecology Reserve – Preservation/Conservation Emphasis

No Action (Current Management) Alternative 1: Research natural area with relatively undisturbed habitat. Emphasis has been for research and education. Landscape opportunities. Rare plants and native communities. Important bird area. Has been closed to many of the impacts other areas have suffered. Fire has altered native community. Restoration and research on restoration strategies that can be applied to other areas of Monument is occurring.

Alternative 2 – Minimal Intervention: Preservation/Conservation

Research: Allow research under permit system.

Education: Establish plan for educational opportunities via observation of ongoing research.

Biological: No restoration; only natural.

Access: Access during spring wild flower season to top of Rattlesnake and Snively Canyon. Trail access at two points. Road stays open but not to vehicles.

Alternative 3 – Higher level of controlled group access/active restoration

Access: Tram or buses (group conveyance) to top of Rattlesnake, possibly guided. Columbia Point visitors center would be starting point for access or tours of ALE. Trails, boardwalks, to minimize soil and habitat disturbance. Includes greater attention to management of trails and access points. Refurbish, maintain, and open observatory to public.

Biological: Active restoration (e.g. plant sagebrush) and research on restoration strategies via treatment and control areas. Similar to no action alternative. Active weed control.

River Corridor/Vernita

Alternative 1 – Current or no action

Access: Boat ramps at Vernita Bridge, White Bluffs, Ringold. River is accessible except for south and west Hanford side. Access points uncontrolled and no facilities except bathroom at White Bluffs. No upland access at Saddle Mountain. Camping at Vernita Bridge, but not officially sanctioned. Hunting from 8 parking lots above Ringold. Island access is variable (i.e. DOE, Refuge, open). Fishing common in Reach; bank fishing at Ringold and Vernita.

Contamination is present in numerous places. Continue to coordinate with other agencies and entities on determining the causes and possible solutions of the sloughing at White Bluffs.

Fish Resources: Northern Pikeminnow reward program. Fall Chinook spawning and rearing, sturgeon, spring Chinook, steelhead, listed species migratory corridor. Smallmouth bass, walleye fishery.

Other resources: Cultural resources (e.g. Locke Is.). White Bluffs erosion. Significant nesting islands. Riparian habitat is important but may be effected by water management. Sloughs are biologically significant. Sand dunes fragile and significant and some of last in Columbia Basin. Rare plants.

Research: Continue research and monitoring for fall Chinook sturgeon and physical modeling.

Alternative 2 – Minimal intervention/Access

Access: Remove access to Vernita Bridge boat launch. Allow access at White Bluffs and Ringold only. If not otherwise mentioned, continue with no action Alternative with regard to access.

Biological: Create buffer zones and restrict access to breeding/nesting and other sensitive areas. Restore functioning riparian system.

Research: Continue research and monitoring for fall Chinook sturgeon and physical modeling.

Alternative 3 –Day use, Dispersed Access

Access: New Vernita boat launch. Permanent restrooms and facilities at 3 boat launches. Day use and picnic areas. Day use only, no camping.

Biological: Restore functioning riparian system.

Other: All other activities and prohibitions as under Alternative 1 are allowed.

Alternative 4

Everything in Alternative 3 Plus:

Access: Large 200 site campground with full facilities including RV and non-native vegetation and trees between B reactor and Vernita on DOE side. Boat docks on DOE side near B reactor. Transportation infrastructure upgraded.

Biological: Restore functioning riparian system.

Education: Interpretive center near B reactor with emphasis on Native Americans, early settlement, atomic era, etc. Build fish interpretive center similar to Bonneville.

**Assumption – Proclamation clause is enacted to roll additional land into Monument; 5 sq. mi. between Highway 24 and B reactor.*

McGee/Saddle Mountain

Alternative 1 – No Action

No access. Important bird stopover. Mitigation site to provide waterfowl habitat previously. Wildlife corridor between ALE and SM. Important sand dunes and rare plant communities. Part of White Bluffs start here. Major irrigation water moving through system.

Alternative 2 – Minimal Intervention/Access

Access: Access by foot or on horse, on trails only.

Education: Pull off on Highway 24 with interpretive information/telescopes to allow viewing of Hanford Site. Enhance what's there currently.

Biological: Protect biologically, geologically, and paleontologically significant areas. Weed management active

Alternative 3 –Day use/ Dispersed Access

Access: Motorized access to top of Umtanum Ridge; picnic area. No overnight use.

Other features as in Alternative 2.

Wahluke

Alternative 1 – No Action

Public access during day. Unimproved roads. Grazing occurred in North end of unit; habitat damage. Dog trials historically occurred. Fishing and hunting allowed. Driving allowed only on designated roads. Other management roads are present. Biological areas not well protected.

Continue to coordinate with other agencies and entities on determining the causes and possible solutions of the sloughing at White Bluffs.

Alternative 2 – Minimal Intervention/Access

Access: Improve road. This would be entry point for overview of Hanford Site. No dog trials. More restrictions on dispersed use.

Education: Top of Saddle Mountain is an interpretive area with telescopes and information on habitat. Viewing and education of entire site.

Biological: Protect significant biological, geological, and paleontological areas. Massive restoration, active habitat management program. Active weed control.

Alternative 3 – Enhanced recreation

Allow all activities as under Alternative 1.

Interpretive areas as in Alternative 2.

Biological: Management of WB-10 ponds for warmwater fishery if water quality allows. May lose amphibians. Eliminate Russian olive and replace with willows and native species to restore riparian community and create birding opportunities. Restoration elsewhere as in Alternative 2.

Synthesis Discussion Points

- 1) When we did not specifically state something, the no action alternative or status quo is inferred.
- 2) We did not address all significant issues such as contamination, cultural resources, fire management, transportation infrastructure, visual character, solitude, connectivity.
- 3) Detailed analysis will weigh impacts to biological, geological, paleontological resources, alternative by alternative.

Group 4 report

Brainstorming Session for Alternative Development:

Starting point might be- There should be areas of protection (with little or no activity) and areas with high access- nodes of connection.

Areas that haven't been used= areas of protection

Areas with current high use = potential areas for more activity

Balancing protection with access- could use simplistic model of High, Medium and Low- High Access, Low Protection or Low access- High protection.

Two phase method could be to look at current access (river and road) and then look at protection levels.

Access is not specifically mentioned in the proclamation. Protection is. There should be some access so people can enjoy the resources. Access and protection will most likely be addressed throughout the range of alternatives.

What is the range of ways to manage this landscape- Evil Plan, Plants Lovers, Bug/Bunny/Muncher/Cruncher Plan, etc.

Range of Alternatives: Brainstorming Session

Extreme Protection
Extreme Access
High Research
Bio-Diversity
Lo-Hi Recreation
Cultural Resources
Tribal Use
Seasonal-Use Plan
Economy Plan (No Frills)
Homeland Security Plan
Tax and Spend Plan
Pay for Use
Permitted Access

Nomination has been moved and seconded to now begin to pair down the above list into a manageable list for consideration.

Bio-Diversity/Permitted Access/Tribal Use/Extreme Protection- Mike suggested fitting the range into geographic areas. Dan rebutted that it would be better to develop themes then fit geographic areas into the themes for ease of analyzing the alternatives inside an EIS.

Distilling range of alternatives-The group explored many ways to distill the information including statistical analysis procedures, complex mathematical calculations taking into account the earth's gravitational rotation, and coin tossing. There was mention of taking a time-out to meditate and get in touch with our inner-self in order to achieve harmony and a "oneness of mind" but then the facilitator suggested an adequate starting point. We now begin with a theme and ranking system:

BIODIVERSITY:

Goal #	Wahluke	Ale	Saddle Mtn.	McGee	Vernita Bridge	River Corridor
1	B	A	B	A	B**	B
2	B	A*(springs)	B	B	A	A
3	A	A	A	A	A	A
4	A	A	A	A	B	A
5	B	B	B	B	B	B
6	A	A	C	A	A	A
7	A	C	C	A/C	B	A
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						

A= Good /Highest Priority/Meets Goal B= Middle Priority C=Low Priority *=weeds/birds

As we got into this exercise we determined that the above exercise may have been too simplistic and not related to focusing us into alternatives for long-term management options. We found ourselves evaluating current conditions instead of determining range of alternatives.

2) Identify areas of best quality biodiversity to preserve and then work to connect and restore areas between. Identify areas of low quality yet contain rare species, study, document, treat with care.

After a break- we came back and tried to focus on a range of alternatives:

No Action	Extreme Protection	Low Use	Moderate Use	High Use	Extreme Use
Status	Lo Rec Hi Research Perm. Access Closed Access Aggressive Fire Mgmt. Aggressive Weed mgmt.		Seasonal Access	Hi Rec.	Hi Access Lots of Infra. No Limits No Limits Loved to Death Few restrictions High Access Low resource protect.

DAY 2

The group opened the session with a review of yesterday's presentations. Basic questions that were raised: Should we re-group the landscape. Should we suggest restructuring the units to take into account landscape processes? If emphasis is on managing landscapes for biodiversity- this would shape alternatives differently than if landbase was managed for another approach (i.e. recreation).

Biodiversity Approach

- I. ALE/McGee Riverlands- Biologically and ecologically similar.
- II. River Corridor- Includes riverine, Islands, riparian areas, dunes and ¼ mile buffer including the White Bluffs. Unite Vernita, River Corridor and lowlands of McGee.
- III. Unite Saddle Mountain and Wahluke Slope into one Management Unit

It was suggested to think desired future condition. We then launched into looking at the goals to determine if there are any that are in conflict with the Biodiversity Alternative.

Biodiversity means: aggressive-invasive (non-native) weed through a carefully defined and implemented Integrated Pest Management and fire management (large inputs – resources-into a fire management program); conservation, preservation and enhancement of native species, reintroduction of T&E species native species.; high quality biodiversity attracts certain tourists that would dictate the control and regulation of visitation. Implementation of a strong education/interpretation component to educate the general public for the protection of biodiversity. Maintaining and restoring connectivity of other high quality areas. Developing partnerships outside of the Monument boundaries to enhance goals for biodiversity. Implementation of a strong monitoring plan to guide management decisions for biodiversity. Access would be limited. Development and implementation of a strong law enforcement program. Strong PR component.

Low Impact Recreation: Dispersed day use

The team began to discuss a second alternative that focused around the concept of what allowable recreation activities would be permitted within a Monument. Does the FWS manage the Monument as a Refuge or are provisions expanded because it is a Monument?

Recreation activities must be compatible with the vision and Proclamation and with existing legal uses accommodated. Dispersed day use could include parking lots, boat ramps, areas of trails, areas of no trails- cross country use. Includes pre-planned access and use areas- Heart of the Monument concept? Off-site campsites, potentially off-site boat ramps. Low intensity activities emphasized education and interpretation. Permitting-sign-ins. Active fire suppression and weed suppression.

Natural and Historic Interpretation

The team now has moved to the development a third alternative that focuses on more public access, interpretation, and understanding of the diversity of resources on the Monument.

Guided tours of the reach for natural, paleo/geo guided tours and cultural resources; Interpretive center with large interpretive staff and volunteers; Stronger need for more infrastructure. Stronger emphasis on preservation, guides, concessionaires, serving public through defined access; integrate with offsite historic structures; strong research component; strong protection of cultural sites and natural resources; controlled access based upon area sensitivity.

(large inputs – resources-into a fire management program); conservation, preservation and enhancement of native species, reintroduction of T&E species native species.; high quality biodiversity attracts certain tourists that would dictate the control and regulation of visitation. Implementation of a strong education/interpretation component to educate the general public for the protection of biodiversity. Maintaining and restoring connectivity of other high quality areas. Developing partnerships outside of the Monument boundaries to enhance goals for biodiversity. connectivity of other high quality areas Implementation of a strong monitoring plan to guide management decisions for biodiversity. Access would be limited. Development and implementation of a strong law enforcement program. Strong PR component

Final Group 4 Alternatives

Alternative I: Current Management

Alternative II: Biodiversity

Management on the Hanford Reach National Monument would maximize the preservation, conservation, and enhancement of native species and their habitats. Three primary management units include the North Slope (Wahluke and Saddle Mountain Units), River Corridor (including the White Bluffs, Riverlands and Vernita) and the Ale/McGee Units.

Management of fire and invasive non-native species and fire management is aggressive. We will reintroduce threatened and endangered species, including locally extirpated species, as appropriate. This approach includes a strong education/interpretation component to help visitors appreciate and protect the biodiversity of the Monument. High quality habitats are maintained while restoring their connectivity to other high quality areas. Partnerships are sought outside of the Monument boundaries to enhance connectivity and cooperative management opportunities. Access is limited and use is heavily regulated. A strong law enforcement program is needed.

Alternative III: Low Impact Recreation

The low-impact recreation alternative may have high use, but impact remains low. Access remains regulated in sensitive areas, and fire management and weed suppression remain active. Dispersed day use is the focus. Permits may be needed in some instances. Trails will be built where people should go, to prevent de-facto trails in the wrong places, such as braided walking trails along rivershores. Existing legal uses (not be confused with valid and existing rights) are accommodated to the extent possible. Emphasis is on education and interpretation.

Infrastructure (parking lots, trails, rest rooms, concessions) may be sited near the Monument's periphery, such as at Vernita and Ringold.

Alternative IV: Natural and Historic Interpretation

The natural and historic interpretation approach increases emphasis on interpretation of the Monument's resources. Emphasis is on guided tours of ALE's wonders, a guided or driving tour of the paleo/geo resources, a large trained staff and group of volunteers to interpret the Monument's resources. Coordination with offsite partners, especially a visitors' center, is important. There is a strong research component. Cultural and natural resources and sites are strongly protected. Facilities are sited in areas of low sensitivity. Areas of high sensitivity are still controlled very closely. Concessions are encouraged. Integration with offsite historic structures is important. There is stronger need for infrastructure (parking, restrooms, interpretive signs).

FOR ALL ALTERNATIVES:

Monitoring is essential

Control is required.

Fire management and weed suppression are active.

Sensitive areas are protected.

Monument's purposes are upheld.

Group 5 report

Alternative Themes

- **Maximum Preservation** - Overriding priority is to protect and conserve and enhance resources. Management would focus on conserving and enhancing resources in the next 15 years. Public uses would be scrutinized to a higher standard than the compatibility standard. No overnight use, no camping, close higher percentage of Monument to use; limit shoreline access and near-shore use; fewer facilities; facilities designed for lower use - more primitive. Education and interpretation emphasized but from the edge looking in. Some restrictions on boating.
- **Maximum Use** - The first priority is to protect and conserve Monument resources.. Support compatible recreation however it doesn't necessarily lead to greater appreciation of Monument resources. Enhance access through development of facilities in areas of lower resource values. Overnight uses and concessionaires allowed. Some impacts are allowed for the sake of use - but there are no "sacrifice zones", rather site hardening or development provides for higher use.
- **CARE alternative** -The first priority is to conserve and protect the Monument resources. Conservation management will be applied throughout the Monument, while opportunities to promote appreciation, recreation and education, revolving around distinctive Monument resources, are provided where compatible. Compatible recreation and educational activities will foster a sense of appreciation that supports conservation and preservation. All areas are assumed to be sensitive until surveyed. Prior to opening an area to a use it would be determined compatible. Area and use would be monitored to ensure compatibility. Next priority is to foster a sense of appreciation through use of interpretation, provision of quality

recreation opportunities and other strategies. Focus on recreation that is dependent upon the resources of the Monument. Consumptive uses are allowed only at sustainable rates.

New Administrative Units

- South Unit = ALE, McGee Ranch/Riverlands
- River Unit = The W & S River corridor plus the sand dunes
- North Unit = Saddle Mt., Wahluke

Alternatives

Maximum Use

North Unit

- Improve roads to pavement
- Increased trails
- Overnight use; develop campgrounds
- Develop facilities to accommodate dog trials and training
- Develop environmental education center
- Allow paragliding activities
- Open Saddle Mountain area to use
- Develop horseback riding facilities and trails
- Consider concessionaires near visitor contact station
- Manage / promote hunting/habitat
- Develop shade structures
- Develop scenic viewsites
- Increased law enforcement

South Unit

- Improve road to summit
- Allow increased access but maintain restrictions such as permitted access
- Hiking trail to Rattlesnake summit
- Controlled elk hunting opportunities
- Developed camping in Riverlands area by Midway station
- Provide for research without emphasis on Monument management
- Intensive invasive species management
- Increase public tours, interpretation and education

River Unit

- Develop boat launches and access along river
- Develop overnight camping
- Allow concession facilities at boat launch
- Develop picnic/day use areas
- Shoreline trails for non-motorized users
- Public interpretive/educational boat tours
- Manage White Bluffs goose pits
- Provide duck blinds

Develop bird hides
Develop scenic view sites
Develop non-motorized pullouts/camping areas

Maximum Preservation

North Unit

No new roads
Maintain roads as secondary gravel roads only with limited parking areas
Limited hours of use, days of use, and/or times of use/No overnight use
Designate certain days as non-motorized uses only
Some areas off limits
No cross country use; designated roads and trails only
Close certain areas to hunting and fishing
More fire protection
More invasive species control

South Unit

No hunting
Access by permit only
Seedless entry
More security monitoring access
Consolidate facilities; remove unneeded facilities
Seek to minimize impacts from valid existing rights
More fire protection
More invasive weed management

River Unit

Designated access points for entire reach
No new roads
Limited use numbers/access by permit only
No wake zones
No jet skis/noise restrictions
No island access
No hunting
No fishing - no net fishing
Permit commercial operations
Day use only
Limit type of craft allowed at launches

Conservation/appreciation/recreation/ education - the Care alternative

Recreation Opportunities

All of the following would be allowed only subject to monitoring programs and only where compatible with Monument resources.

