

**OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT**  
**Stakeholder Team Meeting**  
**Bandon Dunes, Bandon**  
**Facilitator's Meeting Summary**  
**October 27, 2005**

**Attendees for all or part of the meeting:**

Stakeholder Team Members: Paul Englemeyer (Audubon-Public at Large), Tom Forgatsch (Farm Industry), Wayne Giesy (Alsea Valley Alliance), Jennifer Hampel (Coquille Watershed Association), Wayne Hoffman (Mid-coast Watershed Council), Tom Kartrude (Port of Siuslaw), Kaitlin Lovell (Trout Unlimited), Mark McCollister (Oregon Trout), Bill Moshofsky (Save the Salmon Coalition), Dennis Richey (Oregon Anglers-NW Steelheaders), Blake Rowe (Longview Fibre Company), Terry Thompson (Assoc. of Oregon Counties), Stan Van de Wetering (Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians), Bill Yocum (Freeman Rock, Inc.)

Resource Advisors:

Ed Bowles (ODFW), Rosemary Furfey (NOAA), Louise Solliday (OR Gov's Office)

Alternates and Technical Resources: Bob Buckman (ODFW), Kevin Craig (Coquille Indian Tribe), Greg Kreimeyer (ODF), Brandon Ford (ODFW), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Mike Gray (ODFW), Mark Grenbemer (ODFW), Les Helgeson (alternate for Bill Bakke, Native Fish Society), Harry Hoogestager (Dave Jarrett (WRD), Dave Jenkins (ODFW), Terry Leeker (Umpqua Basin Watershed Council), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Bridgette Lohrman (NMFS), Dave Loomis (ODFW), Heather Ludeman (NMFS), Mike Mader (Ten Mile Basin Watershed Council), Cindy Meyers (South Coast Watershed Council), Jo Morgan (ODF), Jim Muck (ODFW), Mike Northrop (USDA Forest Service), Maggie Peyton (Nehalem Watershed Council), Tom Shafer (OWEB), Jon Souder (Coos Watershed Council), Tim Stevenson (ODA), Heather Stout (NOAA-TRT), Karen Tarnow (ODEQ), Ray Wilkeson (OFIC)

Other Interested Parties: Ted Cart, Dan Delaney, Leo Grandmontagne (Wild Fish for Oregon), Representative Wayne Krieger, Tom Kulkotz, Mary Scurlock (Pacific Rivers Council)

Facilitation Team: Donna Silverberg, Robin Harkless

**Action Items**

Action	Who	By When
Send clarifying language for 9/23 notes to facilitation team	Blake Rowe	November 4
Forward responses on Bilby's research to stakeholder team	Les Helgeson	November meeting
Forward specific issues/questions on Forest Practices Act, relative to coho conservation plan,	Stakeholder Team	November meeting

to Blake Rowe		
Forward recommendations for Board of Forestry to stakeholder team	Jo Morgan	<u>Done:</u> November 1
Connect watershed council, etc. presentations with chapters of the conservation plan, and share with stakeholder team	ODFW	November 11
Send NOAA's guidelines for developing recovery plans, revised format, to stakeholder team	Rosemary Furfey	November 11

**Comments on September 23, 2005 Summary Notes**

- Page 3: Follow up on water rights/use issue: Tom Forgatsch found that Bandon does use more than its allotted water. From Tom's perspective, domestic wells are a problem; at 15,000 gallons a day, they hold more than a water right. 193 domestic wells have been drilled. Unrestricted water rights need to be looked at. From the notes, he believes the 1/10 data is off. He suggested having a representative from the Water Resources Department attend a meeting and talk more about this. (Dave Jarrett was in attendance during today's meeting.)
- Page 5: Under 'Management Strategy of Choice', add: 'The third leg of the stool, salmon sensitive regulation of agencies, is wobbly.'
- Page 5, "Desired Status", add: 'Use smolt production as the primary currency for setting desired status goals for coho, based on what it takes to get a minimum return during bad ocean years.'
- Page 9: Under projects from Jeff Light's presentation: Include 'falling trees directly in streams, research on buffer only on south side of stream, ways to design to get the least amount of stream, Newton's research'.
- Page 8, Blake Rowe's presentation:
  - **ACTION:** Blake will send language from his presentation to clarify the bullets.

