

# RESOLVE

Results Through Consensus

720 SW Washington Street, Suite 750  
Portland, OR 97205  
Ph: 503-228-6408 Fax: 503-228-6207  
www.resolve.org

December 14, 2002

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** NMFS Willamette/Lower Columbia River TRT Members

**FROM:** Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE and Paul McElhany, NMFS

**SUBJECT:** Brief Summary and Action Items from the December 13 TRT Meeting

---

Thank you for your participation and efforts at the NMFS Willamette/Lower Columbia River Technical Recovery Team meeting held on Friday, December 13, 2002. This memo includes a brief summary of items discussed during the meeting including:

- I. Viability Document Presentations to the Ex Com
- II. Broad Sense Recovery Presentations to the Ex Com
- III. Lewis River Watershed Case Study
- IV. 'Finalizing' the Viability Document

In addition, a list of the agreed-upon action items can be found at the end of the memo. Please feel free to contact either of us with any questions, concerns, or additional next steps.

### **I. Viability Document Presentations to the Ex Com**

Given the need for the TRT members to make a series of presentations at the December 17-18 Ex Com meeting, the group spent a lot of time discussing the presentations. The group first discussed generally how each presentation should be organized and then went through each section, identifying key issues the presenter should keep in mind in developing/making the presentation. Brief summaries of each discussion are below.

Presenters were asked to bring 30 copies of their slides to the meeting. JJ Westfall indicated that if slides are sent to her by **3:00 p.m. on Monday, December 16**, she will make and bring the copies, otherwise this task is up to the presenter.

Paul McElhany handed out a few revisions to the December 2 version of the report which he indicated would be available for the Ex Com members at the meeting next week. TRT members not in attendance can access them on Docushare.

## **General Thoughts on the Section Presentations**

The group agreed with the following general flow of presentations:

- ❖ Basic logic of section → a review
- ❖ Changes to the document since the last draft – how issues raised regarding the last draft were addressed
- ❖ Identify and explain unresolved technical issues for the TRT
- ❖ Highlight policy ‘choices’ – ask questions

Presenters were encouraged to spell out the implications of TRT decisions, especially around technical issues the Ex Com members may not understand. In addition, using examples was agreed to be a useful tool to integrate into the presentations. As noted below, Dan Rawding is going to give a formal presentation on the Chum, and others may be referencing this example.

Finally the group agreed on the number of minutes for each presentation, within the constraints of the Ex Com agenda. Times for each are indicated next to each section below with the first number representing the presentation and the second number representing time for clarification questions and brief discussion. If necessary, presenters can use some of their discussion time for their presentations, but they were encouraged to stay as close to the time allocated as possible. In the agenda developed, there is one hour for general discussion at the conclusion of all the presentations. It was noted that one hour may be insufficient and that Paul and Patty should work with the Ex Com facilitator to see if additional time can be allocated to the general discussion.

### **Overview/Introduction – Paul McElhany (10/0)**

This presentation will welcome the Ex Com and describe what they should expect from the series of presentations. In particular, the presenter should convey the spirit of collaboration and the desire to encourage dialogue. Further, it should indicate the TRT is looking for the Ex Com members to indicate where the document needs to be clarified, what key issues need additional examination, and what additional information would be helpful. It will include an overview of the document (describing the level of consensus around the document and the appendices) using the flowchart in the executive summary, as well as the flow of the presentations. A brief review of ESU and species status is expected as well.

### **ESU-level Criteria and Attribute Integration – Paul McElhany and Dan Rawding (30/10)**

- ❖ Big concern in first review was flexibility – discuss how it was addressed
- ❖ Unresolved issues:
  - ‘Scoring’ options
    - ❖ weighted vs. unweighted
    - ❖ getting 0 for no information
  - Proposed approach is complicated – important to talk about who is putting together numbers?
- ❖ Questions:
  - Do you buy-in to the framework?
  - How will this work on-the-ground?

### **Adult Growth and Abundance – Paul McElhany (15 minutes/10 minutes)**

- ❖ Concerns raised are addressed in Appendix G – reference, but do not discuss every one
- ❖ Unresolved Issue: Different methods of establishing productivity → spell out implications from a population perspective
- ❖ Lay out technical foundation and implications of assuming 20 years and 95% probability
- ❖ Question: are the assumptions acceptable?
- ❖ Describe HPVA, EDT

### **Juvenile Outmigrant Production – Selina Heppell (10/10)**

Note: Since Selina was not in attendance, Tom Backman agreed to talk with her about the presentation (and if necessary do it if she could not attend the December 17 meeting).