Walking, hiking, biking horseback riding, mountain biking- all on established trails, some designated for certain uses only. (Strategy - Use old roads for multiples use trails if appropriate.)
Fishing, hunting, wildlife observation, wildlife photography, environmental education, interpretation.

Overnight use - if associated with Monument dependent activities, and there is adequate development and staff for proper management, this is an acceptable activity. Dog trialing is allowed for now, although there is some feeling that there are other opportunities nearby and this activity is not dependent upon Monument resources. Developed campgrounds should be considered for Ringold and Vernita. Desire to keep the middle of the Monument free from heavy development. Desire to provide some camping opportunities for non-motorized boaters, but picking a specific site at this time is deferred.

Boating - this would be promoted in support of Monument resources - ie for learning about the Monument, fishing, etc.

This alternative would provide some opportunity for non-motorized uses only - e.g. one day a month. Explore the concept of wake restrictions, motor/noise restrictions, exclusion areas.

Ringold road - developed for through use auto tour route with slow speeds and interpretive pullouts - gates and regular hours. Interpretive facilities at the entrance points.

Some areas open to hunting, as long as it is regulated to protect the resources. There are some designated sanctuary areas where there is no hunting. Fishing allowed with regulations to protect the resources.

Gathering seed is ok for management purposes (to support re-vegetation efforts) but not for commercial uses or for personal uses, unless a certain area is identified where such uses are found to be compatible, and under permit only. Approved research activities could allow gathering.

North Unit

This is the place where people can go on their own to recreate, learn, explore

Auto trail/interpretive/education

Separate hiking trail

Non-motorized trail and non-motorized camping opportunities

Self-guided interpretation opportunities

South Unit

Discussion about the amount of use that is appropriate on ALE, considering it's RNA status, fragile state post-fire and sensitive resources. Consensus was that access should/could be increased for educational purposes, only in guided scenarios, with no overnight use.

Provide access with guides/permits with monitoring in place

River Unit

One day a month human powered craft only

Alternative 1- Status Quo

On the night of day 2, the Fish and Wildlife Service staff and DOE staff met to flesh out the current management (status quo) alternative. Before the next workshop in this series, this alternative will get condensed into a paragraph.

Alternative = No Action (Current Management)

Fitzner/Eberhardt Arid Lands Ecology Reserve

The area has several special designations including Research Natural Area (RNA), National Environmental Research Park (NERP), Important Bird Area (IBA).

Closed Area Access by Permit only, primarily for research and education, or DOE access for on-going Hanford Site wide monitoring projects. Access is also for USFWS projects, and studies.

Research projects that are currently underway include migratory bird monitoring, plant community monitoring (with The Nature Conservancy), microbiotic crust monitoring, habitat restoration. DOE continues ground water monitoring, weather monitoring, seismic monitoring, and other site wide monitoring.

The area contains some of the best plant communities that represent some of the most high quality community associations (element occurrences) designated by the Washington State Natural Heritage program. We currently monitor, attempt to restore and protect these sites. The area also provides habitat for several species of rare plants. These are also monitored and protected, primarily through allowing natural processes, limiting herbicide or mechanical treatments in sensitive areas.

Active weed management includes inventory, treatment (mechanical and chemical), and monitoring of weed species; focus primarily on aggressive noxious weed (legally listed). Main species include; rush skeleton weed, Russian knapweed. Currently, a full inventory and mapping of all noxious weeds is being completed in cooperation with The Nature Conservancy. Much of the focus on weed treatment is concentrated on roads and roadsides. Roads are mowed and sprayed to reduce non-native species, and to prevent spread from roads to other areas. Areas with natural springs or sensitive plants are not treated.

ALE contains historic ranches and homesteads, as well as cold war era structures. There are two sites that are of significance and documented as historic districts.

Native American use occurs primarily for gathering and religious/spiritual uses. These activities are also managed by permit.

Roads are paved to the top of Rattlesnake Mountain (gate 106 roads), improved gravel (1200' road) and some dirt roads (Snively Canyon, Bobcat Canyon, etc.) There are also roads managed for utility Rights of Way, primarily for power lines, both for Bonneville Power Administration, and Benton County Public Utilities.

The Observatory on top of Rattlesnake Mountain is accessed routinely by scientists, volunteers, and community groups to do maintenance monitoring and education. Other structures on the Mountain and else where on the ALE are being monitored and maintained by DOE until removal strategies have been developed and planned. Restoration activities to restore damage from the 24 Command Fire of 2000 is on going. Native plants are being restored to the most damaged areas. The damaged area is a very small portion of the burned area (10 of 77 thousand acres).

The Monument staff provides comments on projects that are occurring on the boundaries of the unit (e.g. Maiden Wind Farm) and also coordinates with adjacent landowners on management issues.

USFWS participates on interagency elk working group, monitor elk herd distribution and numbers, work with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to play a role in elk herd population control.

The herd has been reduced by half over the past 3 years.

McGee/Riverlands

The area is closed to the general public.

Is currently managed by DOE. They go to the area once per month to “check on things”. The county sheriff is under contract to patrol the area. Maintain the fence around the area.

The area has an existing permit for a rancher to trail his sheep across the area.

The area north of the Midway road is de facto open for camping, fishing, and vehicle access to the river, although there are signs that indicate that overnight use and access are not allowed.

The archeological resources are fenced in some areas, but the whole area has other resources that are not currently protected. There are serious Tribal concerns with public access in this area.

BPA has active power lines across this area. and a sub-station. USFWS is using the sub-station site as a maintenance facility.

The native plant communities on Umtanum Ridge are of high quality and this is the only place in the world where the Umtanum desert buckwheat grows/exists. USFWS assists in monitoring this population with the Washington Department of Natural Resources.

Road through the area is a DOE road, with a county easement for the private orchardist in the area.

This area also contains a Department of Transportation Rest Area at Vernita Bridge, managed by the Department of Transportation.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife operates a bounty program at the rest area for northern pike minnow fishery.

This is one of the only places in the state where White-throated swifts nest.

This area is the corridor for wildlife between ALE and Saddle Mountain.

Vernita

The area is managed by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife under a permit by DOE.

There is active camping overnight, boat launching in many areas with no improved boat launches.

There are no facilities and human waste can be an issue here especially during fishing season. The entire area is a sensitive archeological site.

This area was never officially opened but the closure was never enforced, so a huge expectation that this area will remain open exists.

Weeds are a huge problem here. But the cobble and Indian rice grass and needle and thread grass community are fairly good quality, but are somewhat degraded by the dispersed use.

Saddle Mountain

Currently closed to Public Access. Primarily for security for the K-basins.

Access for research and education is by permit.

USFWS conducts wildlife monitoring, weed control.

Utility Rights of Way exists for BPA power lines and for BOR irrigation waste way.

Rare sand dune communities and rare plant communities exist in this area.

Important waterbird roosting and nesting in riparian zone around saddle mountain lakes. Also, waterfowl sanctuary in the lake during winter months if the lake is not frozen. Also important for migratory bird stop over.

Part of the White Bluffs (western edge) is within the saddle mountain area.

Large areas were formerly disturbed and are currently annual grass land (cheat grass) and could be restored to native plants.

USFWS has done prescribe burns for management, as well as native seed collection in this area.

USFWS also maintains fire breaks annually along Highway 24.

Wahluke

Open public access during the day - no overnight use.

Public access roads currently pavement and gravel. Plans to turn currently paved roads to gravel. Regular road maintenance.

Currently no interpretive or educational signing and minimal directional signing exists. Plans to install entrance and educational signing at the main entrances summer of 2003.

Currently no through access (locked gates on south and north ends) from Ringold to Highway 24 due to short section of road with safety issues. No current plans to open the connecting stretch of road, however non-motorized users are allowed on this stretch.

Immediately adjacent to Monument's Ringold entrance is the State Ringold Fish Hatchery, which receives heavy use, including overnight camping, by anglers.

A scenic overlook exists along the Wahluke public use road with excellent views of the river, reactors, major geographic features of the Monument. A scenic vista exists on the Saddle Mountain crest, with access gained by high clearance vehicles.

The White Bluffs Bladderpod exists here and nowhere else in the world.

Historic and cultural sites throughout unit are not interpreted nor well protected. USFWS and volunteers carried out a stabilization project on a historic structure (the white bluffs cabin - which is the only historical "structure" on the Monument) in this unit at the White Bluffs boat landing area.

Fishing and hunting allowed during state regulated seasons. Horseback riding and hiking are allowed cross-country. Motorized and non-motorized vehicles must stay on designated roads only. Dog trials historically allowed, more recent restrictions on overnight use have resulted in dog trials shifting to other lands.

This area provides two improved boat launches; the White Bluffs launch (paved, narrow two lane) and a primitive launch at Parking Lot 7.

Weed monitoring and weed control efforts focus on salt cedar, rush skeleton weed, yellow starthistle, Russian knapweed.

South Columbia Basin Irrigation District has main delivery canal and wasteway returns in this unit, with associated vehicle access along waterways, weed control, maintenance, etc. BPA has powerline right-of-way. HW 24 bisects this unit.

Biological areas not well protected here. There is a major problem with landslides of the White Bluffs into the river in this unit. A study and report has recently been completed to assess this problem.

Schools and educational groups routinely use this area by permit.

River Corridor

No access to DOE reactor side of the river except for research. No access above high water mark on the Saddle Mountain Unit. All islands within the Hanford site boundaries are

technically closed to access. Downstream of the Hanford site, USFWS manages five islands that are open seasonally.

Surface uses are not managed, including commercial uses. Several outfitters and guides operated on the river, providing guided tours, and guided fishing and hunting trips.

Law enforcement of state fishing and hunting regulations carried out by WDFW. Counties enforce boating regulations.

White Bluffs boat launch is seasonally closed to promote a waterfowl sanctuary in the Saddle Mt. Area.

Routine cultural site monitoring.

Air Space

DOE restricts access for 10 miles around PFP and Energy NW reactor.

Synthesis Group

While the FWS group met to develop the current management alternative a synthesis group, made up of one member of each of the five working groups, met to integrate the most salient characteristics from the draft alternatives into a common list of 3-5 alternatives. They worked for over 4 hours and came up with three alternatives in addition to the No Action or Current Management alternative for a total of 4 alternatives. The presented these in a plenary session and all comments were recorded and integrated to create the final draft alternatives.

Common considerations across all alternatives

- Protect and conserve natural resources
- Law enforcement
- Fire management
- Monitoring

Notes

- Add Native American use under common considerations? No because it's implied under treaty rights so we don't even need to address it.

Alternative 2 – Full Resource Protection, Managed Access

This alternative uses science-based zoning of the entire Monument landscape, which is different from present unit designations. Management and fiscal priorities will focus on protection and conservation of natural, cultural and historic resources. The priorities include monitoring, restoration, fire management and invasive species management. These activities will be based on best available science and will take into consideration the diversity of plants, animals and communities native to the site. Partnerships will be sought to enhance connectivity for biological communities and develop opportunities for cooperative management. Research emphasis will be on rare species, communities and other research that benefits management of the resources. The focus of public use will be education and interpretation. Only recreational

activities that assist visitors to experience the natural, cultural and historic legacy of the site while causing the least disturbance to resources will be allowed.

PLENARY NOTES: Keep level of detail consistent with other alternatives, no camping, day use only, this doesn't apply to research. Address fiscal priorities in other alternatives to keep consistent. Discuss whether to include fiscal priorities or not. Zoning based on landscape, define science-based zoning.

Notes (1-1, 2-2, 4-2, 5-1)

- Science based
- Protect and abate threats to paleo/cultural/biological
- Best available science fire management and invasive species management aggressively funded and implemented.
- Fiscal priority would be to protect, conserve, enhance and restore natural resources
- Protect and restore State and Federal endangered species where appropriate
- Science-based zone management not administrative unit management
- Maintain restore and connect native biological communities
- Minimal public uses to emphasize environmental education and recreation opportunities that result in the least resource disturbance.
- Research emphasis on rare species
- Monitor status of biological systems and impacts to protected resources.
- Partnerships sought to enhance connectivity and cooperative management opportunities.
- Interpretation, environmental education and recreational opportunities
- Higher standard than compatibility-no net impact on the resources
- Restoration and weed control
- Natural is different than native
- Natural resources is all-encompassing
- Need to touch on research, interpretation and education
- Control the amount of public disturbance
- Eliminating human disturbance is not feasible
- Which word to use-minimal, minimize public use? Minimal
- Need to address cultural issues
- Interpretation and education is a management tool, not public use. You use it to get the public to buy in to your management direction.

Alternative 3 – Conservation, Appreciation, Recreation and Education

This alternative strives to balance (*loaded term?*) public access with resource protection. It would use a science-based zoning approach to identify and characterize all natural, native and cultural resources and existing and potential public uses. Best science would be used to protect, preserve and conserve the unique biodiversity of the Monument. Conservation management would be applied throughout all zones. The priorities include monitoring, restoration, and invasive species management. Promote recreation, interpretation and education revolving around appreciation of distinctive Monument resources where appropriate and compatible. Recreation and education activities would be offered that foster a sense of appreciation to support conservation and preservation of these resources. Interpretive trails and facilities and educational programs would be developed for individuals and groups. Public access would be

limited to daylight hours and night access would be restricted to limited primitive camping (*broaden concept of night use*). Off-Monument campsites would be promoted. Public access would be designed to promote understanding, awareness, and appreciation of the Monument resources (*revise sentence*). Partnerships would be sought to enhance connectivity of biological communities and to create cooperative management opportunities. Additional law enforcement and fire management resources will be developed to accompany the increased level of activity across the landscape.

PLENARY NOTES: fix first sentence; add 'compatible' to other alternatives; objectives will help distinguish all the alternatives from each other.

Notes (1-2, 2-3, 2-5, 4-4, 5-2)

- Balancing public access with resource protection
- Middle of the road
- Use science-based zoning approach to identify and characterize all natural and cultural resources, and existing and potential public uses.
- Seek to provide public access promoting public understanding, awareness, and appreciation of Monument resources.
- Conservation management will be applied throughout the Monument, while opportunities to promote appreciation, recreation, recreation and education, revolving around distinctive Monument resources, are provided where compatible.
- Day access, night access is limited to primitive camping only.
- Promote off-monument campsites.
- Compatible recreation and education activities will foster a sense of appreciation that supports conservation and preservation.
- Development interpretive trail, interpretive facilities and educational programs
- Partnerships sought to enhance connectivity and cooperative management opportunities.
- Wide range of research relevant to the Monument with a strong educational component encouraged
- Increased requirement for monitoring law enforcement, weed management and fire management and maintenance.
- Maintain, restore and connect biological communities
- Protect and restore T & E species where appropriate
- Protect, conserve, and enhance/restore natural resources (fiscal priority)
- Continue to protect the land base surrounding the Reach
- Do we allow camping? Allow for Monument appreciation, but not just a general campground. Camping for hikers on Saddle Mountain? If you're kayaking on the river and a storm blows up, you can camp on the riverside until the storm subsides.
- Address camping hours in objectives and strategies
- Hunting and gathering?
- Add more about education?
- How much research? Encourage research opportunities tied to conservation?
- Need to include active restoration?
- Partnerships focus on what?
- Research emphasis on Monument resources and education
- Monitoring same as alternative 2.

- Manage populations for educational esthetics and interpretive values as opposed to harvesting value
- Address restoration so we have something to educate about?
- Address biological resources as a potential source for populations outside the Monument such as elk?

Alternative 4 – Broad Public Use

Management direction will follow a science-based stratification (*define zoning: intent is site analysis, landscape analysis*) of the Monument’s ecological, geologic, paleontological, and cultural resources, with an emphasis on providing opportunities for the public to experience, learn about, and appreciate the diverse array of resources. Infrastructure and facilities will be developed in a manner compatible with natural resource patterns on the landscape and with the goal of efficient exposure of the public to the widest possible array of the Monument’s native biological communities and cultural and historic sites. Increase interpretation and education opportunities including development of interpretive centers. This alternative allows a wide range of research. Programs to protect, restore, and monitor native habitats and communities will be developed or maintained, and will provide opportunities for volunteer participation. Invasive species management will be a high priority. Additional monitoring (*define*), law enforcement and fire management resources will be developed to accompany the increased level of activity across the landscape. Concessionaires, and commercial vendors located at strategic points will provide supplies and support services for visitors.

PLENARY NOTES: Would a wide range of research not apply to the other alts?

In this alternative, research can be for other things besides Monument enhancement.

Tremendous need for monitoring due to increased use, we’re not going to allow this alternative to degrade resources. Make sure invasives are noted in all alternatives.

