2005 Current Fiscal Year Report: Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee

Report Run Date: 04/20/2024 02:52:33 AM

1. Department or Agency	2. Fiscal Year
Department of the Interior	2005

3. Committee or Subcommittee	3b. GSA Committee No.
Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee	9568

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?	5. Current Charter	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date
No	01/10/2003	01/10/2005	01/11/2005

8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?	8b. Specific Termination Authority	8c. Actual Term Date
Yes		01/10/2005

9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear	10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?	10b. Legislation Pending?
Terminate	No	Enacted

11. Establishment Authority Presidential

12. Specific Establishment Authority	13. Effective Date	14. Commitee Type	14c. Presidential?
Presidential Proclamation 7319	06/09/2000	Continuing	Yes

15. Description of Committee Non Scientific Program Advisory Board

16a. Total Number of Reports	No Reports for this FiscalYear

17a. Open	17b. Closed	17c. Partially Closed	Other Activities	17d. Total
1	0	0	0	1

Meetings and Dates

Purpose	Start	End

1) Complete recommendations regarding long-term elk management, 2) hear an update on the planning process	01/06/2005 - 01/06/2005

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 1

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	$0.00	$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	$0.00	$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	$6,500.00	$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	$19,411.00	$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	$75.00	$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	$0.00	$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	$0.00	$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	$452.00	$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	$105.00	$0.00
18d. Total	$26,543.00	$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.10	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

The Committee made recommendations to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Serviceand the U.S. Department of Energy on the preparation of a long-term managementplan for the Hanford Reach National Monument Comprehensive Conservation Planand associated Environmental Impact Statement (CCP/EIS), focusing on advice that identifies and reconciles, where possible, land management issues while meeting the

Proclamation directives to protect the biologic, scientific, archaeologic, historic, geologic, and paleontologic objects of interest on the Monument. The Committee assisted the Service with providing opportunities for meaningful public participation and input during the planning process. The Committee provided recommendations to the Service in identifying planning issues. The Committee provided recommendations to the Service on developing a vision, goals, management alternatives, objectives, strategies, and priorities for the CCP/EIS. The Committee submitted their own preferred alternative for the Service's consideration in developing the CCP/EIS. Because the Committee charter expired prior to release of the draft CCP/EIS, the Committee will not provide recommendations to the Service for addressing public comments and preparing the final plan as stated in the Charter.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The membership of the Committee was balanced, comprising a cross-section of those entities directly affected, interested, and qualified to address issues of the Monument. The Committee included 19 membership positions, including a representative for each of the four local counties, representatives from two local cities, representation from Washington State government; one representative for the five involved tribal governments, one local economic interest, one K-12 education interest, one nationally or regionally recognized environmental interest, one hunter/angler interest, one representative from irrigation interests, one representative from utilities, one member of the public-at-large, three members representing

scientific or higher level academic interests, and one tourism representative.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

During FY 2005, the Committee met 1 time. The meeting was highly relevant to the Committee purpose as defined in the charter. Through the meeting, the Committee developed advice for the US Fish and Wildlife Service and US Department of Energy regarding long-term elk management on the Hanford Reach National Monument.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

The Fish & Wildlife Service recognizes that the planning process is best conducted by seeking the advice of local and regional public and private sector entities associated with the Monument. It has long been recorded by Congress that Federal Advisory Committees that appropriately representthe concerned entities effectively, economically, and in the best public interest can provide the necessary advice for program development and implementation.Despite the diverse background and interests of the members, the Committee successfully worked together towards their purpose of providing the Service and DOE with advice on a CCP and related EIS for long-term Monument management. Both the high level of Congressional interest, and the complex nature of issues and opportunities present at Hanford require collaboration and commitment to achieve results. The Service and DOE were impressed with the dialogue and sincerity with which the Committee acted, and how well the Committee worked together towards their purpose outlined in the Charter. Local and regional advice through the Committee was essential to meeting

local and regional citizens' expectations. During FY 2005, the Committee provided formal advice to the Service and DOE on January 6, 2005, regarding long-term elk management on the Monument.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

N/A; all meetings were open.