Local media outreach: Local station KCBY attended today's meeting. ODFW does press releases for each of the stakeholder team meetings. It was noted that this will be more important as the process continues, and there will be more push for a media connection. Kevin Goodson reported that town hall meetings will be scheduled when the final draft of the conservation plan is completed and released for public comment. Louise Solliday provided copies of the Newport Times article from the September 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting in Newport.

Clarification of Limiting Factors and Current and Future Threats: Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, reported that her advisor was making a few changes and she will send the draft guidance document to the stakeholder team prior to the next meeting.

**Follow up on Desired Status**

Kevin Goodson provided a handout of ODFW's draft desired status under poor ocean conditions. The number 200,000 in the graph was based on Wayne Hoffman's concept

presented at the last meeting.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments:

- Re: In the carrying capacity model, what is the recruit curve? It is based on actual performance of the fish and estimated to full seeding. Gaps between desired and current status are identified, then look at a specific area's potential for meeting carrying capacity.
- Paul Englemeyer still has technical questions about full seeding, and suggested this issue has implications for whether he could endorse the desired status concept presented today. ODFW offered that Amendment 13 may come into play later but is not a focus for now. It was clarified that 'full seeding' used in the graph is not the same as full seeding in Amendment 13, but is based on Mark Chilcote's work. ODFW recognizes that uncertainty around full seeding is an issue that needs to be resolved, and that resolution may not occur before the conservation plan is written. The concept will be included as a proportion of full seeding and likely be resolved later when ground-truthing the plan.
- Several approaches were suggested during Wayne Hoffman's presentation at the last meeting. The graph presented today has produced some anomalies (e.g. 10 mile Lake is not able to carry as much weight as the graph shows, more could be done in the Siuslaw, Yaquina and others have greater potential), and the next step will be to understand what it would take/where opportunities really exist (feasibility). This is a good first step.
- What does 's max' correspond to? About half, or 100,000. Simply put, full seeding during poor ocean conditions would require a doubling of fish numbers. What is the stakeholder team being asked to review – numbers, an approach for allocating back to basins, or both? ODFW responded that they are looking for input on a reasonable desired status number, and identifying where the most work is needed.
- How do you measure poor ocean survival? The Oregon Production Index is used. "1%" is worst, "10%" is best. Historical numbers are used; this might have caused some of the anomalies in the graph.
- "Current status" is a 1993-99 average. This is a lower than low average, as the poorest ocean conditions were seen during this time period. ODFW agreed. Adult returns were so low that smolt production could not get close to filling the habitat. ODFW's goal is to reach a point that smolt production is not so influenced by poor ocean conditions. Variance in spawning density is such that severe localized problems arise/exist. The desired condition is two-fold: increasing productivity and increasing carrying capacity (high quality habitat). The group was reminded that the state's assessment identified over-wintering habitat as the main bottleneck area.
- Is the desired status achievable? We may be setting an unrealistic bar. Fundamentally changing the habitat at a landscape scale will be VERY challenging, even to get to 's max'. Why set the goal higher than 's max'?
- Have habitat conditions not been improving? The habitat has stabilized as far as metrics show; but the data does not show improvements to habitat at the landscape scale. Still, the fact that we do not appear to be deteriorating is an important step. Given this, fish numbers may not matter as much in years to come, as we will put our best efforts forth, and improvements will be made as we progress.
- In some areas, habitat is NOT the primary limiting factor. (E.g., in the Yaquina,

predators are a problem.) Look at other options.

Kaitlin Lovell, Trout Unlimited, provided a handout and shared ideas about desired status from the fish conservation perspective. They went back to the statutes for a definition of recovery in the Oregon Plan. While they believe it is a good start, a few issues were identified. Diversity is not explained, and should include life history and genetics; ISAB concluded that you must look at all populations not just those looked at by ODFW; and finally, looking at the state's numbers, societal benefits were at zero. From the fish conservationists' perspective, recovery means that societal benefits need to be seen in almost all years. Generally, their suggested approach is to look at smaller scale areas for potentials to meet desired status/recovery.