Notes 4-3, 2-4, 5-3

- Allows the broadest use of area for the public
- First priority is protection of existing paleo/cultural/biological resources and sensitive areas
- Enhance access through development of facilities (campgrounds, trails, roads, toilets, etc.) in areas of lower resource value
- Develop interpretive centers
- Develop trails/roads to minimize effects to resources
- Increased requirement for monitoring, law enforcement, weed management, and fire management
- Allow for concessionaires, and commercial uses
- Wider range of research opportunities
- zone management by use
- develop facilities
- overnight camping

Final Draft Alternatives

A small group met to incorporate the comments made in plenary and came up with synthesized alternatives. These alternatives were presented in plenary again, and slightly revised to the following. The FAC and Fish and Wildlife Service will review these alternatives and the revised versions will be presented in the next workshop.

Alternative 1 - Current Management

The Hanford Site Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) designated parts of the Hanford Site as conservation/preservation status. As a result of the CLUP and associated EIS, management of buffer lands was transferred to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Under this alternative the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) manages the Monument/Refuge areas under permit management from Department of Energy (D.O.E.) (with 30 day revocable clause). The Monument/Refuge is managed primarily under National Wildlife Refuge System policy. However, many of the administrative areas transferred to the management of the Service had existing uses and designations, which the Service has respected. The Service has made a conscious decision to not make major management changes pending the completion of the Monument Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP). The Arid Lands Ecology Reserve Unit is a Research Natural Area (RNA) and has been managed primarily for research and education, it is closed to the general public and access is by permit only. The Wahluke Unit was managed by the state department of fish and wildlife as a public recreation area and continues to be managed for public access, it is open year around from 2 hours before sunrise to 2 hours after sunset. Saddle Mountain National Wildlife Refuge Unit has been managed as a wildlife sanctuary and is closed to the public, for both wildlife protection and for security buffer for facilities on Central Hanford. The River Corridor Unit has been open to public boating and fishing since the 1970's with no restrictions on number or types of boats in Reach, fishing regulations are determined by the State of Washington. The McGee Ranch/Riverlands area is currently managed by the D.O.E. and is closed to the public, except in the area between the Midway road and the Columbia River, which has been opened "de facto" since the closure was never enforced. The situation is similar in the Vernita area which is owned by D.O.E. and managed by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and is technically closed, but is "de facto" open for overnight camping and boating and fishing access because the closure was never enforced.

Alternative 2 – Full Resource Protection/Managed Access

This alternative focuses on protection and conservation of natural, cultural and historic resources. This alternative uses science-based landscape analysis of the entire Monument, which may result in different management units from present designations. Management priorities include monitoring, restoration, fire management and invasive species management. These activities will be based on best available science and will take into consideration the diversity of plants, animals and communities native to the site. Partnerships will be sought to enhance connectivity for biological communities and develop opportunities for cooperative management. Research emphasis will be on rare species, communities and other research that benefits management of the resources. The focus of public use will be education and interpretation. Only recreational activities that assist visitors to experience the natural, cultural and historic legacy of the site while causing the least disturbance to resources will be allowed.

Alternative 3 – Care: Conservation, appreciation, recreation and education

This alternative focuses on conservation but also provides for recreation and education within the Monument and appreciation of the Monument's values. It would use a science-based landscape analysis approach to identify and characterize all natural, native and cultural resources and existing and potential public uses. Best science would be used to protect, preserve and conserve the biodiversity of the Monument. The priorities include monitoring, restoration, and invasive species management. Provide access and opportunities for recreation, interpretation and education revolving around appreciation of distinctive Monument resources. Recreation and education activities would be offered that foster a sense of appreciation to support conservation and preservation of these resources. Interpretive trails and facilities and educational programs would be developed for individuals and groups. Recreational public access would generally be limited to daylight hours. Partnerships would be sought to enhance connectivity of biological communities and to create cooperative management opportunities. Additional law enforcement and fire management resources will be developed to accompany the increased level of activity across the landscape.

Alternative 4 – Expanded Public Use

This alternative emphasizes opportunities for the public to experience, learn about, and appreciate the diverse array of resources. Management direction will follow a science-based landscape analysis of the Monument's ecological, geologic, paleontological, and cultural resources. Infrastructure and facilities will be developed in a manner compatible with natural and cultural resource patterns on the landscape and with the goal of exposing the public to the widest possible array of the Monument's native biological communities and cultural and historic sites. Increase interpretation and education opportunities including development of interpretive centers. This alternative allows the broadest range of education and research opportunities. Programs to protect, restore, and monitor native habitats and communities will be developed or maintained, and will provide opportunities for volunteer participation. Invasive species management will be a high priority. Additional resource impact monitoring, law enforcement and fire management resources will be developed to respond to the increased level of activity across the landscape. Concessionaires, and commercial vendors located at strategic points will provide supplies and support services for visitors.

Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop II

February 10-13, 2003
Richland, WA

FINAL REPORT

Section 3 Draft Objectives



Draft Objectives

According to 602 FW 1.6 and the Goals and Objectives Handbook, an objective is a concise statement of what we want to achieve, how much we want to achieve, when and where we want to achieve it, and who is responsible for the work. Objectives derive from goals and provide the basis for determining strategies, monitoring refuge accomplishments, and evaluating the success of strategies. Each working group was responsible for developing objectives for 3 goals across all alternatives and then, if time allowed, applying the SMART criteria to each objective making it attainable, time-specific, and measurable. The goals were assigned as follows:

Group 1: Goals 4, 6 and 13

Group 2: Goals 1, 11 and 12

Group 3: Goals 2, 3 and 10

Group 4: Goals 5, 8 and 9

Group 5: Goals 4, 7 and 8

Some groups were particularly interested in a goal not assigned to them so they developed objectives for that goal as well. All objectives were presented in a long and very active plenary session and then the groups revised them, incorporating comments received, into the final draft objectives for Workshop II. Consensus was not reached on these objectives, and they will be reviewed by the FAC, Fish and Wildlife Service and the public, and then brought back to Workshop III.

Group 1 report

Group 1 started by filling in the following table.

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation Appreciation Recreation Education	Alternative 4 Broad Public Use
<i>Goal 4. Protect the distinctive geological and paleontological resources of the Monument.</i>			
	1. Identify, classify, and map G&P resources. 2. Conduct threats analysis on resources. 3. Design a threat abatement strategy that focuses on critical	1. Identify, classify, map G&P resources. 2. Conduct threats analysis on resources. 3. Design a threat abatement strategy that focuses on	1. Identify, classify, and map G&P resources. 2. Conduct threats analysis on resources. 3. Design a threat abatement strategy that focuses on

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation Appreciation Recreation Education	Alternative 4 Broad Public Use
	threats to the long-term sustainability of the resources.	actively stabilizing resource sites.	monitoring and mitigating human impacts.
<i>Goal 6. Provide a rich variety of educational and interpretive opportunities for visitors to gain an appreciation, knowledge and understanding of the Monument, compatible with resource protection</i>			
	<p>1. Provide geological; paleontological; terrestrial and aquatic biological; and cultural educational and interpretive opportunities.</p> <p>2. Use intensive management of visitors (remote interpretation, web cam's, offsite visitor center,)</p>	<p>1. Provide geological; paleontological; terrestrial and aquatic biological; and cultural educational and interpretive opportunities.</p> <p>2. Use integrated management of visitors (guided opps., in-school EE, limit self guided trails to a mini (<2mile) interpretive trail that traverses representative habitats, offsite visitor center.)</p>	<p>1. Provide geological; paleontological; terrestrial and aquatic biological; and cultural educational and interpretive opportunities.</p> <p>2. Use interactive management of visitors (self-guided trails to include mini and longer, kiosks on site, cassette tapes tours, handouts)</p>
<i>Goal 13. Provide infrastructure, operations and maintenance capabilities that are in harmony with Monument purposes.</i>			
Infrastructure = roads, wells, septic systems, parking lots, gates, powerlines, canals, dikes, USFWS cars, truck, boats, boat launch guzzlers, visitor center, trails, fences, buildings, ponds, firebreaks, toilets, garbage etc.	<p>1. Identify, classify, and map current infrastructure.</p> <p>2. Analyze Monument infrastructure needs to implement this alternative.</p> <p>3. Maintain, improve, build or eliminate infrastructure based on protection needs, low-impact priorities, and</p>	<p>1. Identify, classify, and map current infrastructure.</p> <p>2. Analyze Monument infrastructure needs to implement this alternative.</p> <p>3. Maintain, improve, build, or eliminate infrastructure based on protection and visitation needs.</p>	<p>1. Identify, classify, and map current infrastructure.</p> <p>2. Analyze Monument infrastructure needs to implement this alternative.</p> <p>3. Maintain, improve, build, or eliminate infrastructure based on protection and visitation needs. (even</p>

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation Appreciation Recreation Education	Alternative 4 Broad Public Use
	aesthetics (reduce roads and parking areas; ensure firefighting capability)	(increased infrastructure likely including offsite visitor center)	more infrastructure needs likely including on site visitor center)

After presenting these objectives in a plenary session, Group 1 incorporated the comments and revised their objectives into the following. For a complete set of plenary notes see Appendix I.

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation Appreciation Recreation Education	Alternative 4 Broad Public Use
<i>Goal 4. Protect the distinctive geological and paleontological resources of the Monument.</i>			
	1. Identify, classify, and map G&P resources. 2. Conduct threats analysis on resources. 3. Design and implement a threat abatement strategy that focuses on active protection and restoration.	1. Identify, classify, map G&P resources. 2. Conduct threats analysis on resources. 3. Design and implement a threat abatement strategy that focuses on stabilizing critical resource sites.	1. Identify, classify, and map G&P resources. 2. Conduct threats analysis on resources. 3. Design and implement a threat abatement strategy that focuses on monitoring and minimizing human impacts.
<i>Goal 6. Provide a rich variety of educational and interpretive opportunities for visitors to gain an appreciation, knowledge and understanding of the Monument, compatible with resource protection</i>			
We assume that all of the natural and cultural resources will go through an identification,	1. Identify, classify, and map existing and potential regional and Monument educational and interpretive	1. Identify, classify, and map existing and potential regional and Monument educational and interpretive	1. Identify, classify, and map existing and potential regional and Monument educational and interpretive

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation Appreciation Recreation Education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Broad Public Use</p>
<p>classification, and mapping process.</p>	<p>opportunities.</p> <p>2. Analyze needs.</p> <p>3. Provide geological; paleontological; terrestrial and aquatic biological; and cultural educational and interpretive opportunities based on analysis</p> <p>4. Public Use limited by intensive management of techniques (increase offsite educational opportunities, limited onsite use zones and times. remote interpretation, web cam's, offsite visitor center,)</p>	<p>opportunities.</p> <p>2. Analyze needs.</p> <p>3. Provide geological; paleontological; terrestrial and aquatic biological; and cultural educational and interpretive opportunities based on analysis.</p> <p>4. Use integrated management of visitors (guided opportunities, in-school Environmental Education, limit self guided trails to a mini (<2mile) interpretive trail that traverses representative habitats, offsite visitor center.)</p>	<p>opportunities.</p> <p>2. Analyze needs.</p> <p>3. Provide geological; paleontological; terrestrial and aquatic biological; and cultural educational and interpretive opportunities based on analysis.</p> <p>4. Use interactive management of visitors (self-guided trails to include mini and longer, kiosks on site, cassette tapes tours, handouts)</p>
<p><i>Goal 13. Provide infrastructure, operations and maintenance capabilities that are in harmony with Monument purposes.</i></p>			
<p>Infrastructure = roads, wells, septic systems, parking lots, gates, powerlines, canals, dikes, alternative modes of transportation, boat launch guzzlers, visitor center, trails, fences, buildings, ponds, firebreaks, toilets, garbage etc.</p> <p>Also suggest using cameras for fire monitoring.</p>	<p>1. Identify, classify, and map current infrastructure.</p> <p>2. Analyze Monument infrastructure needs, including transportation, to implement this alternative.</p> <p>3. Maintain, improve, build or eliminate infrastructure based on protection needs, low-impact priorities, and</p>	<p>1. Identify, classify, and map current infrastructure.</p> <p>2. Analyze Monument infrastructure needs, including transportation, to implement this alternative.</p> <p>3. Maintain, improve, build, or eliminate infrastructure based on protection and visitation needs.</p>	<p>1. Identify, classify, and map current infrastructure.</p> <p>2. Analyze Monument infrastructure needs, including transportation, to implement this alternative.</p> <p>3. Maintain, improve, build, or eliminate infrastructure based on protection and visitation needs. (even</p>

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation Appreciation Recreation Education	Alternative 4 Broad Public Use
	aesthetics (reduce roads and parking areas; ensure firefighting capability, determine modes of access)	(increased infrastructure likely including offsite visitor center, determine modes of access)	more infrastructure needs likely including on site visitor center, determine modes of access)

Group 2 report

Conversation relating to which goals we were assigned as a group and which we wanted to add with relationship to our individual expertise.

Synthesis group presentation = a combination of all the group alternatives.

Question- will each objective be developed BY goal for EACH synthesized alternative?
 So - 3 different objectives - for each goal that reflect the intent of the alternative?
 YES

Goal 12

Under Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection -

- aggressive management to suppress wild fires
- aggressive prescribed burn program focused on resource management
- review and update fire management program
- consider identifying zones for different levels of fire protection (is it an objective or strategy)

- amount of staff, cooperative agreements, amount of equipment

The things that will vary across the various alternatives are the number of fire stations/locations, fire fighting staff and amount of equipment, public educational needs, seasonal restrictions but we believe these are all strategies

Coordination of responsibilities will be the most important -

ALL of our objectives will be the same across all Alternatives.
 Objective 1: draft

Develop Fire Prevention and Education Program with relationship to Fire Management (including public education regarding prescribed fire, fire fighting, and fire safety and prevention, public safety {evacuation routes}) with in 5 years of the approval of CCP. Following development of this plan, implementation will occur for the next 10 year period. {the term of the CCP}{Including educational materials, signs, presentations, as strategies) Note: we are wondering if public education plan which was our original objective should instead be a strategy under fire prevention objective.

Objective 2:draft

Review, update and execute cooperative agreements every 5 years.

Objective 3: draft

Suppress fires and keep them to the smallest acreage that is feasible for fire fighter safety and resource protection. (We are wondering about SMART - with reference to time frame on this one)

Objective 4: draft

Review, update and implement Fire Management Plan every 5 years. Integrate Fire Management into all Monument/Refuge programs to ensure consistency across management including; biological, cultural, public use and maintenance programs. (including number of fire stations/locations, fire fighting staff and amount of equipment, public educational needs, seasonal restrictions

Objective 5: draft

Use prescribed fire to accomplish resource management objectives, and to reduce hazardous fuels on the Monument. (Also question about SMART)

Objective 6:

Capital needs for facilities and equipment for Fire Management should be evaluated and described for different levels across each alternative.

There is a lot of information with in the resource review on Wildlife and Habitat that includes many potential objectives and strategies that could be implemented.

Equipment and capital is a concern because that would vary across alternatives. We were wondering if there should be a objective regarding capital needs (equipment, facilities, etc.). We included this in Objective 6. We are not sure about if this is a strategy or part of the EIS analysis in a different section.

Goal 1

Objective 1

Inventory all plant communities, plants and animals within upland habitat in the Monument and identify critical and sensitive areas and conservation targets within five years.

Objective 2

Inventory, map (GIS), and treat all invasive species in upland habitats within five years.

Objective 3

Write an integrated pest management plan within two years after completion of the CCP

Objective 4.

Restore the historic community structure of Monument upland habitat. Increase the cover of native plant/animal communities from x to x percent, and native plant/animal species richness from x to x species over the next 15 years.

NOTE: In alternative 2, more emphasis would be placed in reintroduction of some species, particularly T & E. Alternatives 3 and 4 would have less emphasis on reintroduction of species.

Objective 5

Develop and implement a habitat management plan to identify critical areas for protection and prioritize areas for restoration projects within five years.

Objective 6

Develop a monitoring plan within five years of the completion of the CCP to identify different types of monitoring goals and their respective timeframes.

Strategy: Conduct vegetation mapping using protocol developed by YTC for consistency. Incorporate locations of plants and animals into GIS.

Monitoring would need to monitor success of restoration projects, trends of plant and animal communities, and be coordinated with fire and other resource programs.

Effects of people on natural resources would be better captured under the public use goals.

Goal 11

Objective 1

Establish an ecologically based research and monitoring program.

Objective 2

Alternative 2 - Research emphasis will be on rare species and plant communities and research that contributes towards management of the Monument.

Alternatives 3 and 4 - A wide range of research relevant to Monument management is allowed with a strong emphasis on providing education opportunities.

NOTE: Consider an advisory committee to review and approve research proposals.

Objective 3

Utilize new information from research and adapt management within two years of when information becomes available.

Objective 4

Research conducted on the Monument must provide a report upon conclusion of the research and clean up and restore areas to original condition.

Objective 5

Alternatives 3 and 4 - Emphasize field studies by students from all grade levels and university.
Alternative 2 - Student involvement in field research would predominantly be university graduate students.

Goal 7

Objective 1

Create a measurement that assesses levels of resource protection tied with visitor experience.
(Some level less than carrying capacity)

Objective 2

Survey visitors seasonally for a period of five years to determine quality of experience by activity, season, and area within the Monument.

Objective 3

Encourage alternative forms of transportation (i.e. vans, buses, boats, mules, horses, wagon rides).

NOTE: Prepare transit/shuttle plan.

Objective 4

Develop visitor services plan that integrates transportation needs.

Objective 5

Permit commercial vendors.

NOTE: Part of high quality is to use local businesses and labor for projects and services.

Goal 10

Identify areas or zones that are compatible for future utility corridors and areas where they are not compatible.