- ❖ Not really concerns raised about the technical underpinnings, rather regarding feasibility and how many places to do it?
  - For ESU
  - For cost
- ❖ Unresolved Issue: within attribute ‘integration,’ how do you deal with no information?
- ❖ Note that one of the Growth and Abundance approaches requires JOM information

### **Spatial Structure – Craig Busack (10/10)**

- ❖ Question:
  - How do you make it happen? Feasibility?
  - How do you rationalize?
    - Metric is harder to gauge than others
- ❖ Chum example (Gray’s River) is relevant here and Craig and Dan should talk about how to convey
- ❖ Lewis Case Study is also something to mention

### **Diversity – Jim Myers (10/10)**

- ❖ Questions:
  - How do you make it happen?
    - Functional populations is goal rather than focusing historical phenotype
  - What is the process?
    - Subbasins develop plans and then TRT reviews
- ❖ Chum example is relevant here and Jim and Dan should talk about how to convey

### **Habitat Section – Cleve Steward (10/10)**

- ❖ Describe how habitat is explicitly related to other criteria
- ❖ Clarify change from last time – habitat is criteria in this case, not factor for decline
- ❖ Unresolved Issue: How far to take this criteria? How specific to get?

### **Chum Example – Dan Rawding (20/5)**

- ❖ ESU scale
  - What it needs to be 2.25
  - What we currently score chum
- ❖ Population scale
- ❖ Follow the flow of presentations – this is a case study

### **Next Steps: Where the TRT Goes Now? – Paul McElhany (5/0)**

- ❖ The TRT would like to be done by March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2003
  - Done = final TRT recommendations on the body of the document
    - ❖ Substantive conversations on this round completed
    - ❖ Put into NOAA Technical Memo format
    - ❖ Still work on Appendices if necessary
    - ❖ Edit/format after March 1

### **Proposed Draft Agenda**

9:15 – 9:25	Introduction, Paul McElhany
9:25 – 10:05	ESU Viability and Integration, Paul M. and Dan Rawding
10:05 – 10:30	Adult Growth Rate and Abundance, Paul M.
10:30 – 10:40	Break
10:40 – 11:00	JOM, Selina Heppell and/or Tom Backman
11:00 – 11:20	Spatial Structure, Craig Busack
11:20 – 11:40	Diversity, Jim Myers
11:40 – 12:00	Habitat, Cleve Steward
12:00 – 1:00	Lunch
1:00 – 1:25	Chum Presentation, Dan Rawding
1:25 – 1:30	Next Steps
1:30 – 2:30	General Discussion

As mentioned above, if additional time for general discussion is necessary, the group will explore whether or not it can use an extra 15 minutes from BSRG session and/or ask that the 4:30 – 5:00 time slot be moved to the next day.

## **II. Broad Sense Recovery Presentations to the Ex Com**

Given limited time, the group did not get into a long discussion of the paper drafted and distributed to the Ex Com by Paul McElhany. However, the group did have time to offer a few comments. The group agreed the paper was a good start at getting the Ex Com to think about the issue of broad sense recovery goals, but added that it might have left the wrong impression in some instances about the feasibility of developing them. They agreed that Paul should start the session with a 10 minute presentation on the paper (noting that this would be a little bit of a review for some who heard Paul talk about it at the November Ex Com meeting).

In addition, the group discussed the proposed presentation about HPVA. Craig Busack agreed to make a 20 minute presentation that would generally describe why it is being presented (the Ex Com Subgroup was interested in the approach), what it is, how it has been applied in the Puget Sound area, and how it could relate to the W/LC region (including some specific numbers for species in the region). Generally, members were comfortable with the presentation approach, though it was noted that Craig (and Dan who would be available to add thoughts if necessary) would be indicating he was making the presentation with his WDFW ‘hat’ on and not his TRT hat.

### **III. Lewis River Watershed Case Study**

Paul McElhany, Ashley Steel and Pat Olsen all gave presentations on the progress of the case study and issues associated with implementing it. Besides some comments regarding the progress thus far, ideas about the future were identified. In particular, the following actions will take place:

- Pat noted that initial products are expected by the end of January, 2003;
- Cleve will work with Ashley and Dan to determine how the analysis of current conditions (linked to EDT) can be done in the appropriate timeframe;
- Ashley will follow up with Tom regarding the FERC relicensing and how options they have identified might be useful in this process;
- An outstanding question of ‘how far down the list’ or ‘to what degree is the TRT going to answer the issue of what actions’ needs to be addressed.

At the end of the discussion, the group agreed to ask Ashley, Cleve, Paul, and Dan to more formally serve as the Case Study subgroup. In this capacity they were asked to organize a conference call in the near future (JJ will help arrange this) to catch each other up on the ongoing efforts and figure out what next steps are necessary to ensure the full TRT is aware of what is happening and have an opportunity to engage on this issue, especially in light of the emphasis on finalizing the Viability document over the next few months.