Preferring a qualitative description, they offered a broad brush quantitative desired status of 760,000-1.4 million returning adults. At a minimum, nutrient requirements at 1.4-1.5 million. They also went back to the TRT document for smolt abundance – roughly 400 fish/mile. They suggested starting to talk about management actions that would be needed to get to desired status. Overall, everyone must do something. Look at stream by stream needs. Kaitlin had copies of the Oregon Business Council's vision for salmon, a business plan for how salmon recovery can be done and provide a benefit to the Oregon economy. If anyone wants a hard copy, contact Kaitlin.

Donna Silverberg reminded everyone that this is a first step in looking at desired status, and that the group will have the opportunity to refine the concept at future stakeholder team meetings.

#### Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments

- Clarification: 400 fish/mile does not need to be all coho. Some Chinook, some chum, etc. Further clarification: The TRT says up to 400 fish/mile.
- **Action:** As a follow-up item from a previous stakeholder team meeting, Les Helgeson reported that he received responses on Bilby's research and offered to send the information to the stakeholder team.
- What about seals and birds? Yes, this issue needs to be addressed but was not included in the handouts; it should be added to harvest/predation. Through a stream by stream analysis, these limiting factors will reveal themselves, at which time something would be done to address them.
- Look also at ocean management of other stocks.

Additional feedback from the group on the desired status concept is welcome. ODFW shared their perspective that we need to understand the basis of desired status and current condition numbers to understand what would need to be changed to get to these numbers. While there is some disagreement over the numbers, the fish conservationists think it is a good range. Ed Bowles offered that to keep the concepts 'apples to apples, the desired status concept from the fish conservationists should equate to ocean conditions, as in ODFW's analysis.

#### Additional questions:

- In what way does the current standard not get at recovery as defined in the statute? The

assessment meets VSP attributes but does NOT ensure societal and ecological benefits. That is what we are looking to address in developing a desired status.

- Just because there may not be a fishery provided in every year, it does not mean you have failed in providing societal benefits. This is just one interpretation of societal benefits. This concept needs to be further negotiated by the stakeholder team.
- Suggestion: The stakeholder team should review the business plan provided and have discussion later about it.
- As history shows, there may not be societal benefits every year, no matter what we do.
- The desired status concepts presented today provide great options. The next step will be to do a side by side comparison to better understand how the options line up.
- Suggestion – send the Lackey paper to the stakeholder team – it may only be available in hard copy.

### **Follow up discussion on Forestry Issues and Next Steps**

Following a small group discussion, the stakeholder team identified outstanding questions from Blake Rowe's presentation at the September 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting, and suggestions for future management strategies for coho conservation relative to forestry.

Questions the group may want to discuss included:

- Status of riparian protection as compared to other “salmon states”? Federal, state, counties, etc. management. How do fisheries compare? What are economic implications of different states' Forest Practices Acts? How do economies vary?
  - Jo Morgan, ODF, noted that many of these questions are answered in the ODF booklet – copies were available at the meeting.
- Monoculturing and diversity issues – how do they play into coho issues?
- What benefit does one size set back have for coho and the forest industry?
- What changes to the Forest Practices Act (FPA) should be contemplated for coho? Is this fair?
- What are constraints on the forest industry of a “leave it to beaver” strategy to assist channel complexity? (See below for further discussion.)
- How can we use natural events to assist in channel complexity through management actions (e.g. road issues, trees and landslide events)?
- How are IMST recommendations being addressed? (See below for further discussion.)
- Does the Oregon FPA meet Clean Water Act standards? If not, by how much?
- What is the relationship of channel migration zones to forest practices?
- What is the review of research on light on streams telling us?
- How do we identify incentive strategies to help wood delivery to needed places at the right time? What are other states doing on this?
- How does difference of length of rotation effect the adequacy of the FPA in fostering restoration of in-stream and riparian conditions?
- Are there more opportunities to get large wood where needed?
- Are there opportunities for trade offs between high and low intrinsic potential areas?