These objectives were then presented in plenary, and the comments were incorporated. Below are the suggestions of the large group, and Group 2's changes in italics.

Goal 12

Comments on prescribed fire - fuels management may be done by other means than prescribed fire.

We decided to make a new objective related to hazardous fuel reduction, separate from prescribed fire.

Availability of water, and early detection of fire, and details on equipment needs should be included in objective number 6

For these concerns we added water sources, detection capabilities, and equipment needs to both the Fire Management Plan Objective and the Capital Needs Objective, but we feel these items are strategies to implement these objectives as they are currently written.

Strategy should include fostering partnerships with local fire protection

We added some information to the review cooperative agreements, to foster the partnerships and have annual meeting as a strategy.

Goal 1

Is that objective 2 should have funding and staff levels and also should include phrases that indicate that treatments need to be done annually. Also add information on number acres that might be treated - but this may not be the best way.

Prioritize treatment areas for weeds

We added prioritizing to the mapping objective and a new objective dealing with annual weed treatment.

The reintroduction of species is limited by what was original to the area (not others) (not human introduced species, e.g. horses)

There is an issue with term “historic” - there is a definition for historic condition - presented by Jane

Monitoring should be done in phases - many things that may be implemented with the other aspects of the plan, so that impacts to resources can be monitored. Important to monitor right away.

We struggled with this because of the many different types of monitoring. We feel that many of the monitoring needs will be address within the CCP, or that a plan for monitoring should be part of the CCP. Decisions related to what actions are taken within the CCP will dictate what monitoring will be needed.

Implementation of restoration should be identified

We feel that the restoration objective the word “restore” is an active word and includes implementation.

Goal 11

research - is restricted to biological should consider geological and other physical sciences

We changed the phrases to incorporate other scientific fields.

switch/broaden the relevant to Monument management - as long as compatible, e.g. basic research - esp. on RNA. *We noted this, and level of type of research will vary across the management alternatives.*

Because this is a “natural treasure” we should look to this area to support research - keep observatory in mind.

Long term research with markers should be retained

Consider using GPS to mark sites
Will USFWS be repository for locations of research as a strategy
Reports may need to be interim (annual or quarterly)
Also make research results available to the public

Research/clean as you go and minimize impacts (strategy to have research denied if stuff not cleaned up)

Advisory committee should be switched to peer panel for review: *we did this*
Monument research should be emphasized to contribute to monument management. *There were both views expressed - this view and that all other research should be allowed.*

Goal 7

Confused by permit - means “by permit” *we changed the wording*

These plenary comments were incorporated into the following final draft objectives. Additions from the plenary session are in italics.

Goal 12

Under Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection -

- aggressive management to suppress wild fires
- aggressive prescribed burn program focused on resource management
- review and update fire management program
- consider identifying zones for different levels of fire protection (is it an objective or strategy)

- amount of staff, cooperative agreements, amount of equipment

The things that will vary across the various alternatives are the number of fire stations/locations, fire fighting staff and amount of equipment, public educational needs, seasonal restrictions but we believe these are all strategies

Coordination of responsibilities will be the most important -

ALL of our objectives will be the same across all Alternatives / *level of degree of implementation will vary.*

Objective 1: draft

Develop Fire Prevention and Education Program with relationship to Fire Management (including public education regarding prescribed fire, fire fighting, and fire safety and prevention, public safety {evacuation routes}) with in 5 years of the approval of CCP. Following development of this plan, implementation will occur for the next 10 year period. {the term of the CCP}(Including educational materials, signs, presentations, as strategies) Note: we are wondering if public education plan which was our original objective should instead be a strategy under fire prevention objective.

Objective 2: draft

Review, update and execute cooperative agreements every 5 years. *Maintain open communication and foster partnerships with other cooperators (city, county, and other agencies). Potentially arrange an annual or more frequent meeting to discuss capabilities of each partner (as a strategy).*

Objective 3: draft

Suppress fires and keep them to the smallest acreage that is feasible for fire fighter safety and resource protection. (We are wondering about SMART - with reference to time frame on this one)

Objective 4: draft

Review and update the Fire Management Plan every 5 years. Implement the plan. Integrate Fire Management into all Monument/Refuge programs to ensure consistency across management including; biological, cultural, public use and maintenance programs. (including number of fire stations/locations, *water sources, detection means and dispatch capabilities*, fire fighting staff and amount of equipment, public educational needs, seasonal restrictions)

Objective 5: draft

Use prescribed fire to accomplish resource management objectives.

New objective: Objective 7

Reduce hazardous fuels on the Monument by appropriate means. (Strategies prescribed burns, mechanical, chemical, or other). (Also question about SMART)

Objective 6:

Identify capital needs for facilities (*including water sources, lookouts/detection means, buildings, facilities and equipment needs*) for Fire Management and evaluate and describe for different levels across each alternative.

There is a lot of information with in the resource review on Wildlife and Habitat that includes many potential objectives and strategies that could be implemented.

Equipment and capital is a concern because that would vary across alternatives. We were wondering if there should be a objective regarding capital needs (equipment, facilities, etc.). We included this in Objective 6. We are not sure about if this is a strategy or part of the EIS analysis in a different section.

Goal 1

Implementation of all plans and projects related to these objectives are a given.

Objective 1

Inventory all plant communities, plants and animals within upland habitat in the Monument and identify critical and sensitive areas and conservation targets within five years.

Note Strategy: Conduct vegetation mapping using protocol developed by YTC for consistency. Incorporate locations of plants and animals into GIS.

Objective 2

Inventory, map (GIS), and *prioritize treatment areas* for all invasive species in upland habitats within five years.

New objective

Develop a treatment and monitoring program based on identified priorities and annually implement. (As strategies include levels of staffing, materials, and equipment needs)

Objective 3

Write an integrated pest management plan within two years after completion of the CCP

Objective 4

Restore the historic community structure of Monument upland habitat. Increase the cover of native plant/animal communities from x to x percent, and native plant/animal species richness from x to x species over the next 15 years. *(We refer to the definition presented by Jane to address the issues related to historic condition)(We also feel the the word “restore” is an “active” enough word to include implementation)*

NOTE: In alternative 2, more emphasis would be placed in reintroduction of some species, particularly T & E. Alternatives 3 and 4 would have less emphasis on reintroduction of species.

Objective 5

Develop and implement a habitat management plan to identify critical areas for protection and prioritize areas for restoration projects within five years.

Objective 6

Develop and implement monitoring plans that contribute to management decisions, and evaluate monitoring results. Use adaptive management to modify actions ~~within five years of the completion of the CCP.~~ (that incorporates/provides data or information on restoration efforts, ecosystem health wildlife populations and user impacts.) (identify different types of monitoring goals and their respective timeframes.) Notes: Monitoring would need to monitor success of restoration projects, trends of plant and animal communities, and be coordinated with fire and other resource programs. Effects of people on natural resources would be better captured under the public use goals.

Goal 11

****We did not get to this one with the entire group.**

Objective 1

Establish an ~~ecologically based~~ research and monitoring program *to study the natural, physical and cultural resources (of the Monument).*

Objective 2

Alternative 2 - Research emphasis will be on rare species and plant communities and research that contributes towards management of the Monument.

Alternatives 3 and 4 - A wide range of research relevant to Monument management is allowed with a strong emphasis on providing education opportunities.

Consider broadening the scope to include basic research other than research that contributes to Monument management.

NOTE: Consider an ~~advisory~~ peer review committee to review and approve research proposals.

Objective 3

Utilize new information from research and adapt management within two years of when information becomes available.

Objective 4

Research conducted on the Monument must provide a report upon conclusion of the research and clean up and restore areas to original condition.

Objective 5

Alternatives 3 and 4 - Emphasize field studies by students from all grade levels and university.

Alternative 2 - Student involvement in field research would predominantly be university graduate students.

Goal 7

****These we incorporated in to Group 5's objectives**

Objective 1

Create a measurement that assesses levels of resource protection tied with visitor experience. (Some level less than carrying capacity)

Objective 2

Survey visitors seasonally for a period of five years to determine quality of experience by activity, season, and area within the Monument.

Objective 3

Encourage alternative forms of transportation (i.e. vans, buses, boats, mules, horses, wagon rides).

NOTE: Prepare transit/shuttle plan.

Objective 4

Develop visitor services plan that integrates transportation needs.

Objective 5

Use permit system for commercial vendors.

NOTE: Part of high quality is to use local businesses and labor for projects and services.

Goal 10

Identify areas or zones that are compatible for future utility corridors and areas where they are not compatible.

Group 3 report

Group 3 started by developing their objectives in the following table.

<p>Alternative 1 Current Management</p>	<p>Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection Managed Access</p>	<p>Alternative 3 Conservation Appreciation Recreation Education</p>	<p>Alternative 4 Broad Public Use</p>
<p><i>Goal 2. Conserve and restore the communities of fish and other aquatic and riparian-dependant plant and animal species native to the Hanford Reach National Monument.</i></p>			
	<p><u>Objective 2.1</u>-Implement fall Chinook research program to quantify relationship between physical conditions and productivity.</p> <p><u>Objective 2.2</u>-Implement monitoring program to determine trend in population relative to physical conditions.</p> <p><u>Objective 2.3</u>-To further restoration of fall Chinook productivity, provide results of research and monitoring to ecological services and fishery resources to work in river management forums. Also manage land-based activities that could have impact on Chinook productivity.</p> <p><u>Objective 2.4</u>-Conservation (?) over 15 years (because it is in goal statement).</p> <p><u>Objective 2.5</u>-Conduct geographic baseline inventory of riparian plant and animal community that includes habitat conditions, plant community composition, herp and invertebrate composition.</p>		

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation Appreciation Recreation Education	Alternative 4 Broad Public Use
	<p><u>Objective 2.6</u>-Conduct monitoring program (for “before” time period) to determine changes in riparian community before and after restoration is conducted</p> <p><u>Objective 2.7</u>-Within 5 years, write restoration plan based on baseline inventory.</p> <p><u>Objective 2.8</u>-Conserve and maintain 100% of native species.</p> <p><u>Objective 2.9</u>-Conduct baseline inventories of water quality, distribution and abundance of macro-invertebrate populations and native and non-native fish communities and their habitats.</p> <p><u>Objective 2.10</u>-Monitor trends in water quality, and native and non-native fish communities and their habitats.</p> <p><u>Objective 2.11</u>-Use results of studies to provide quantitative data for management of non-native fish communities, and for use in river management forums.</p>		
<p><i>Goal 3. Enhance Monument resources by establishing and maintaining connectivity with neighboring habitats.</i></p>			
	<p><u>Objective 3.1</u>-Enhance Monument resources and connectivity by establishing working groups of interested, involved agencies and the public within 1 year. Meet quarterly.</p> <p><u>Objective 3.2</u>-Identify funding</p>		

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation Appreciation Recreation Education	Alternative 4 Broad Public Use
	<p>opportunities from alternative sources, and identify funding needs within 2 years.</p> <p><u>Objective 3.3</u>-Annually secure 10% of identified critical, connective properties within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Objective 3.4</u>-As an ongoing activity meet with 3-4 adjacent landowners annually to discuss common habitat/management objectives and future possibilities.</p>		
<p><i>Goal 10. Foster, support and respect cooperative partnerships that preserve valid existing rights while protecting the purposes of the Monument. Recognize and cooperate with tribal, state and local governments and federal agencies in the discharge of statutory responsibilities Enhance relationships and partnerships with community organizations and neighbors furthering management goals.</i></p>			
	<p><u>Objective 10.1</u>-Maintain proactive communication with “rights holders” and concerned parties. Hold annual meetings to discuss common issues.</p> <p><u>Objective 10.2</u>-Establish system for appropriate exercising of existing rights. Establish standard operating procedures within 6 months.</p> <p><u>Objective 10.3</u>-Make presentations available to community organizations describing Monument attributes within 2 years.</p> <p><u>Objective 10.4</u>-Establish on-site community-based outreach program within one year of completion of CCP.</p>		

These objectives were then brought to plenary and the comments of the large group are recorded below.

Question: Regarding overlap of work and jurisdiction on fall Chinook objectives involving NMFS and FWS. Objectives for goal 2 are inappropriate relating to anadromous fishes since USFWS does not have jurisdiction but NMFS does.

Response: Work proposed in Objective 2.3 does not include overlap with any work NMFS is conducting. This objective does not propose anything with regard to management jurisdiction.

Question: In Objective 2.11 there is a problem with using the Monument plan to seek data to use in other forums.

Question: Concern was stated about impact of monitoring program on exercising existing rights and other Agency management actions.

Response: Monitoring program is to develop quantitative technical information database and will have no impact on existing rights.

Question: Comment regarding safety of human consumption of fish from WB-10 ponds.

Response: See work described under Objectives 2.9-2.11. Water quality evaluations together with current BOR work would provide basis for such an evaluation.

Question: Comment on not addressing connectivity regarding river.

Response: We did not understand comment.

Question: Question on details regarding “how” for objective 3.3.

Response: This will be dealt with when strategies are developed.

Question: Identify areas or zones that are compatible for future utility corridors and areas where they are not compatible.

Response: We are not sure whether this should be an objective under Goal 10 or not. We did not include this.

***We did not have time to vary our objectives across the range of Alternatives

The plenary comments were then incorporated in to the following final draft objectives.

Goal 2. Conserve and restore the communities of fish and other aquatic and riparian-dependant plant and animal species native to the Hanford Reach National Monument.

Objective 2.1-Implement fall Chinook research program to quantify relationship between physical conditions and productivity.

Objective 2.2-Implement monitoring program to determine trend in population relative to physical conditions.

Objective 2.3-To further restoration of fall Chinook productivity, provide results of research and monitoring to ecological services and fishery resources to work in river management forums. Also manage land-based activities that could have impact on Chinook productivity.

Objective 2.4-Conservation (?) over 15 years (because it is in goal statement).

Objective 2.5-Conduct geographic baseline inventory of riparian plant and animal communities.

Objective 2.6-Conduct monitoring program (for “before” time period) to determine changes in riparian community before and after restoration is conducted

Objective 2.7-Within 5 years, write restoration plan based on baseline inventory.

Objective 2.8-Conserve and maintain diversity of native aquatic and riparian species.

Objective 2.9-Conduct baseline inventories of water quality, distribution and abundance of macro-invertebrate populations and native and non-native fish and aquatic plant communities and their habitats.

Objective 2.10-Monitor trends in water quality, and native and non-native fish communities and their habitats.

Objective 2.11-Use results of studies to provide quantitative data for management of non-native fish communities, and for use in river management forums.

Goal 3. Enhance Monument resources by establishing and maintaining connectivity with neighboring habitats.

Objective 3.1-Enhance Monument resources and connectivity by establishing working groups of interested, involved agencies and the public within 1 year. Meet quarterly.

Objective 3.2-Identify funding opportunities from alternative sources, and identify funding needs within 2 years.

Objective 3.3-Work with other partners to annually achieve a minimum increase of 10% of identified critical, connective properties.

Objective 3.4-As an ongoing activity meet with 3-4 adjacent landowners annually to discuss common habitat/management objectives and future possibilities. (Comment: This may be a strategy rather than an objective)

Goal 10. Foster, support and respect cooperative partnerships that preserve valid existing rights while protecting the purposes of the Monument. Recognize and cooperate with tribal, state and local governments and federal agencies in the discharge of statutory responsibilities Enhance relationships and partnerships with community organizations and neighbors furthering management goals.

Objective 10.1-Maintain proactive communication with “rights holders” and concerned parties. Hold annual meetings to discuss common issues.

Objective 10.2-Establish system for communication and coordination regarding exercising of valid existing rights. (e.g. Establish standard operating procedures within 6 months-possible strategy).

Objective 10.3-Make multimedia presentations available to community organizations describing Monument attributes within 2 years.

Objective 10.4-Establish on-site community-based outreach program within one year of completion of CCP.

Group 4 report

Goal 5:

5.1 Within 2 years of CCP completion gather oral and written histories on pre-Hanford and Manhattan Project eras. (what little history is available on Midway needs to be captured ASAP)

5.2 Develop an integrated historic information system for the Monument with stakeholder, volunteer and Tribal involvement.

5.3 Develop action plan to determine the protection and stabilization of historic sites with stakeholder and Tribal involvement.

5.4 Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) will be inventoried and evaluated in collaboration with Tribes in the region to develop a restoration, access, and utilization plan within 5 years of CCP completion.

5.5 Develop and maintain agreements between the USFWS, Tribes, Counties, DOE, City, State and private sources regarding the use, sharing and collection and protection of information on historic sites on the Monument.

Goal 8:

8.1 Within 2 years of CCP completion, develop design standards for structures and utilities on the Monument.

8.2 FWS will advocate and build partnerships with air quality upwind regulators to keep air clean to maintain visibility.

8.3 Within 3 years of the plan being completed, DOE will cleanup all unnecessary research and construction trash, and all unnecessary structures from the Monument. Following

completion of the CCP USFWS will coordinate periodic trash pickup to maintain the visual quality of the Monument.

8.4 Within 6 months of plan adoption the FWS will file with the FAA for a 1,000 foot AGL flight restriction for all normal flight operations in order to prevent harassment of wildlife and protect solitude and the visual character of the Monument.

8.5 The FWS will actively participate in planning efforts for projects that could affect the Monument viewshed or solitude.