Within the context of the case study discussion, Paul McElhany offered some initial thoughts on the TRT process up until now and some ideas about how to address these issues when thinking about the future of the TRT. Given the short amount of time, the group agreed to postpone this discussion until after the Ex Com meeting, but recognized it would be necessary to come back to this in the near future.

### **IV. ‘Finalizing’ the Viability Document**

At the end of the meeting the group confirmed its interest in ‘finalizing’ the Viability document as quickly as possible. By ‘finalizing’ the group agreed they wanted to have completed the substantive work on the document so that it could be turned into a NOAA Technical Memo and therefore referenced in the future. They recognized that they might have to revisit the document in the future, based on future comments, experience, etc., but that such action would be considered in a different context than rewriting the document.

Big issues identified as still needing to be addressed included: growth and abundance, habitat, attribute integration, monitoring, appendices, and comments received from the Ex Com. Given this, the group agreed that they would ‘finalize’ the document by February 28, 2003. They noted the appendices may not be completed at that time but should be done by the end of March. Before deciding on meeting dates, the group discussed what needed to happen to make the next meeting useful. Specifically they agreed the following tasks needed to be accomplished:

- Develop and distribute a revised Habitat Section for review by January 6, 2002 - Cleve Steward, with Tom Backman and Steve Kolmes, and others who indicate an interest;

- Develop and distribute written comments on the document to all TRT members by January 17, 2002 – all TRT members (Note: it was agreed that given the time commitment required, members will only need to discuss issues on which written comments are submitted at the future meetings)
- Create a memo (or some other vehicle) describing data necessary to make decisions about where to go with the growth and abundance criteria by January 17, 2002 – Dan Rawding and Paul McElhany
- Obtain and distribute all Ex Com comments on the document by January 17, 2002 – Paul McElhany
- Review all written comments in advance of the January 23-24 TRT meeting (may depend on the agenda if all comments need to be read as the focus may be on one big issue as opposed to all of them) – all TRT members

Based on these actions, and looking at their schedules, the group came up with three two-day slots for meetings: January 23-24, February 6-7, and February 24-25. Specific agendas will still need to be worked out for each of these meetings.

**Proposed Timeline Including Deadlines:**

December 17-18 – Ex Com Meeting

January 6 – Habitat section rewrite distributed for comment

January 17 – all written comments submitted by TRT members to other TRT members

January 17 – all written comments submitted by Ex Com members to TRT members

January 23-24 – TRT meeting

February 6-7 – TRT meeting

February 24-25 – TRT meeting

February 28 – all substantive work on the body of the Viability document completed

**V. Agreed Upon Action Items**

<b>Action Item – Ex Com Meeting</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>When</b>
1. Develop Viability document presentations for Ex Com meeting.	TRT members – as described above	Monday, December 16
2. Develop Broad Sense Recovery Goals presentations	Paul McElhany	Monday, December 16
3. Develop HPVA presentation.	Craig Busack	Monday, December 16
4. Make 30 copies of presentations and bring to Ex Com meeting (or send to JJ Westfall by 3:00 p.m. Monday, December 16)	All Presenters (or JJ Westfall)	Monday, December 16
5. Talk to the Ex Com facilitator about the agenda.	Paul McElhany and Patty Dornbusch	Monday, December 16
<b>Action Item – Revising Document</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>When</b>
6. Revise and distribute the Habitat section for review.	Cleve Steward (and Tom and Steve)	Monday, January 6, 2003
7. Develop tentative agenda and send	Paul De Morgan and	Friday, January 10, 2003

out logistics for January 23-24 TRT meeting.	Paul McElhany	
8. Submit written comments on the Viability document.	All TRT members	Friday, January 17, 2003
9. Obtain and distribute all written comments from Ex Com.	Paul McElhany	Friday, January 17, 2003
10. Submit additional information regarding growth and abundance options.	Dan Rawding and Paul McElhany	Friday, January 17, 2003
11. Review all written comments on the Viability document.	All TRT members	Thursday, January 23, 2003
<b>Action Item – Case Study</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>When</b>
12. Organize and hold conference call to discuss next steps for the case study.	Paul, Dan, Ashley, Cleve, and JJ	ASAP
13. Distribute results of the conference call to the rest of the TRT.	Paul, Dan, Ashley, Cleve, and JJ	ASAP

**TRT Members in Attendance:**

- Tom Backman
- Craig Busack
- Steve Kolmes (by phone)
- Paul McElhany
- Jim Myers
- Dan Rawding
- Ashley Steel (by phone)
- Cleve Steward

**Others in Attendance:**

- Jen Burke, NOAA (for part of the afternoon)
- Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE
- Patty Dornbusch, NOAA
- Pat Olsen, PWI (for part of the afternoon)
- J.J. Westfall, NOAA