Suggested strategies for the conservation plan included and will need further explanation:

- Continue culvert replacement program
- Riparian thinning for large wood

- Research and Monitoring
- Through incentives, encourage private timber industry to increase the probability of availability for wood in streams– See below
- Business plan for balancing economics with actions
- Leave it to Beaver – See below
- Wood debris from flows and landslides
- Falling trees into streams
- Riparian management areas above fish barriers
- Increase basal area target for medium and small Type F streams

As time permitted, Blake Rowe responded to a few of the questions and suggested strategies that were offered by the group:

‘Leave it to Beaver’: Forestry has seen less beaver control on some private lands than in the past. On low gradient streams many have buffers already so beavers are impacting the existing buffers. In some areas, where roads are an issue (blocking culverts, e.g.), there is very little if any beaver control, so the ‘leave it to beaver’ concept is not far from what is already happening. Given this, ODFW may initiate, through experimental management, curtailing harvest of beavers in a specific zone, and measure the response. (Blake agreed that this is possible, but there may need to be some allowances for problems with water temperature and nutrients).

- Question: What about BLM land? It is not covered under the Forest Practices Act, but is covered under federal regulation, e.g. the Northwest Forest Plan, etc.
- **ACTION**: Stakeholder team members will forward any specific issues and questions from the Forest Practices Act to the facilitation team to pass on to Blake, including suggestions about what is being/needs to be done to change the Act.
- Question: Consider relocating ‘bad actor’ beavers?

The IMST report on forestry was reviewed by the Forest Practices Advisory Council (FPAC). From the report, a set of recommendations from DOF went to the Board of Forestry, and many of those recommendations have been addressed. At the 11/22 Board of Forestry meeting, the Board will decide whether to go forward with formal rulemaking for the following rule concepts: Riparian management areas above fish barriers (to ensure riparian vegetation is maintained on stream reaches that have the potential to become accessible by fish once an artificial barrier is removed but are currently classified as non-fish streams); wood from debris flows and landslides (a minor adjustment to an existing rule standard is being recommended because there is increasing scientific evidence that small non-fish-bearing streams prone to debris flows provide an important source of large wood for downstream fish habitat); and increase basal area target for medium and small Type F streams (increase the standard and active management basal area retention requirements within RMAs along small and medium fish bearing streams in western Oregon).

**ACTION**: Jo Morgan, ODF, forwarded the proposed rule changes for the 11/22 Board of Forestry meeting to the stakeholder team.

- Question: Do we have adequate monitoring of woody debris? Can we monitor instream habitat conditions? These questions should be directed more to ODFW. From the forest industries perspective, many good projects are happening, and there could be more.

Jo Morgan added that the adequacy of the Forest Practices Act is being addressed by the Board of Forestry. Discussions have been on-going for a long time and will continue to be discussed; the discussion will not end on November 22<sup>nd</sup>. ODF is putting together a report on the Hinkle Creek research, which will fold into the discussions. The stakeholder team can provide ideas about how we can meet needs of over-wintering habitat, but we do not have time to debate the Forest Practices Act through this stakeholder process.

### **Management Actions to Address Limiting Factors and Current and Future Threats: Local Populations and Perspectives**

#### *Coquille Watershed Association*

Jennifer Hampel presented background information on the Coquille Watershed Association and discussed limiting factors and management actions specific to the area. See the coho website, [www.oregon-plan.org](http://www.oregon-plan.org) for slides from Jennifer's power point. Formed in 1993, the Association originally was very focused on coho fisheries. It then expanded to other groups, including timber, business, etc. Jennifer noted that every watershed council is different, and that the Coquille focuses on restoration projects. The 'old' way of getting projects going everywhere with less time spent prioritizing helped the Association make contacts with locals so now folks are aware of what the Association does; however, very little monitoring was done in the beginning.

To meet the goals of the Board (getting restoration on the ground), and to evolve to a more strategically functioning group, the Association is currently prioritizing actions and has increased and improved its monitoring. Next steps include finalizing basin assessments and updating the management action plan.

#### Limiting factors identified:

- Stream complexity (more specifically, lowland habitats of which wetlands are virtually nonexistent now – reduced by 90%.) To address wetlands has been politically difficult but the Association is implementing pilot projects for usable wetland habitat, restoring the wetland (juvenile habitat) while allowing landowners to continue to use the land.
- Lack of spawning habitat was deemed NOT a limiting factor by the Association.
- Instream structure is a limiting factor as an over-wintering habitat.
- Temperature is still being debated – riparian shade assessments being used to look at this area. And, it may not be realistic to get temperatures down.

#### Management actions:

- Primary focus on wetlands.
- Targeted “cluster area” riparian restoration projects.
- Instream projects focusing on juvenile habitat.
- Monitoring data is now posted on the website and very accessible.