8.6 New construction and uses will be consolidated to minimize the foot print of potential development.

8.7 Limit noise in the Monument below XXXX decibels.

8.8 Within 10 years of plan completion a comprehensive transportation system plan will be developed and implemented by USFWS and DOE to remove all unneeded roads and plan for future access construction needs that protect visual quality and solitude.

8.9 Treat invasive species that impact visual and ecological integrity in accordance with an overall Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan.

8.10 Within 1 year of plan completion, the FWS will utilize available information and USGS findings on the White Bluffs sloughing to initiate implementation of feasible recommendations that protect the integrity of the White Bluffs and Locke Island.

Goal 9:

9.1 The USFWS and DOE will establish and implement a regular schedule of Government to Government meetings with the Tribes to implement treaty rights on the Monument.

9.2 Following completion of the plan, the FWS and USDOE in coordination with the Tribes will develop and implement an on-going public education program on treaty rights.

9.3 Within 1 year following plan completion, establish policies and procedures for artifact collection, inadvertent discovery of human remains and areas at risk for potential damage through erosion and vandalism).

These objectives were then presented in plenary and revised into the following final draft objectives. For a complete record of plenary comments see Appendix I.

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation, Appreciation Recreation and Education	Alternative 4 Broad Public Use
<p>Goal5. <i>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.</i></p>			
	<p>5.1 Within 2 years of CCP completion gather oral and written histories on pre-Hanford and Manhattan Project eras. (what little history is available on Midway needs to be captured ASAP- a lot of room for stakeholder involvement- need to capture info soon because people are dying.)</p> <p>5.2 Begin to develop an integrated historic information and education program for the Monument with stakeholder, volunteer and Tribal involvement. (strategies- collect, organ. Share- include electronic, paper, kiosks, flyers websites).</p> <p>5.3 Develop action plan to determine the protection and stabilization of cultural and historic sites with stakeholder and Tribal involvement.</p> <p>5.4 Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) will be inventoried and evaluated in collaboration</p>	<p>5.1 Within 2 years of CCP completion gather oral and written histories on pre-Hanford and Manhattan Project eras. (what little history is available on Midway needs to be captured ASAP- a lot of room for stakeholder involvement- need to capture info soon because people are dying.)</p> <p>5.2 Begin to develop an integrated historic information and education program for the Monument with stakeholder, volunteer and Tribal involvement. (strategies- collect, organ. Share- include electronic, paper, kiosks, flyers websites).</p> <p>5.3 Develop action plan to determine the protection and stabilization of cultural and historic sites with stakeholder and Tribal involvement.</p> <p>5.4 Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) will be inventoried and evaluated in collaboration</p>	<p>5.1 Within 2 years of CCP completion gather oral and written histories on pre-Hanford and Manhattan Project eras. (what little history is available on Midway needs to be captured ASAP- a lot of room for stakeholder involvement- need to capture info soon because people are dying.)</p> <p>5.2 Begin to develop an integrated historic information and education program for the Monument with stakeholder, volunteer and Tribal involvement. (strategies- collect, organ. Share- include electronic, paper, kiosks, flyers websites).</p> <p>5.3 Develop action plan to determine the protection and stabilization of cultural and historic sites with stakeholder and Tribal involvement.</p> <p>5.4 Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) will be inventoried and evaluated in collaboration</p>

Alternative 1 Current Management	Alternative 2 Full Resource Protection Managed Access	Alternative 3 Conservation, Appreciation Recreation and Education	Alternative 4 Broad Public Use
	<p>with Tribes in the region to develop a restoration, access, and utilization plan within 5 years of CCP completion.</p> <p>5.5 Develop and maintain agreements between the USFWS, federal, Tribes, Counties, DOE, City, State and private sources regarding the use, sharing and collection and protection of information on historic sites on the Monument.</p>	<p>with Tribes in the region to develop a restoration, access, and utilization plan within 5 years of CCP completion.</p> <p>5.5 Develop and maintain agreements between the USFWS, federal, Tribes, Counties, DOE, City, State and private sources regarding the use, sharing and collection and protection of information on historic sites on the Monument.</p>	<p>with Tribes in the region to develop a restoration, access, and utilization plan within 5 years of CCP completion.</p> <p>5.5 Develop and maintain agreements between the USFWS, federal, Tribes, Counties, DOE, City, State and private sources regarding the use, sharing and collection and protection of information on historic sites on the Monument.</p>

<i>Goal 8. Protect the natural visual character and promote the opportunity to experience solitude on the Monument.</i>			
	<p>8.1 Within 2 years of CCP completion, USFWS will develop design standards for structures and utilities on the Monument in cooperation with impacted agencies and governments.</p> <p>8.2 FWS will advocate and build partnerships with air quality regulators to keep air clean to maintain visibility.</p> <p>8.3 Within 3 years of the plan being completed, a completed inventory of all research and</p>	<p>8.1 Within 2 years of CCP completion, USFWS will develop design standards for structures and utilities on the Monument in cooperation with impacted agencies and governments.</p> <p>8.2 FWS will advocate and build partnerships with air quality regulators to keep air clean to maintain visibility.</p> <p>8.3 Within 3 years of the plan being completed, a completed inventory of all research and</p>	<p>8.1 Within 2 years of CCP completion, USFWS will develop design standards for structures and utilities on the Monument in cooperation with impacted agencies and governments.</p> <p>8.2 FWS will advocate and build partnerships with air quality regulators to keep air clean to maintain visibility.</p> <p>8.3 Within 3 years of the plan being completed, a completed inventory of all research and</p>

	<p>construction trash will be completed and DOE in cooperation with USFWS will complete cleanup, and all unnecessary structures from the Monument. Following completion of the CCP USFWS will coordinate periodic trash pickup to maintain the visual quality of the Monument.</p> <p>8.4 Within 6 months of plan adoption the FWS will file with the FAA for a 1,000-foot AGL flight restriction for all normal flight operations in order to prevent harassment of wildlife and protect solitude and the visual character of the Monument. (Normal flight operations as defined by FAA- special permits could be required for all other flights).</p> <p>8.5 The FWS will actively participate in planning efforts for off-site projects that could affect the Monument viewshed or solitude.</p> <p>8.6 New construction and uses will be consolidated to minimize the footprint of potential development wherever possible.</p> <p>8.7 Develop standards for noise within the Monument.</p>	<p>construction trash will be completed and DOE in cooperation with USFWS will complete cleanup, and all unnecessary structures from the Monument. Following completion of the CCP USFWS will coordinate periodic trash pickup to maintain the visual quality of the Monument.</p> <p>8.4 Within 6 months of plan adoption the FWS will file with the FAA for a 1,000-foot AGL flight restriction for all normal flight operations in order to prevent harassment of wildlife and protect solitude and the visual character of the Monument. . (Normal flight operations as defined by FAA- special permits could be required for all other flights).</p> <p>8.5 The FWS will actively participate in planning efforts for projects that could affect the Monument viewshed or solitude.</p> <p>8.6 New construction and uses will be consolidated to minimize the footprint of potential development.</p> <p>8.7 Limit noise in the Monument below XXXX decibels.</p>	<p>construction trash will be completed and DOE in cooperation with USFWS will complete cleanup, and all unnecessary structures from the Monument. Following completion of the CCP USFWS will coordinate periodic trash pickup to maintain the visual quality of the Monument.</p> <p>8.4 Within 6 months of plan adoption the FWS will file with the FAA for a 1,000-foot AGL flight restriction for all normal flight operations in order to prevent harassment of wildlife and protect solitude and the visual character of the Monument. . (Normal flight operations as defined by FAA- special permits could be required for all other flights).</p> <p>8.5 The FWS will actively participate in planning efforts for projects that could affect the Monument viewshed or solitude.</p> <p>8.6 New construction and uses will be consolidated to minimize the footprint of potential development.</p> <p>8.7 Limit noise in the Monument below XXXX decibels.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>8.8 Within 10 years of plan completion the CCP comprehensive transportation system plan will be implemented by USFWS and DOE in cooperation with other parties to remove all unneeded roads and plan for future access construction needs that protect visual quality and solitude.</p> <p>8.9 Treat invasive species that impact visual and ecological integrity in accordance with an overall Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan. (strategy note: IPM plan will be ecologically not visually based).</p> <p>8.10 Within 1 year of plan completion, the FWS will utilize available information and findings on the White Bluffs sloughing to initiate implementation of feasible recommendations that protect the integrity of the White Bluffs and Locke Island.</p>	<p>8.8 Within 10 years of plan completion the CCP comprehensive transportation system plan will be implemented by USFWS and DOE in cooperation with other parties to remove all unneeded roads and plan for future access construction needs that protect visual quality and solitude.</p> <p>8.9 Treat invasive species that impact visual and ecological integrity in accordance with an overall Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan. (strategy note: IPM plan will be ecologically not visually based).</p> <p>8.10 Within 1 year of plan completion, the FWS will utilize available information and findings on the White Bluffs sloughing to initiate implementation of feasible recommendations that protect the integrity of the White Bluffs and Locke Island.</p> <p>8.11 If camping is allowed, USFWS will establish noise limits from dusk to dawn.</p>	<p>8.8 Within 10 years of plan completion the CCP comprehensive transportation system plan will be implemented by USFWS and DOE in cooperation with other parties to remove all unneeded roads and plan for future access construction needs that protect visual quality and solitude.</p> <p>8.9 Treat invasive species that impact visual and ecological integrity in accordance with an overall Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan. (strategy note: IPM plan will be ecologically not visually based).</p> <p>8.10 Within 1 year of plan completion, the FWS will utilize available information and USGS findings on the White Bluffs sloughing to initiate implementation of feasible recommendations that protect the integrity of the White Bluffs and Locke Island.</p> <p>8.11 If camping is allowed, USFWS will establish noise limits from dusk to dawn.</p>
--	--	--	---

Goal 9 Honor treaty rights in accordance with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Native American policy.			
	<p>9.1 The USFWS and DOE will establish and implement a regular schedule of Government-to-Government meetings with the Tribes to (exercise) implement treaty rights on the Monument.</p> <p>9.2 Following completion of the plan, the FWS and USDOE in coordination with the Tribes will develop and implement an on-going public education program on treaty rights.</p> <p>9.3 Following plan completion, establish policies and procedures for artifact collection, inadvertent discovery of human remains and areas at risk for potential damage through erosion and vandalism).</p>	<p>9.1 The USFWS and DOE will establish and implement a regular schedule of Government-to-Government meetings with the Tribes to (exercise) implement treaty rights on the Monument.</p> <p>9.2 Following completion of the plan, the FWS and USDOE in coordination with the Tribes will develop and implement an on-going public education program on treaty rights.</p> <p>9.3 Following plan completion, establish policies and procedures for artifact collection, inadvertent discovery of human remains and areas at risk for potential damage through erosion and vandalism).</p>	<p>9.1 The USFWS and DOE will establish and implement a regular schedule of Government-to-Government meetings with the Tribes to (exercise) implement treaty rights on the Monument.</p> <p>9.2 Following completion of the plan, the FWS and USDOE in coordination with the Tribes will develop and implement an on-going public education program on treaty rights.</p> <p>9.3 Following plan completion, establish policies and procedures for artifact collection, inadvertent discovery of human remains and areas at risk for potential damage through erosion and vandalism).</p>

Group 5 report

Overall Concept

The difference between the alternatives is in the speed with which the info is gathered.
 The greater the access that will be allowed, the more time urgent the need for information.

Goal 4 Protect the distinctive geological and paleontological resources of the Monument

Common to all Alternatives

Objective 4.1: Conduct a structured, scientific inventory of existing data related to geologic and paleontologic resources of the Monument and maintain/consolidate in one repository.

Objective 4.2: Identify and fill data gaps in knowledge of geological and paleontological, e.g. knowledge of fossil locations and flood features.

Objective 4.3: All management activities, e.g. surface disturbing activities, will require a geological and paleontological clearance prior to implementation to ensure resource protection.

Objective 4.4: Monitor impacts on geol/paleo resources from visitor use and other processes. Report annually on the condition and status of “key” indicator resources.

Discussion about non-duplicative efforts; Monument should seek to discover what monitoring is being done by other entities; e.g. Grant PUD, BOR, and use that information where appropriate.

Strategies

Develop Monitoring Plan that id’s key resources using risk-based analysis

Partnerships and Volunteer Program

Design Clearance and Reporting Formats/Timing

Use GIS technology

Add staff expertise and law enforcement

Enforce and educate on “no collection” and related policies

Seek Special Funding

Land Acquisition

Provide Interpretation

Goal 7 Provide access and opportunities for high-quality recreation compatible with resource protection.

Discussion about not allowing recreation until we have adequate knowledge of resources and adequate means to ensure that recreation use will not degrade Monument resources.

First must have resource index, then define compatible recreation activities. This discussion led to the following edict:

Develop a recreation suitability analysis for all Monument areas to protect resources in the EIS process and identify access zones/areas and activities and facilities that are compatible with these zones.

The placement and construction of visitor facilities will be dependent upon the site-specific analysis of resources. Large facilities will require NEPA documentation. Development would be deferred until sufficient information is known.

Common to all Alternatives:

Zone Concept: Zones 1 - V are identified based on resource sensitivity, with the highest resource value being assigned class V and those areas that are irrevocably disturbed being assigned class

1. E.G. Level I= existing development like highways, Vernita Rest stop

Level II= disturbed areas like Riverlands, white area in BRMP

Level III= gray area in BRMP such as

Level IV= most of ALE

Level V = Umtanum desert buckwheat population, prehistoric burial sites

This EIS will identify allowable activities by zones and strategies; criteria or stipulations by zone.

	Existing Action	Full Protection	Care	Public Use
Obj. 7.3:Hunting	Waterfowl, upland bird, big game in Wahluke	None -note this is not considered realistic by Group 5 but probably does need to be included in one alt to avoid lawsuit.	Open xx to provide a range of high-quality opportunities waterfowl, big game and upland bird, safe	Open xx (more than Care)
Strategies			permit special hunts (non-motorized, etc.. reservation, establish no shooting zones, self registration station at the entrance	
Stipulations			no goose pits, surface camo only,	Fixed blinds

Goal 8 Protect the natural visual character and promote the opportunity to experience solitude on the Monument.

Objective 8.1: Complete inventory of visual resources to determine a range of visual classes from low to high sensitivity. Develop objectives for each class

Objective 8.2: Develop a landscape design standards plan to guide facility design to protect visual resource qualities.

Objective 8.3: Partner with local agencies and other federal agencies to identify important visual and aesthetic resources on the Monument and avoid/reduce impacts from off-Monument development. Strategy-participate in other organization's NEPA processes.

Objective 8.4: Provide X areas on the Monument that are free from high public use, excessive noise, stench and intrusive development. Areas would favor natural pristine landscapes.

Strategies:

- Provide information to visitors on times and areas receiving least visitation
- Establish group size limits
- Inform/educate visitors as to least visited areas and times
- Considering existing rights and needs apply restrictions to management that help to protect solitude during certain times/seasons

Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop II

February 10-13, 2003
Richland, WA

FINAL REPORT

Appendix I Plenary Notes



Appendix I: Plenary Notes

Monday, 10 February 2003

FWS Draft Goals

Are there too many goals that it will be hard to write the CCP?

It will take longer, but we were very concerned in honoring the workshop 1 and FAC goals, so we kept them all.

There are a couple of goals that deal with restoration, but you're required to only address protection by the proclamation. What do you mean by restoration?

Restoration is not prohibitive; it is a component of conservation

Goal 8: I don't see visual character as a part of the proclamation.

This goal isn't focused only on the proclamation; we feel it's important that visual character be a part of the plan. This term could be defined differently under different alternatives. Visual character could be just what color to paint the buildings.

The term 'visual character' has come out as being important in all stages of this process from the public scoping meetings to focus groups to workshop 1, so we want to make sure we address it.

"High quality" public use, what would be low quality?

Low quality could mean too many people on the river at one time.

I think you've captured high quality with 'compatible with resource protection...'

High Quality is somewhat in the eye of the beholder.

This group will help us decide what is high quality, however the FWS does have standards they need to abide by.

Goal 11: Where does the research natural area (RNA) come from?

There is a specific research goal; it is a very valuable and necessary component of the area. The Antiquities Act spells out research. We will get more specific about research in objectives.

There is one large RNA now, is it adequate? Should we make it smaller or larger or add another? We'll address that here.

Last clause implies that there is some sort of way to prioritize research, is this true?

If possible, we want research to benefit the Monument; the Refuge Manager has the authority to review all research requests.

If we receive 2 research requests that are the same in all ways except for one benefits the monument, we'd probably chose that one.

This goal is written to allow all research if compatible with resource protection. And it's still draft.

Issues Deferred to Step-Down Plans

Why are we able to address Salmon issues at this workshop, but not Elk Management?

Would prepare a specific step-down plan for elk management outside this workshop.

Salmon are mentioned in the proclamation but not elk. This plan is based most on the monument proclamation to decide what issues to address in this workshop process.

Under biological resource goal, you could have an objective about elk, but we decided that this is not the time for it. We will address this in a step-down plan.

There is just not enough time for us to address every little thing in this process.

Go with the assumption that you can be open and creative with the lands adjacent to the monument, just know that we're still trying to figure out how that process with work.

Current Management-status quo

Is current management primarily access driven taking exclusion first?

ALE is open by permit system to certain uses (i.e. research) only.