21. Remarks

Agency recommended continuation in December, 2004, however Committee charter was not renewed.

Designated Federal Officer

Gregory M Hughes Hanford Reach National Monument Project Leader

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Ancona, Doug	01/31/2001	03/19/2002	Utilities	Representative Member
Bowman, Leo	01/31/2001	01/31/2003	Benton County Commissioner, Prosser, WA	Representative Member
Geist, David	01/31/2001	01/31/2003	Fisheries Biologist, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, Representing Science/Academic	Representative Member
Gerber, Michele	01/31/2001	01/31/2003	Historian/Author, Fluor Hanford Inc., Representing: Scientific/Academic	Representative Member
Jensen, Chris	01/31/2001	11/15/2002	City of Pasco	Representative Member
Leaumont, Rick	01/31/2001	01/31/2003	Conservation Chariman, Lower Columbia Basin Audubon, Representing Conservation Interests	Representative Member
Schreckhise, Gene	01/31/2001	01/31/2003	Professor/Dean/Academic Coordinator, WA State University, Representing:Scientific/Academic	Representative Member
Steele, Rich	01/31/2001	01/31/2003	Hunter/angler interests	Representative Member
Tayer, Jeff	01/31/2001	01/31/2003	Regional Manager, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Yakima, WA, Committee Vice-Chair	Representative Member

Tomanawash, Bobby	01/31/2001	12/19/2001	Native American	Representative Member
Watkins, Kris	01/31/2001	01/31/2003	President/CEO, Tri-Cities Visitor & Convention Bureau, Representing: Public-at-Large	Representative Member
Watts, Jim	01/31/2001	01/31/2003	Self Employed, Representing Local Economic Interests	Representative Member
Wieda, Karen	01/31/2001	01/31/2003	Science Education Specialist, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Representing Education K-12	Representative Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 13

Narrative Description

The charter was not renewed for this committee.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
Improvements to health or safety	☐
Trust in government	☑
Major policy changes	☐
Advance in scientific research	☐
Effective grant making	☐
Improved service delivery	☐
Increased customer satisfaction	☑
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	☐
Other	☐

Outcome Comments

The Committee provided input representing local and regional stakeholders regarding management goals, objectives, and implementation strategies for the Hanford Reach National Monument. Operation of the Committee represented a commitment made by the federal government to ensure that local and regional voices would be heard during the development of a management plan for the Monument.

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
None	☐

Unable to Determine	☑
Under $100,000	☐
$100,000 - $500,000	☐
$500,001 - $1,000,000	☐
$1,000,001 - $5,000,000	☐
$5,000,001 - $10,000,000	☐
Over $10,000,000	☐
Cost Savings Other	☐

Cost Savings Comments

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service)believes that the Committee's involvement in the planning process will result in very strong stakeholder ownership or and support for the final management plan. While it is difficult to place a dollar value upon, stakeholder support is of high value to the Service.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

1

Number of Recommendations Comments

The Committee met just once during fy 2005 prior to the expiration of their Charter, and provided one formal letter of recommendation regarding elk management.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

90%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has or will implement the Committee's recommendations to the extent allowed by law, regulation, and policy. Approximately 10% of the Committee's advice has not yet been acted upon by the Service pending consultation with Tribal and state governments.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

Please see comments above.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ☑ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Agency Feedback Comments

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service provides both verbal and written feedback.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

	Checked if Applies
Reorganized Priorities	☐
Reallocated resources	☐
Issued new regulation	☐
Proposed legislation	☐
Approved grants or other payments	☐
Other	☐

Action Comments

NA

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

No

Grant Review Comments

NA

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

	Checked if Applies
Contact DFO	☑
Online Agency Web Site	☑
Online Committee Web Site	☐
Online GSA FACA Web Site	☑
Publications	☐
Other	☑

Access Comments

Committee records are available for review at the Washington State University public library reading room. located on campus in Richland, Washington.