Jennifer reiterated that expectations will depend on the specific watershed council, since every council has its unique focus. Management actions should be site specific.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments:

- Kudos, you have done everything the watershed councils were originally designed to do. Now monitoring will be important as results of restoration projects may not be known for 20 years.
- Has the Coquille STEP hatchery program been successful? Yes, the Coquille program has been successful in public outreach and educating and motivating volunteers. Broodstock collection and monitoring is needed for this as well as everything else.
- Look at current and future threats – and at those that used to be threats that could re-emerge and should be monitored.

*Coos Watershed Council*

Jon Souder offered that the Coos Watershed Council (WC) has taken three main approaches to management: a function approach similar to OWEB project investment priorities; the Reeves et. al coho limiting factors technique; and an approach being developed as part of a Sea Grant project – see the coho website for Jon’s slides.

The Coos watershed holds the largest urban area and largest estuary on the coast. So, the WC is looking at aquaculture in water quality in addition to fish, e.g. crab and larva species. The primary limiting factor is water quality. Concerns include: high summer water temperatures; high sediment loads (dredging to address this); and high bacteria levels and sources affecting oyster cultivation. This and other information can be found on the WC’s web site. [www.cooswatershed.org](http://www.cooswatershed.org).

The WC looked at limiting factors on a sub-region scale. The upper watershed area contains corporate timber land, and these corporations (Weyerhaeuser and Menasha) work well with the WC to do restoration projects. The sub-region holds high intrinsic potential for coho—stream complexity (cleaned out or splash-dammed) is the primary limiting factor: too much sediment is put into streams, mainly from legacy forest roads. The WC is working with its partners to address sediment issues.

The heads of tide region is forested in the uplands, agricultural in the lowlands. It does not hold as much coho as in the upper watershed area but does provide crucial refugia. The primary limiting factor here is bank stability and shade: for cooling streams.

The slough system region is forested uplands, urban/rural residential lowlands. It does not hold high potential for spawning, but does contain critical rearing areas. The primary limiting factor is connectivity (between sloughs and adjacent land); secondary is hatchery releases (hard to quantify but many hatchery fish are released and are likely impacting coho).

The direct bay tributaries region contains industrial forest in its uplands, private land managed for forestry in the valley; and agricultural and rural residential in the lowlands. This sub-region is potentially highly productive for coho. Tide gates at the mouths do not



seem to be reducing fish numbers. The primary limiting factor is floodplain connectivity; the secondary is stream water temperatures.

The Coos Watershed Council management actions include working with landowners to match up with what landowners want to do with their property. Actions fall into four restoration categories: Restore watershed connectivity (passage at culverts and tide gates, stream/floodplain connectivity, natural stream flow restoration); restore watershed processes (control sediment inputs, riparian planting, rip-rap removal); restore watershed inputs (irrigation improvements); and restore symptoms of disturbance (large wood placement, create natural channels, install water/sediment control basins).

Summer/winter habitat and channel complexity as identified key limiting factors are both likely due to poor connectivity. To address this, the WC is using a decision support system to look at reaches of the river and how fish respond to various habitat types and restoration actions. Next step include monitoring.

Next step goals are to: Gather good restoration data if not already available; participate in group restoration projects; get active involvement of landowners; look at and address limiting factors (different than being only opportunistic); and monitor.

#### Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments

- What about hatchery fish? There are very few strays in the area.
- What type of monitoring are you doing? There are four stream gauging stations, temperature monitors, spawning reach monitoring, life cycle monitoring, and an extensive riparian monitoring program; overall there is a real commitment to monitoring.
- When and where are fish using the streams? The WC's understanding is poor on this.
- Have you seen different outcomes with the three approaches to limiting factors? It is too soon to tell, and also they have different spatial perspectives.
- What is the dredging affect on oyster aquaculture? Not much because dredging is happening in a different area from oyster aquaculture. However, there is a potential for bacteria increase due to movement and sediment.
- For lowland agriculture, is CREP a good resource? CREP is our best tool to work with landowners in lowland areas. There is a potential problem with the amount of technical paperwork. There is a need for an alternative for those areas that do not want to use CREP, as well as a need to build trust between agricultural landowners and CREP.