There is no current plan in Saddle Mountain Unit and Wahluke Unit.

Wahluke Unit previously managed by the state and fishing and hunting have been allowed.

McGee Ranch Riverlands Unit is managed by DOE.

How is DOE managing?

Have a permit system, management plan.

No action is public expectation of previous management.

Why is no one currently allowed in the ALE and people all over Wahluke? What is the history behind it?

No action also could include maintenance that was needed anyway.

Currently have a fire management plan.

Currently doing the basics of Refuge management: roads, public use, biology.

Alternative Development

Group 4

First thought of different flavors of management. Looked at goals across the flavors of management and abandoned this approach because they were all so important.

Now have a range of extreme protection and extreme use with high protection low use and high use low protection. Now we're matching the goals against this and have high, medium and low relevance to goals.

Group 3

Took the baseline and broke it by area across the 13 goals to see if they meet the goals, the two that didn't fit currently were education and public use.

Then brainstormed 7 different potential uses, had high, medium, low and no use.

Looked at the possibility of public use under all existing units.

Group 5

Reorganized boundaries on map to make a North Unit, South Unit and river unit (including dunes). They looked at each of the units in terms of maximum preservation and then looked at each under high use and recreation. Now trying to find a middle ground.

None would be purely preservation or use. There would always be at least a little of both.

Defined what would happen under each gradient.

All options seemed to need more law enforcement either to keep people out or monitor people inside the monument.

Group 1

First went unit to unit, but became mostly about access.

Then went to alternative themes such as unlimited access, biodiversity preservation, wilderness designation.

Then went to themes of management such as environmental education and interpretation, safety and security, cultural resource, protecting and restoring native habitat, public use and access, landscape scale management.

Then made paragraphs under each theme and ranked them as to how they fit with the goals.

Group 2

Decided they didn't have enough info about current management. Felt that current management with a little refinement could be a good alternative. Looked at each management theme relative to the status quo.

1. Status quo
2. Less access than currently-focus on conservation.
3. Expanding current access
4. Totally open-extreme access

Other alternatives could apply these gradients differently to each unit.

Haven't gone through to see how these meet the goals yet.

Important notes

Focus on access as the range of alternatives

We need to think about whether this does incorporate everything we want it to.

Wednesday, February 12, 2003

Synthesized Alternatives

Alternative 2 – Resource Protection with Managed Use

Keep level of detail consistent with other alternatives

No camping - day use only, this doesn't apply to research.

Address fiscal priorities in other alternatives to keep consistent.

Discuss whether to include fiscal priorities or not.

Zoning based on landscape, define science-based zoning.

Alternative 3 – Conservation, Awareness, Recreation, and Education

Fix first sentence, is 'balanced' a loaded term?

Add the word 'compatible' to other alternatives

Are the alternatives different enough?

Objectives will help distinguish all the alternatives from each other.

Night access would be restricted to limited primitive camping?

Broaden concept of night use, mentioning primitive camping is too detailed

Revise the sentence on public access

Alternative 4 – Broadest Public Access

Define zoning: intent is site analysis, landscape analysis

Would a wide range of research not apply to the other alts?

In this alternative, research can be for other things besides Monument enhancement.

Why is there more monitoring in this alternative?

Tremendous need for monitoring due to increased use

We're not going to allow this alternative to degrade resources.
Make sure invasives are noted in all alternatives; are they a high priority in all alternatives?

Draft Objectives

Group 4

Goal 5

Objective 5.1

Why does it take so long to gather the history that you would need an objective for it?
It's spread out in a lot of different places and it need to gather oral history too.
Add words about what you're intending to collect and how you'll get help with partners.
This is going on right now, but volunteers are doing it, so add that verbiage.
There is some urgency to this.

Objective 5.3

Does that cover Native American sites as well? Take out historic and add pre-historic.

Objective 5.2

Define information system

Is cultural and historical redundant? Cultural is all-inclusive, so you don't need historical.

Objective 5.5

Can't share Tribal information, so need just historic.
Need to include the word 'federal' or BPA

*Add an objective to incorporate an education component? Could also be under the next goal.

Goal 8

Objective 8.1

Who is going to develop the design standards?

Objective 8.2

Is the Monument going to get a class one air shed? This couldn't happen because all industry in the area would have to shut down.
Mention that it doesn't include a class one air shed

Objective 8.3

Cannot make another agency do anything.

Objective 8.4

Doesn't include BPA, Air force planes.
Define who this is.
This is written so the people that can do special operations can do them.
Is 1,000 feet an accepted standard? Yes.

Objective 8.5

Mention that this objective is primarily off-site.

Objective 8.6

This means clumping buildings so they aren't in the view of photographs.

Why disturb a new area for a building?

You will usually build the building in the place that makes the most sense.

This objective is on-site.

Objective 8.7

Limit noise *to* below...

There are a lot of exceptions to this.

This deals with jet skies, boats, radios.

If you put the number up there, you'll have to have a way to measure and enforce it.

Objective 8.8

Who will decide what an unneeded road is?

Mention cooperating agencies.

We mean old military roads that go nowhere, etc.

Need to check with the federal transportation system.

Everyone is involved in the word 'comprehensive'

Mention something about who can use what roads.

Objective 8.9

Do invasive species belong under visual character?

Objective 8.10

There are other ways besides FWS and USGS.

Something needs to be done about the White Bluffs, we can't just sit back and watch them slough away.

This objective was written for the FWS to take some action to fix the visual character of the bluffs.

Add: "...continuing to work with other agencies..."

Is that just implied in all of these?

FWS will initiate implementation, but that doesn't mean that they will do it.

*some of these could be strategies under a camping objective.

Goal 9

Objective 9.2

DOE already has this.

This may be something as simple as a display at an interpretive center.

Address: "why can they fish and we can't?"

I thought the Native Americans didn't want to be mentioned because they already have valid existing rights.

Have to be careful to enlarge or diminish Native American rights.

Objective 9.3

This whole thing will be a tricky process, it starts with government to government communication and FWS isn't the only one involved.

One year is too soon.

Unrealistic objective.

Need to deal with each tribe individually to make this work.

Group 1

Goal 4

Objective 4.3

Nothing is implemented here, only identified, and designed.

Goal 6

Objectives 6.2

As the use grew, so did educational and interpretive activities

Full protection assumes that one of the stresses on the Monument is people.

I'm not sure a complete lock-out is the best thing here.

Are we looking at practicality?

It's not a complete lockout but minimal public use.

Everything is resource driven.

People like to use the river.

This objective is talking about where the education will be provided, not public use.

You need to educate people about the resource or they won't respect it.

Off-site could be giving boaters brochures.

Goal says provide a rich variety, which could include off-site and on-site.

Tried to get clear separation between alternatives.

Goal 13

Defined what infrastructure is.

FWS staff and trucks are not included in infrastructure

What about an alternative transportation option such as a shuttle?

Goal-Fire

Say something about availability of water, storage facilities

Mention equipment you would need.

Goal 1

Objective 3 would be tough to accomplish in 5 years.

Dealing with invasive species is a long process of treatment.

High priority should be an integrated pest management plan. This is being done currently.

Only considering reintroduction of species that were originally there.

Are you looking for things that were prehistoric? Historic conditions are defined by the FWS.

Why not go to reintroduction under alternatives 3 and 4? Reintroduction could increase interest of public visitors.

Does this include grizzly bear and wolves?

Monitoring is to establish a base plan
Trying to encompass many different kinds of monitoring

Goal 11

Objective 11.2

Is this restricting to biological and not geological research?

Not sure on the Research Natural Area why you're limiting it to Monument interests as long as it is compatible with the refuge management.

Consider broadening research to activities that are compatible with refuge.

Have to look at the big picture because this is a natural treasure. Shrub-steppe is only found here. Shouldn't rule out physical and geological science.

The observatory would still be used.

Objective 11.3

Don't let research sit on the shelf. Use it to better management.

When research is done, publish it and make it available to the public so it can be used.

Objective 11.4

It's not always best for research to restore areas to original condition. It's good to use the same plots over and over again.

In strategy, keep plots on GIS with GPS so the information is somewhere.

Some researchers do leave a lot of junk, so cancel projects if they don't respect the resource.

The plots that have long-term monitoring history should be kept.

Report to peer group, not advisory committee. Advisory committees get so formal and are costly.

Goal 7

Objective 7.5

Means 'by permit'.

Goal 10

How can you do that if it is a valid existing right?

During planning process it would be good to consider in zoning

Group 3

Goal 2

Just don't lose native species, not eliminate non-native species.

How would you treat Eurasian water milfoil?

We didn't discuss that.

How does this compare to what National Marine Fisheries Service is doing?

NMFS deals with anadromous fish.

There might be some jurisdictional overlap. That is not the intent, however.

There is quite a bit about restoration, what are we restoring?

Why are you monitoring? It would be hard for the refuge manager.

There are other restoration issues besides salmon.

We will address these

Goal 3

Are you going to use eminent domain as a strategy?

At least 10%, don't limit.

River is a habitat as well and can be connecting.

Objective 3.4 could be a strategy for 3.1.

Starting within 5 years of completion of the CCP.

Other agencies could provide the connectivity, not just FWS.

Goal 10

I don't think you have to wait 2 years to make presentations.

Make standard presentations in 2 years.

Use of appropriate existing rights?-explain.

Need a standard operating procedure.

Isn't there an objective to identify the valid existing rights and one to review what is going on so it doesn't infringe on existing rights.

That is a requirement of the CCP write up. So valid existing rights will definitely be outlined in the CCP.

Thursday, February 13, 2003

Group 5

Goal 7

Hunting Objective

It would be smart to have an alternative with no hunting, to let the no hunting constituency see that you considered it.

Need a sliding scale on many different objectives, but make sure that it is in areas where there is a lot of public opinion.

You could split hunting into boat hunting and land hunting.

Every kind of access has its impact.

Lots of the big use groups such as bikers and horsemen have organizations that could be involved in the stewardship?

By law the FWS can't favor those that give something back.

But you can work with partners.

We need to look at the ongoing impact of these groups.

The proclamation says the resources are paramount here.

You can't use lack of funds as a block to public use activities.

Define high quality hunting.

Determine areas compatible with hunting.

Under level V zone, just say burial sites not prehistoric because it should also include historic burial sites.

Goal 8

Did you discuss wilderness designation under this goal?

Yes, we need to do a wilderness suitability analysis to see if that is even an option.
If not, we could manage some areas of the Monument closer to the wilderness style.

* Is there a way to address monitoring so it's not just in a book somewhere? Adaptability of plan to monitoring results, so it's an ongoing process.
Some kind of trigger that sets a management action.
Write an objective to determine what those triggers are.

Revised Alternatives

Add a preamble that mentions all the aspects common across all the alternatives.

Alternative 2

Analysis to determine zones.

Common to all action alternatives: new zoning that may change existing management zones.

Do we need this in each alternative?

Alternative 3

Access generally limited to daylight hours.

Get rid of conservation management sentence.

Alternative 4

Drop the word "broad" from the title and add "expanded".

Title: Expanded Public Use

The word "efficient" is too strong.

Remove "efficient"

Remove the word "natural" in front of resources so you include cultural resources as well.

No, need to keep the word "natural" and add others if you want.

Say, "natural and cultural resources"

Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop II

February 10-13, 2003
Richland, WA

FINAL REPORT

Appendix II Presentations



Appendix II: Presentations

Presenter: Mike Marxen, Conservation Planning Team Leader, Pacific Region

PRESENTATION Outline:

A. Scoping Process Overview

B. Issue-based Problem Statements

C. Management Alternatives

CCP Planning 8 – Step Process

1. Preplanning: Planning the Plan
2. Initiate Public Involvement and Scoping
3. Refine Vision Statement and Goals, Determine Significant Issues
4. Develop and Analyze Alternatives
5. Prepare and Release Draft Plan and NEPA Document
6. Prepare and Adopt Final Plan
7. Implement Plan, Monitor and Evaluate
8. Review and Revise Plan

- Planning Step 2:
Initiate Public Involvement and Scoping of Issues (June – Oct, 02)
- Public Meetings
- Resource Reviews
- Briefings
- Planning Updates
- Issues Workbook

The Core Planning Team

Cooperating Agencies and Consulting Governments

- FWS (Lead)
- DOE
- BOR
- BPA
- COE
- Yakama Nation
- State WDFW
- Benton County
- Adams County

CCP/EIS

Study Area

Lands and Waters For Detailed Analysis

Issue Identification:

- Who are the affected parties?
- What Issues and Concerns Are In the Community?
- Do We Really Understand the Problems?
- What Data Do We Have and Need?

Preliminary Issues Analysis for the EIS

1. What Are the Significant Issues to Resolve? (Issues With In-Depth Analysis and a Range of Alternatives)
2. Other Issues But Not Significant
3. Issues Deferred to Step-Down Plans
4. Issues Outside the Scope of This CCP/EIS

Significant Issue 1: How Will The Biological Resources of the Monument Be Managed, Protected and Restored?

Significant Issue 2: What actions can be taken towards protecting fishery resources?

Significant Issue 3: How Will Cultural Resources Be Protected?

Significant Issue 4: How Will Geological and Paleontological Resources Be Protected?

Significant Issue 5: What Actions Can Be Taken To Reduce Deterioration of the White Bluffs?

Significant Issue 6: How Will Contamination Issues Be Addressed?

Significant Issue 7: What Visitor Activities Are Appropriate and Where Will They Occur?

Significant Issue 8: How Will Transportation Be Managed to Provide Access for Visitors, Management Needs, and Valid Existing Rights?

Significant Issue 9: What Facilities and Infrastructure are Needed and Where?

Issues Outside of the Scope

Visitor Center Location

River Flows

B Reactor

Retaining or Removing Lands from Federal Ownership

Cultural Sites Outside of Monument Boundary

DOE Land Transfer/PILT Payments

Issues Deferred to Step - Down Plans

Invasive Species Control

Elk Management

Monitoring (Wildlife, Habitat, Visitors)

Landscape Design Standards

Emergency Response Planning

Cultural Resources

Fire Management (Plan/EA Complete)

Planning Step 3:

Define Vision, Develop Goals (Workshop I, Nov - Feb, 2003)

Monument/Refuge Purpose
Monument Vision Statement
Monument Goal Statements

Planning Step 4:

Develop Preliminary Management Alternatives and Objectives

Planning Workshops II and III (Next 6 Months)

Alternatives

Alternatives Are Different Ways to:
Achieve the Purpose (Proclamation)
Meet the Monument Vision and Goals
Contribute to Refuge System
Resolve Issues

Range of Alternatives

Alternatives Discussed in the EIS
All Reasonable Management Alternatives
Includes the No Action or “No Change from Current Management” Alternative
Different Sets of Objectives & Strategies

How Many Alternatives Will Be Displayed in the Draft EIS?

No Magic Number
Too Many Alternatives Are Confusing
3 or 4 Alternatives Often Works Well

Alternatives Describe Management For Programs:

Alternatives Identify Appropriate Activities for the Monument

Priority Activities

Environmental Ed
Wildlife Viewing
Hunting
Fishing
Wildlife Photography
Interpretation

Other Activities

Boating
Horseback Riding
Field Dog Trials
Camping
Research

Alternatives Describe Landscape Management Zones

(Existing Units/Designations)

Existing Units (ALE, Saddle Mountain, Wahluke, Sand Dunes, River Corridor.)

Existing Designations (Research Nat. Area, Wild and Scenic River, Waterfowl Sanctuary, Closed Areas, Rights of Ways,)

CLUP Designations: Preservation, Conservation, High-Intensity Recreation, Low-Intensity Recreation

Alternatives Describe Landscape Management Zones

(New Designations)

Wilderness

Roadless Areas, Access By Permit, Special Management Zones, Outdoor Env. Education Areas, Research Areas, No Wake Zone, Primitive Zone, Cultural Resource Protection Zone

Other

Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop II

February 10-13, 2003
Richland, WA

FINAL REPORT

Appendix III Issues Statements



Preliminary Issues Analysis

The Hanford Reach National Monument CCP/EIS planning team evaluated the issues and topics documented during the scoping and resource review processes. Issues are defined as matters of controversy, dispute, or general concern over resource management activities, the environment, or land uses. Issues are important because they help identify topics to be addressed in the plan, types of information to gather, and how to define alternatives for the plan. It is the Service's intent to produce a broad, landscape-scale conservation plan followed by several more detailed step-down management plans. This planning concept is important to understanding the issue sorting and analysis recommendations that follow.

Numerous issues, concerns and opportunities were raised and all will be addressed in some manner in the CCP/EIS. It is the lead agency's responsibility to focus planning and the EIS analysis on the significant issues. We are currently in the process of determining these issues. Significant issues typically suggest different actions or alternative solutions and are those within Monument jurisdiction. Significant issues will influence the decisions proposed in the plan. Some issues identified in scoping are more appropriately addressed in other NEPA processes. Other less significant issues will be covered in the EIS but will not be the focus of the range of alternatives.

Some issues will be addressed in detailed step-down plans (and associated NEPA documentation) that will follow or run concurrent with the CCP process. The deferred issues will be addressed in the CCP/EIS by a brief discussion of why they were not examined in depth. For example, elk population, elk depredation and elk management were identified as issues by the public, by tribes, and cooperating agencies. However, elk management requires further data collection and a level of detail inappropriate for a landscape-scale plan. Many of the elk management issues are more appropriately dealt with through the State's Rattlesnake Hills Management Plan and in a Monument focused Elk Management Plan stepping down from the CCP.

1. Significant Issues To Resolve In The CCP (Issues with in-depth analysis and a range of alternatives):

- How will the biological resources of the Monument be managed, protected, enhanced and/or restored?
- What actions can be taken towards protecting fisheries?
- How will cultural resources be protected?
- How will geological and paleontological resources be protected?
- What actions can be taken to reduce deterioration of the White Bluffs?
- How will contamination issues be addressed?
- What recreation activities and interpretation and education programs are appropriate and where will they occur?
- How will transportation be managed to provide access for public uses, management needs and valid existing rights?
- What facilities and infrastructure are needed and where?

2. *Issues/topics raised that are not considered significant issues at this point but will suggest actions common to all alternatives and may be addressed in the CCP Goals, Objectives and Strategies, as well as other sections of the document:*

- Partnerships
- Wild & Scenic River Eligibility
- Tribal Rights
- Valid Existing Rights — Emergencies, Security, Safety, Existing Structures
- Traditional Cultural Property Designation Status
- Connectivity of Habitat with Lands Outside the Monument
- Research Access
- Operations & Maintenance — Emergencies, Security, Safety, Staffing, Law Enforcement
- Threatened & Endangered Species

3. *Issues primarily deferred to step-down planning. The CCP may provide broad guidance regarding these topics or at a minimum identify when the step down plan would be completed.*

- Integrated Pest Management (Invasive Species Control)
- Monitoring — Wildlife, Habitat, Public or Other
- Landscape Design Standards/Aesthetics
- Elk Management
- Visitor Services/Recreation
- Emergency Response
- Cultural Resources
- Fire Management

4. *Other step-down plans suggested by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service policy.*

- Law Enforcement
- Fishing
- Habitat Management Planning
- Hunting
- Research Natural Area Management

5. *Issues/topics raised that are primarily dealt with outside this CCP/EIS scope. These are handled in other planning, government -to-government or NEPA analyses processes.*

- Visitor Center Location/Design
- PILT Payments
- River Flows
- Co-Management with Tribes
- Existing DOE Structures
- B Reactor Determination
- Cultural Resources on DOE Lands Outside of the Monument — White Bluffs Bank, White Bluffs Town Site, Bruggeman Warehouse
- Rattlesnake Hills Elk Management
- Recovery Plans for Threatened & Endangered Species
- Retention of Lands in Federal Ownership
- Maintenance of Advisory Board

Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop II

February 10-13, 2003
Richland, WA

FINAL REPORT

Appendix IV Participant Introduction Questions



Personal Goals and Conservation Issues

The first task in the workshop process was for each person to introduce themselves and to write out and then read aloud answers to three introductory questions. This process allows for expression of individual responses without being immediately influenced by previous responses. The responses indicate potential areas of common ground and provide a first insight into the diversity of perceived issues present in the group. The responses also provide a check on whether the workshop deliberations address these concerns.

Question 1: Please provide your name and a brief identification of organization, area of expertise, and area of primary interest. Did you participate in Workshop I?

1. Larry Gadbois, EPA Hanford Project Office, Cleanup Risk Assessment, especially ecological risk assessment. Not part of Workshop 1.
2. Dana Ward, DOE Closure Division, Environmental Sciences, Radiation Protection, did attend Workshop 1, primary interest is to see that the HRNM be managed as a monument and not just a wildlife refuge.
3. Mary Hollen, Bonneville Power Association-Power business line, generation contracts especially nuclear, interested in generation issues (nuclear power plant ops., river ops.), industrial rouse, wind generation, emergency planning. Participated in Workshop 1.
4. Rick Leaumont, Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society, long history of advocating protection of HRNM and its fish, wildlife & native plants, expertise in Hanford natural resources, attended Workshop 1, member of FAC.
5. Harold Heacock, Richland Rod & Gun Club, local business on Reach Committee, Hanford site issues-resource utilization and public policy issues, did attend Workshop 1.
6. Janet Budzeck, Port of Benton, work with all areas of economic development, no particular area of expertise, establishment of interpretive center for monument.
7. Al Wright, consultant to grant CPUD, hydro-power resources and environmental management on the Columbia River, primary intent is with resources and fisheries management in the Hanford Reach, did not attend Workshop 1.
8. Paul LaRiviere, Fisheries Biologist, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife, Cooperating agency representative, primary interest in resource protection, did attend Workshop 1.
9. Mike Marxen, US Fish & Wildlife, expertise in conservation planning focusing on wildlife refuges in the pacific NW, did attend Workshop 1.
10. Everyll Davison, member of Purple Sage Riders, a chapter of Backcountry Horsemen of America, did attend Workshop 1.
11. Naomi Sherer, mid-Columbia River NWR environmental education, community participation, did attend Workshop 1.
12. Greg Hughes, USFWS, HRNM Manager.
13. Linda Smith, Representative of the Back Country Horsemen from the Rattlesnake Ridge Chapter.
14. Betsy Bloomfield, The Nature Conservancy, community-based conservation of global biological diversity, did attend Workshop 1.

15. Terese Schrom, Grant County Tourism, representing Grant County, liver and farm near the monument, interested in seeing how project will be developed, how Grant County needs to be involved, did not participate in Workshop 1.
16. Tom Ferns, DOE, closure division, area of expertise is Hanford, area of interest is Hanford operations, did attend Workshop 1.
17. Jane Bardolf, USFWS, Experienced in many aspects of Natural Resource Management, interested in all aspects of FWS planning, did participate in Workshop 1.
18. Charles (Chuck) Houghten, USFWS, NWRS, Region 1, Planning Division Chief, Refuge planning policy, process, procedures ecosystem-landscape-site level planning, did attend Workshop 1.
19. Heidi Newsome, USFWS, Wildlife Biologist, expertise and interest in wildlife, biology, ecology, ecosystems functions, etc. attended Workshop 1.
20. Don Anglin, FWS, Columbia River Fishery Program Office, Fishery Biologist, experience and interest in fishery issues, particularly fall Chinook, aquatic ecology, attended Workshop 1.
21. Stuart Harris, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Risk Assessor, protection of treaty reserved rights, did participate in Workshop 1.
22. Shannon Arntzen, Columbia River Journeys, boat tours on Hanford Reach since 1996, public use/use, did attend Workshop 1.
23. David Geist, Battelle and FAC member, Fisheries biologist/research scientist, worked on Hanford Reach for 15 years, did not participate in Workshop 1.
24. Althea Wolf, Environmental Justice Intern for the Confederated Umatilla Tribes, primary interest is extending opportunities to all people, did participate in Workshop 1.
25. Don Rose, Bonneville Power Administration, Environmental specialist, cooperating agency, interested in protecting valid existing rights for utilities.
26. Denny Huntzinger, Ringold Ranch, private landowner.
27. Sharon Selvaggio, USFWS, area of expertise and interests are in planning process, techniques and outcomes, did participate in Workshop 1.
28. Paula Call, ORP HRNM, did participate in Workshop 1.
29. Madeline Brown, retired, B Reactor Museum Association and Washington League of Women Voters on DOE's Hanford Advisory Board.
30. Jim Eydrauer, State of WA Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation, statewide outdoor recreation studies, data access is an area of interest, did not participate in Workshop 1.
31. Janelle Downs, President of Columbia Basin Chapter of the WA Native Plant Society, Shrub-Steppe community dynamics, public education, education (students), research, and protection of resources for future.
32. Donna Postma, US Bureau of Reclamation, Manager, Office of Environment, contracts and compliance, primary interest is access and existing rights, did participate in Workshop 1.
33. Jim Evans, The Nature Conservancy office in WA, expertise in plant ecology, noxious weeds, natural resources, conservation, did participate in Workshop 1.
34. Lisa Hallcock, WA Natural Heritage Program, Herpetologist, Conducted 1995 and 1998 reptile and amphibian inventory of Hanford site for the Nature Conservancy, Primary interest is reptiles and amphibians and protection and conservation of the Hanford site in general, did not participate in Workshop 1.

35. Rex Crawford, Natural Heritage Program, WA DNR, plant ecologist, natural processes, vegetation conservation, did not participate in Workshop 1.
36. Tom Logan, retired, Bechtel environmental restoration contract, vice president and life sponsor in Ducks Unlimited, did not participate in Workshop 1.
37. Aimee Kinney, US Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District, did not participate in Workshop 1, area of expertise in NEPA, environmental compliance, corps authorities, habitat restoration.
38. Dennis Faulk, EPA Region 10, Environmental cleanup, public policy, public access to the Reach including B Reactor, did not attend Workshop 1.
39. Wyn Birkenthal, Director of Parks and Recreation, city of Richland, expertise in habitat land acquisition, trail design and construction, recreational projects design and management.
40. Mike Lilga, Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society, resource conservation, attended the first Workshop.
41. Connie Estep, CREHST museum, Curator, expertise in history and biology.
42. Erin Stockenberg, USFWS Reality/Planning Division Regional Office, Geographic Information Systems Specialist, did not participate in Workshop 1.

Question 2. What is your personal goal for this Workshop?

1. Understand the drivers that will be the basis for management of the Hanford Reach Monument.
2. To assure diversity within the HRNM, i.e. that it incorporates a full spectrum of resources values.
3. Provide input to the plan alternatives.
4. Develop objectives for CCP which are in harmony and support the proclamation which established the monument and also support goal identified in Workshop 1.
5. Continue participation in planning process for reach, achieve balance between public use and resource protection.
6. Get closer to defining what needs to be done to establish center for monument.
7. To understand and provide to my client knowledge what impacts and influences the HRNM will have a Grant PUD in relationship of Priest Rapids and Winepum hydroelectric projects.
8. Resources protection and preservation.
9. To capture participant ideas for future management of the Monument, and to help you understand this planning process in particular how and why we focus this strongly on the most significant and appropriate issues.
10. To be able to have continued access to the interests of the monument in the form of horse trails and trailheads.
11. Understand the complex issues of public use for the Reach and what compromises will have to occur.
12. To work with the public and stakeholders to craft a management plan for the future of the HRNM that we all can be proud of.
13. Encourage access for equestrians; provide volunteer help especially where horses can be used.

14. To participate effectively in a solution-based approach to the management issues surrounding the monument.
15. To familiarize myself more with the process and learn about the monument and the vision for it.
16. Gain a broader perspective for the planning process.
17. Help the process in anyway I can.
18. Observe and participation to help determine potential for this technique for future use on other planning efforts. Promote public and agency input into the HRNM planning process.
19. To not get bogged down in detail, and to get a good usable product.
20. Develop goals and objectives that are realistic and put together quality management plan for significant resources of HRNM.
21. To participate and provide a Tribal perspective for the protection and enhancement of the cultural and natural resources.
22. Listen and learn, work toward the ability to use without abuse.
23. Listen and learn, contribute where possible, make sure science is part of objectives and management alternatives.
24. Partnerships.
25. Participate in the process and help shape alternatives, be a voice for BPA in the process.
26. Information about private land within the Reach.
27. To determine if quality alternatives and objectives can be developed using this type of accelerated process.
28. To hear from others in the room regarding their ideas and thoughts on planning alternatives.
29. I want to ensure all alternatives, protect natural resources, interpret and protect historic resources. And lots of “insertion points” for public participation in decisions and volunteer opportunities to implement. Make new friends.
30. Determine whether SCORP findings are considered, observe/study the workshop as a technique I might use at some point.
31. Contribute knowledge and understanding of shrub-steppe dynamics to aid in plan design and ensure wise policies for education and research goals.
32. Protection of existing rights to access Reclamation facilities and assist in writing the most acceptable management plan for the Reach.
33. To continue the work begun in the first Workshop. To conserve and maintain the biological resources of HRNM.
34. To learn about and contribute ideas toward the future management of the Hanford site.
35. To get familiarized with process and direction of planning to help to secure natural status of “ALE”.
36. Learn and contribute to a successful workshop.
37. To assist USFWS as a cooperating agency in the NEPA process, I hope to identify ways the corps can support the FWS in this effort.
38. To understand and provide input on the future use of the Reach. Make sure decisions I make on Hanford cleanup are consistent with future potential uses.
39. Represent the city of Richland, learn about the issues surrounding the protection and management of the Reach monument. Assist in finding the balance between public access and resource protection.

40. Write objectives that are as protective of the natural and wetland resources of the NM as possible.
41. To ensure that the history of monument lands be preserved and interpreted, that the monument retains it's biological heritage and that researchers can study this area.
42. To learn more about the planning goals and interests for the Monument.

Question 3. Was any important problem for the conservation planning process missed in the first Workshop? What is it?

1. N/A
2. What DOE has planned for the Central Hanford Area, and how that area will be integrated into the HRNM.
3. N/A
4. Nothing missed.
5. Initially hard to see where headed-end result was very good.
6. Not that I can think of.
7. I couldn't get the material from the first workshop.
8. N/A
9. N/A
10. N/A
11. we touched on many issues but I am anxious and excited to see how they will be resolved, how can people see what's on the site without disturbing.
12. I don't think so
13. Biggest problem, too much to do in too short of time.
14. N/A
15. N/A
16. None that I'm aware of outside of the tribal government to government relationship.
17. N/A
18. N/A
19. Determination, using science of biological and natural resources of concern, conservation targets, so that other activities can be planned around those things. This will be more important for setting objectives. I am worried that public use and access/public concerns rather than wildlife and resource conservation is driving this planning process.
20. Don't think so, we did a good job of covering all the issues.
21. N/A
22. I think we made a lot of progress at the last workshop.
23. Not aware of any.
24. Rights and history of local Native American Tribes.
25. How this workshop influences the Federal Advisory Committee.
26. N/A
27. N/A
28. N/A
29. Regrettable workshop participants did not see full breadth of comments from scoping.
30. N/A

31. I believe the first workshop was thorough to the extent that they addressed the objectives outlined.
32. I am not aware of anything being missed.
33. N/A
34. Did not attend Workshop 1.
35. N/A
36. Did not attend.
37. N/A
38. N/A
39. Did not attend first Workshop.
40. N/A
41. I think we lost sight of the fact that we are planning for a National Monument and cannot be entirely bound by USFWS policies.
42. N/A

Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop II

February 10-13, 2003
Richland, WA

FINAL REPORT

Appendix V List of Participants



Participant List

Don Anderson
Franklin County Historical Society
212 Willow Court
Pasco, WA 99301
509/547-5118

Don Anglin
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
9317 NE Highway 99
Suite I
Vancouver, WA 98665
360/696-7605
don_anglin@fws.gov

Shannon Arntzen
Columbia River Journeys
Post Office Box 26
Richland, WA 99352
509/734-9941
shannon@columbiariverjourneys.com

Jane Bardolf
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
16507 SW Roy Rogers Road
Sherwood, OR 97140
503/590-6596
jane_bardolf@fws.gov

Wyn Birkenthal
City of Richland Parks and Recreation
500 Amon Park Drive
Richland, WA 99352
509/942-7578
wbirkenthal@ci.richland.wa.us

Betsy Bloomfield
The Nature Conservancy
208 East 6th Street
Suite 200
Ellensburg, WA 98926
509/962-1333
bbloomfield@tnc.org

Madeleine Brown
Washington League Women Voters
1412 Farrell Lane
Richland, WA 99352
509/946-4082
mxbrown@charter.net

Onnie Byers
Conservation Breeding Specialist Group
12101 Johnny Cake Ridge Road
Apple Valley, MN 55124
952/997-9801
onnie@cbsg.org

Janet Budzeck
Port of Benton
3100 George Washington Way
Richland, WA 99352
509/943-2522
budzeck@portofbenton.com

Paula Call
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Hanford Reach National Monument
3250 Port of Benton Boulevard
Richland, WA 99352
509/371-1801
paula_call@fws.gov

Rex Crawford
Washington Department of Natural Resources
111 Washington Street, SE
Post Office Box 47014
Olympia, WA 98504
360/902-1749
rex.crawford@wa.dnr.gov

David Geist
PNNL
113 Enterprise Drive
Richland, WA 99352

Everyll Davison
Backcountry Horsemen of Washington
715 South Juniper
Kennewick, WA 99336
509/586-3553

Janelle Downs
Native Plant Society
41703 West Knox
Benton City, WA 99320
509/376-6641
jl.downs@pnl.gov

Connie Estep
CREHST
95 Lee Boulevard
Richland, WA 99352
509/943-9000
cestep@crehst.org

Jim Evans
The Nature Conservancy
217 Pine Street
Suite 1100
Seattle, WA 98101
206/343-4345 x 336
jevans@tnc.org

Jim Eychaner
Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
1111 Washington Street, SE
Post Office Box 40917
Olympia, WA 98504
360/902-3011
jime@iac.wa.gov

Dennis Faulk
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
712 Swift Boulevard
Suite 5
Richland, WA 99352
509/376-8631
faulk.dennis@epa.gov

Tom Ferns
U.S. Department of Energy
Environmental Restoration
Post Office Box 550
MS K8-50
Richland, WA 99352
509/376-7474
thomas_w_ferns@rl.gov

Glenn Frederick
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
16507 SW Roy Rogers Road
Sherwood, OR 97140
503/590-6596
glenn_frederick@fws.gov

Larry Gadbois
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
712 Swift Boulevard
Suite 5
Richland, WA 99352
509/376-9884
gadbois.larry@epa.gov