#### *Sixes, Floras and New River: South Coast Watershed Council*

Harry Hoogestager introduced the South Coast WC's limiting factors matrix. Using OWEB guidance and local experts, an assessment, action plans and limiting factors matrix were produced Harry noted that the work is about halfway done.

Cindy Myers also noted that the matrix is in draft form and should be available in the next couple months. The WC will use the matrix to help prioritize actions. She highlighted limiting factors for each of the rivers of focus for the South Coast WC. Her presentation can be found on the Coho Project website.

Sixes – Consists of a low gradient, unconfined flood plain (which provides over-wintering habitat); tributaries (clear water), clay soil (affecting turbidity and runoff); a complex estuary; and high nutrient levels. The data from the Sixes is new and not yet published. Off channel habitats include swamp, flood overflow channels, beavers, runoff pollutants, an impaired macro invertebrate community, and varying habitat quality. Recently, a conservation easement was secured for 50 years on the dry river.

Floras – Consists of clay soil, high runoff/low summer flows, low gradient habitat, more water yield, and better shade and supply of hard wood in the upper area. Downstream is sensitive to erosion, has a history of bank stabilization and aversion to beavers. Off channel habitats connect with the New River, but are disconnected from the floodplain. An important tributary feeds into the Floras. Confined by rip rap, sediment cannot be trapped. The lower mainstem was straightened.

New River – Off channel habitats include: high value coastal lakes and complex lakes, channels, and ditches. Tributaries that drain uplands, straightened/incised/depositional, ditches were dug to drain wetlands but caused problems, water quality concerns, complex issues around artificially breaching (which has been done).

- Public comment—Degradation of the New River occurred as a result of building the highway/bridge, and straightening the river. Breaching caused problems.

South Coast WC management actions include: livestock exclusion, riparian improvements and planting, fish passage, large wood placement, upland sediment treatments, gorse management, constructed wetlands from cranberries, Conservation Reserves (we need to find a way to streamline and make this program easier for landowners).

Channel complexity and water quality were identified as the key limiting factors for the South Coast WC.

#### *Umpqua Basin Watershed Council*

Terry Leeker presented information on the Umpqua Basin WC. Projects include: education, fish passage, flow modification, GIS data collection, large wood/boulder placement, research and monitoring, riparian restoration, watershed assessments, and channel reconstruction. Through planned and, mostly, opportunistic means, projects are implemented after receiving feedback from the Technical Advisory Committee.

Management strategies include: Working with habitat biologists at ODFW, tying old projects into new (structure placement; mixing landowner with timber industry to move up river, etc.); project monitoring; and using the SWCD's culvert ratings to prioritize for maintenance and replacement.

Terry concluded with a question for the group to consider, and welcomed feedback: How do watershed councils plan for monitoring and restoration management when most are surviving hand to mouth?

Comment: Dan Delaney, who is working with the Coquille Tribe, noted that they are putting together a review team to look at the Coquille River Basin Management Plan. Anyone interested in hearing more or getting involved should contact him at (541) 659-8515, or [wildriver@charter.net](mailto:wildriver@charter.net). The deadline for completing the plan is June 2006.

Public comments:

- What about introduced fish? This is an issue in some areas, and more information can be found on the WC's website. What about starting a population? How do you do that? Through desired status, the state will look at fish-based abundance and productivity criteria along with objectives for getting there, with a focus on habitat. The current status of coho is available in the assessment.
- CREP contracts cover 280 acres in Coos County, 430 in Curry County, 483 in Umpqua County, 243 in Lane County, and in other areas. Success of the program depends on the willingness of landowners. Most recently, Klamath has gotten involved.
- Priority actions have been acknowledged by the forest industry, and there is a need to see evidence that actions are being taken, e.g. watershed enhancement projects. (This is not always apparent in dollars and number of miles, so show more specifically how the work ties into habitat and other coho needs.) Finally, this group should focus on controversial areas in the Forest Practices Act that relate to what goes into the coho conservation plan. This group could and should influence other decision-making bodies, e.g. the Board of Forestry.