Mike Green
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Migratory Birds
911 Northeast 11th Avenue
Portland, OR 97232
503/872-2707
michael_green@fws.gov

Dan Haas
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Hanford Reach National Monument
3250 Port of Benton Boulevard
Richland, WA 99352
509/371-1801
daniel_haas@fws.gov

Lisa Hallock
Washington Department of Natural Resources
111 Washington Street, SE
Post Office Box 47014
Olympia, WA 98504
360/902-1670

Stuart Harris
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian
Reservation
Post Office Box 638
Pendleton, OR 97801
541/966-2408
stuartharris@ctuir.com

Harold Heacock
Richland Rod & Gun Club
760 South Tacoma Street
Kennewick, WA 99336
509/735-1000
hheacock@tridec.org

Mary Hollen
Bonneville Power Administration
Post Office Box 968
MD 1399
Richland, WA 99352
509/372-5250
mjhollen@bpa.gov

Chuck Houghten
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Division of Refuge Planning
911 NE 11th Avenue
Portland, OR 97232
503/231-6207
charles_houghten@fws.gov

Thea Huesties-Wolf
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian
Reservation
Post Office Box 638
Pendleton, OR 97801
541/966-2411
ajwolf77@msn.com

Greg Hughes
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Hanford Reach National Monument
3250 Port of Benton Boulevard
Richland, WA 99352
509/371-1801
greg_m_hughes@fws.gov

Denny Huntzinger
Ringold Ranch
321 Ringold River Road
Mesa, WA 99343
509/269-4585

Aimee Kinney
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Post Office Box 3755
Seattle, WA 98124
206/764-3634
aimee.t.kinney@usace.army.mil

Paul La Riviere
Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
2620 Commercial Avenue
Pasco, WA 99301
509/545-2014

Rick Leaumont
Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society
9016 Sunset Trail
Pasco, WA 99301
509/545-6115
leaumont@owt.com

Mike Lilga
Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society
317 Fuller Street
Richland, WA 99352
509/375-4354
mike.lilga@pnl.gov

Thomas Logan
Ducks Unlimited
73031 Grosscup Road
West Richland, WA 99353

Mike Marxen
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
16507 SW Roy Rogers Road
Sherwood, OR 97140
503/590-6596
mike_marxen@fws.gov

Moriya McGovern
Conservation Breeding Specialist Group
12101 Johnny Cake Ridge Road
Apple Valley, MN 55124
952/997-9800
moriya@cbsg.org

Jennifer Meisel
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Hanford Reach National Monument
3250 Port of Benton Boulevard
Richland, WA 99352
509/371-1801
jennifer_meisel@fws.gov

Heidi Newsome
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Hanford Reach National Monument
3250 Port of Benton Boulevard
Richland, WA 99352
509/371-1801
heidi_newsome@fws.gov

Donna Postma
Bureau of Reclamation
Post Office Box 815
Ephrata, WA 98823
509/754-0209
dpostma@pn.usbr.gov

Mike Ritter
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Hanford Reach National Monument
3250 Port of Benton Boulevard
Richland, WA 99352
509/371-1801
michael_ritter@fws.gov

Valerie Rodman
Federal Highway Administration
Western Federal Lands
610 East Fifth Street
Vancouver, WA 98661
360/619-7984
valerie.rodman@fhwa.dot.gov

Donald Rose
Bonneville Power Administration
Post Office Box 3621
Portland, OR 97208
503/230-3796
dlrose@bpa.gov

Terese Schrom
Grant County Commissioners
7240 Road 17, SW
Royal City, WA 99354
509/346-9464

Sharon Selvaggio
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
16507 SW Roy Rogers Road
Sherwood, OR 97140
503/590-6596
sharon_selvaggio@fws.gov

Naomi Sherer
407 Abbot Street
Richland, WA 99352
509/946-5517
nsherer@att.net

Dave Smith
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Hanford Reach National Monument
3250 Port of Benton Boulevard
Richland, WA 99352
509/371-1801
david_n_smith@fws.gov

Linda Smith
Backcountry Horsemen of Washington
29305 West Highland Road
Benton City WA 99320
509/588-3600

Carol Swan
93 Grabenstein Road
Selah, WA 98942
509/697-5526

Dana Ward
U.S. Department of Energy
Post Office Box 550
MS A5-15
Richland, WA 99352
509/372-1261
dana_c_ward@rl.gov

Don Voros
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
911 NE 11th Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Al Wright
Al Wright Consulting
812 SW Washington
Suite 907
Portland, OR 97205
503/224-0744
alwright@hevanet.com

Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop II

February 10-13, 2003
Richland, WA

FINAL REPORT

Appendix VI Workshop Invitation and Invitation List



Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop II

February 10-13, 2003
Richland, WA

FINAL REPORT

Appendix VII Glossary



Hanford Reach National Monument Glossary

Affected Environment. In an environmental impact statement, a description of the existing environment covering information that directly relates to the scope of the proposed action and alternatives that are analyzed.

Alternatives. Different sets of objectives and strategies or means of achieving refuge purposes and goals, helping fulfill the Refuge System mission and resolving issues.

Anadromous Fish. Fish that normally migrate to salt water as juveniles and return to freshwater as adults to spawn.

Archeological Resource. Material remains of past human life or activities including (but not limited to) pottery, basketry, bottles, weapons, tools, structures, or any portion of the foregoing items at least 100 years of age.

Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA). Protects cultural resources and outlines permitting procedures as well as violations and fines.

Biological Diversity or Biodiversity. The variety of life and its processes, including the variety of living organisms, the genetic differences among them, and communities and ecosystems in which they occur.

Biological Integrity. Biotic composition, structure, and functioning at genetic, organism, and community levels comparable with historic conditions, including the natural biological processes that shape genomes, organisms, and communities.

Compatibility Determination. A written determination signed and dated by the Refuge Manager and Regional Chief, signifying that a proposed or existing use of a national wildlife refuge is a compatible use or is not a compatible use.

Compatible Use. A proposed or existing use of a national wildlife refuge that, based on sound professional judgment, will not materially interfere with or detract from the fulfillment of the National Wildlife Refuge System mission or the purpose(s) of the national wildlife refuge.

Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP). A document that describes the desired future conditions of a refuge or planning unit and provides long-range guidance and management direction to achieve the purposes of the refuge.

Habitat Connectivity or Landscape Connectivity. The arrangement of habitats that allows organisms and ecological processes to move across the landscape.

Cultural Resources. The physical remains, objects, historic records, and traditional life-ways that connect us to our nation's past.

Ecosystem. A biological community together with its associated non-living environment, functioning as a unit.

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). A detailed written statement required by section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act, analyzing the environmental impacts of a proposed action, adverse effects of the project that cannot be avoided, alternative courses of action, and any irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources.

Geological Resources. Natural features related to the form of the earth or its solid surface. Rattlesnake Ridge, the Saddle Mountains, and White Bluffs are a few of the geological resources of Hanford Reach National Monument.

Goal. Descriptive, open-ended, often broad statement of desired future conditions that conveys a purpose but does not define measurable units.

Habitat. A suite of existing environmental conditions required by an organism for survival and reproduction. The place where an organism typically lives.

Historic Conditions. Composition, structure, and functioning of ecosystems resulting from natural processes that we believe, based on sound professional judgment, were present prior to substantial human related changes to the landscape.

Historic Preservation. Includes identification, evaluation, documentation, excavation, curation, acquisition, protection, rehabilitation, restoration, stabilization, maintenance, and any combination of the foregoing activities relative to cultural resources.

Invasive Species. Plant or animal species that tend to spread rapidly and harmfully. For example, cheatgrass invasion of native shrub-steppe displaces native species and alter natural fire regimes. Many invasive species are also noxious weeds.

Issue. Any unsettled matter that requires a management decision, e.g., an initiative, opportunity, resource management problem, threat to the resources of the unit, conflict in uses, public concern, or the presence of an undesirable resource condition.

Management Unit. An administrative area identified for management purposes. The Monument is currently divided into six management units.

Microbiotic Crust. A diminutive collection of mosses, lichens, liverworts, algae, and bacteria forming a living, spongy layer that helps protect soil from erosion, absorbs moisture, and provides nitrogen and other nutrients for plant growth.

Monitoring. Monitoring: A process of collecting information to evaluate if objective and anticipated or assumed results of a management activity or plan are being realized or if implementation is proceeding as planned.

Mountain Bicycle. Bicycle designed for off-pavement use. Generally are multi-gear with fat knobby tires. Frames and tire rims are stronger than road bicycles. Also referred to in this document as a non-motorized vehicle.

Native. With respect to a particular ecosystem, a species that, other than as a result of an introduction, historically occurred or currently occurs in that ecosystem.

Noxious Weed. A plant species designated by federal or state law as generally possessing one or more of the following characteristics: aggressive or difficult to manage; parasitic; a carrier or host of serious insect or disease; or non-native, new, or not common to the United States.

Objective. A concise statement of what we want to achieve, how much we want to achieve, when and where we want to achieve it and who is responsible for the work. Objectives are derived from goals, and should be attainable, time-specific, and measurable.

Overlay Wildlife Refuge. A wildlife refuge on land which is owned by one or more federal agencies but managed by the USFWS. The Saddle Mountain National Wildlife Refuge is an overlay wildlife refuge.

Paleontological Resources. The remains of plants and animals that existed in prehistoric times.

Planning Area. The area upon which the planning effort will focus. A planning area may include lands outside existing planning unit boundaries currently studied for inclusion in the National Wildlife Refuge System and/or partnership planning efforts. It also may include watersheds or ecosystems outside of our jurisdiction that affect the planning unit. At a minimum, the planning area includes all lands within the authorized boundary of the refuge.

Prescribed Fire. Controlled application of fire to natural fuels under conditions of weather, fuel moisture, and soil moisture that will allow confinement of the fire to a predetermined area and, at the same time, will produce the intensity of heat and rate of spread required to accomplish planned benefits to one or more management objectives. Based on the concept of using fire as a management tool to achieve certain benefits at minimum environmental damage and acceptable cost.

Reach. A portion or stretch of a river. The 51-mile Hanford Reach is the last non-tidal, free-flowing stretch of the Columbia River in the United States. Most of it is contained in the Monument, which was named after it.

Purpose(s) of the Refuge [Monument]. The purposes specified in or derived from the law, proclamation, executive order, agreement, public land order, donation document, or administrative memorandum establishing, authorizing, or expanding a national wildlife refuge or refuge subunit.

Research Natural Area. A federal land designation that establishes areas with predominantly natural conditions and processes for research and educational purposes. Such lands may have management restrictions to protect studies and ecological processes.

Riparian. Of or on the bank of a natural course of water. For example, riparian vegetation includes any and all plant life growing on the bank of a stream or the edge of, but not within, a pond or lake.

Roads:

State Highway. State-maintained, paved highway. State Highways 240, 24 and 243 are found in and around the Monument.

Public Use Roads. Transportation corridors that are administratively open to state licensed vehicles and non-motorized vehicles.

Administrative Roads. Transportation corridors that are closed to all motorized and non-motorized vehicles except for administrative purposes.

Sacred Site. As defined by Executive Order 13007, a specific, discrete, narrowly delineated location on federal land that is identified by an Indian tribe as sacred by virtue of its established religious significance to, or ceremonial use by, an Indian religion, provided that the tribe or appropriately authoritative representative of an Indian religion has informed the agency of the existence of such a site.

Shrub-Steppe. Arid land dominated by shrubs and grasses where soil and moisture limit the growth of trees. Such lands extend from southeastern Washington and eastern Oregon, through Idaho, Nevada, and Utah, and into western Wyoming and Colorado. Shrub refers to the most abundant plant species that grows in this ecoregion. “Steppe” is a Russian word that means a vast treeless plain.

Step-Down Management Plan. A plan that provides specific guidance on management subjects (e.g., habitat, public use, fire, safety) or groups of related subjects. It describes strategies and implementation schedules for meeting CCP goals and objectives.

Strategy. A specific action, tool, technique, or combination of actions, tools, techniques used to meet objectives.

Traditional/Religious Values. Places that possess values important to Native American tribal groups or other ethnic groups for traditional cultural or religious reasons. Traditional cultural values may not be necessarily associated with easily definable sizes of objects such as is the case with sacred peaks or viewsheds.

Trail. A developed or evolved transportation corridor that has been administratively authorized and designated for certain types of use.

Vision Statement. A concise statement of what the planning unit should be, or what we hope to do, based primarily upon the Refuge System mission and specific refuge purposes, and other mandates.

Wetlands. Lands transitional between terrestrial and aquatic systems where the water table is usually at or near the surface or the land is covered by shallow water.

Wild and Scenic River. A portion of a river that has been designated by Congress as part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. In 1994, the Hanford Reach was found eligible and suitable for “recreational” wild and scenic river designation. The USFWS is obligated to manage the Hanford Reach so as not to negatively impact its potential addition to the National System.

Wilderness. An area that has been designated by Congress for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Wildfire. Any wildland fire that does not meet management objectives, thus requiring a fire suppression response.

Wildlife-Dependent Recreation. A use of a national wildlife refuge involving hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, or environmental education and interpretation. The National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 specifies that these are the six priority general public uses of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop II

February 10-13, 2003
Richland, WA

FINAL REPORT

Appendix VIII
About CBSG



About CBSG

CBSG is part of IUCN — The World Conservation Union. With 975 volunteer members, CBSG is one of the largest of more than 110 Specialist Groups comprising the Species Survival Commission (SSC), one of six IUCN Commissions. CBSG has over 10 years of experience in developing, testing and applying scientifically based tools and processes for risk assessment and decision-making in the context of species and habitat management. These tools, based on small population and conservation biology, human demography, and the dynamics of social learning are used in intensive, problem-solving workshops to produce realistic and achievable recommendations for both conservation and management.

CBSG's workshop process provides an objective environment, expert knowledge, and neutral facilitation to support the exchange of information across diverse stakeholder groups in order to reach some agreement on the important issues facing both humans and wildlife. With this understanding, meaningful and practical management recommendations can be made. The process has been remarkably successful in uncovering and integrating previously unpublished information vital to the decision making process.

CBSG has learned a host of lessons in more than 100 workshop experiences in 40 countries. Traditional approaches to endangered species problems have tended to emphasize the lack of information and the need for additional research. This has been coupled with a hesitancy to make explicit risk assessments of species status and a reluctance to make immediate or non-traditional management recommendations. The result has been long delays in preparing action plans, loss of momentum, and dependency on crisis-driven actions or broad recommendations that do not provide useful guidance to the managers.

CBSG's interactive and participatory approach produces positive effects on management decision-making and generating political and social support for conservation actions by local people. Workshop participants recognize that management policies and actions need to be designed as part of a biological and social learning process. CBSG workshops provide tools for designing management decisions and programs on the basis of sound science, while allowing new information and unexpected events to be used constructively to adjust management practices. Timely production of workshop reports has immediate impact on stakeholders and decision makers.

Our basic set of tools for workshops include small group dynamic skills, explicit use in small groups of problem restatement, divergent thinking sessions, identification of the history and chronology of the problem, causal flow diagramming (elementary systems analysis), matrix methods for qualitative data and expert judgments, paired and weighted ranking for making comparisons between sites, criteria, and options, utility analysis, stochastic simulation modeling for single populations and metapopulation and deterministic and stochastic modeling of local human populations.

CBSG is funded by annual voluntary donations from more than 150 institutions and individuals worldwide. Support for individual projects comes from conservation organizations, private foundations, zoos, aquariums and regional zoo associations, corporations and wildlife agencies.

Moriya McGovern Program Assistant

B.A., Biology, St. John's University/College of St. Benedict, 1999

Moriya joined CBSG in September 2000 after completing a marine mammal training internship at Shedd Aquarium in Chicago. She has experience as an interpretive naturalist and in insect rearing and studied marine biology for a semester at the University of Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

Moriya's main biological interests have evolved to include wildlife ecology, entomology and taxonomy. This background has helped her in her role as recorder and process assistant at CBSG workshops as well as when assisting the CBSG Program Officers with assembling workshop briefing books, editing reports, and other workshop preparation. Moriya also graphically designs report covers, designed and now updates the CBSG website and edits the CBSG Newsletter.

Dr. Onnie Byers Program Officer

B.S., Animal Science, University of Wisconsin, 1983

M.S., Animal Physiology, University of Minnesota, 1987

Ph.D., Animal Physiology, University of Minnesota, 1990

Post Doc., National Zoological Park/Smithsonian Institution, 1990-1993

Onnie earned her Ph.D. in reproductive physiology from the University of Minnesota and completed a post doctoral fellowship at the Smithsonian Institution's National Zoo in Washington D.C. She was a member of the National Zoological Park's Mobile Laboratory Research team, and participated in reproductive studies involving cheetah, pumas, tigers and the giant panda.

Onnie joined the CBSG staff in 1991 as a Program Officer. In addition to serving as a reproductive specialist in workshops conducted by CBSG and other conservation organizations, Onnie is responsible for organization, design and facilitation of CBSG's Population and Habitat Viability Assessment, Conservation Assessment and Management Plan and Organization-based workshops. She also has been collaborating with the SSC and the IUCN Red List office to develop a process for feeding species threat assessments made at CBSG workshops directly into the global IUCN Red List. Onnie is dedicated to the transfer of these tools and processes to conservationists around the world through the establishment and nurturing of regional and national CBSG Networks.