Small group discussions:

The group listed additional limiting factors they heard from the presentations today, that may not yet be part of the state's list. They include:

- Sediment in the Coos,
- Political and legal infrastructures (e.g. funding rules),
- Wetland restoration,
- Invasive species (plant bird, fish, etc),
- Floodplain connectivity,
- Bank stability,
- Water quality (e.g. mercury, temperature, quantity, seasonal changes in hydrograph-peak flow alterations),
- Hatchery releases

Current and future threats the group identified included:

- Developmental pressures,
- Predators (exotic/invasive species, striped bass),
- Diking and channelization,
- Complex paperwork programs for incentives,
- Phosphorous overloading,
- Spills of noxious materials,
- Uncertainty of funding for local projects/efforts,
- Changes in stream flow patterns and bank stabilization projects,
- Recruitment of wood debris (more needed),

- Road building (legacy and new),
- Invasive species,
- Size of hatchery releases

Finally, the group listed management strategies they heard from the presentations, which included:

- Monitoring,
- Streamlining the application process,
- Need for more responsive incentives programs/relationship building with agriculture industry.
- Create “natural” channels for fish

A suggestion was made to link the listed limiting factors with current and future threats and with management actions.

**ACTION:** ODFW will link information from the watershed council presentations/suggestions to chapters of the conservation plan.

#### **Resource User Group Perspectives: Focus Local Agriculture**

Tom Forgatsch presented information on agriculture, specifically cranberry farming. Cranberry growers consider themselves stewards of the land – many cranberry growers have been around for two or three generations. The marine environment makes the south coast area prime for growing cranberries, and the beds provide excellent wildlife habitat. For every acre of bed, four acres of ‘support’ are needed. Water management is very important: cranberry growers dig sumps for storage and use, and usually have more water than needed for growing, which creates additional habitat.

Management actions include more eco-conscious pest management approaches, and re-use management of water.

Question: Is water quantity an issue? There are ways to access water in this area, water close to the ocean that gets out via cracks (not rivers). It is just a matter of finding the water.

Windhurst Reservoir is a water district contributed by cranberry growers, who use and sell the water, and the water serves as wildlife habitat. The cranberry growers are currently proposing the Johnson Creek project, another reservoir for water storage, at a cost of \$3 million (including studies).

Question re: grower guidelines/Best Management Practices: Does this include water quality monitoring? Yes, the cranberry farming community is sensitive about water quality. The Food Protection Act looks closely at the content of cranberries for contamination. Cranberry farmers conform to SB 1010, CZMA, CWA, ESA and FQPA. Copies were made available the cranberry grower’s best management practices.

Question: How will the reservoir project be impacted by the predicted population growth on the south coast? The reservoir would not be able to support the expected growth – water storage is key.

Question re: SB 1010: How does cranberry agriculture compare to other agriculture in this area? There are many other types of agriculture in the area. Dairy here is moving toward organic.

Question: If phosphorous was a problem, what would you do to alleviate it? One solution would be to run water into certain storages to break it down. There is an Extension study on phosphorous, specifically looking at artificial wetland treatment; anyone that is interested should talk with Tom Forgatsch. The study found that background and outflow water were not that much different, and never exceeded EPA's standards.

**ACTION:** Per request, Tim Stevenson, ODA, will provide a short presentation on SB 1010 rules at the next stakeholder team meeting.

### **Meeting Schedule/Agendas**

**November 14 (12:30-6:30)-15 (9-3:00) Rockaway Beach:** North Coast Populations

- User perspective: Agriculture – dairy and SB 1010 presentation from ODA
- Local Perspectives on limiting factors and management strategies: North Coast Populations
- Resource User Perspectives: municipalities/tribal focus
- Desired Status
- Feedback on ODFW staff draft chapter on mid-coast populations

Les Helgeson offered to do a field trip on the morning of 11/14 before the start of the meeting.

An additional meeting was scheduled for December 8 in Roseburg. An agenda will be sent out prior to the meeting.

### **Comments on ODFW's Work Plan**

ODFW provided a draft work plan for developing a conservation plan. The stakeholder team provided initial comments:

- The NOAA chapters corresponding to the chapters in the work plan are NOAA's guidelines for developing recovery plans.
  - **ACTION:** A revised document from NOAA (changed only in format) will be forwarded from Rosemary Furfey to the group.
- How is the iterative process built in? If we are to comment, we need more than a week to review the draft conservation plan. ODFW responded that it will be a 'drafty' draft. The agency will be looking for feedback on whether they are heading in the right direction. And, there will be opportunity for additional feedback later.