OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT
Stakeholder Team Meeting
Roseburg, OR
Facilitator's Meeting Summary
December 8, 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), Paul Heikkila (OSU Extension Sea Grant), Les Helgeson (alternate for Bill Bakke, Native Fish Society), Cindy Heller (STEP), Wayne Hoffman (Mid-coast Watershed Council), 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), Johnny Sundstrom (Siuslaw SWCD)

Resource Advisors:
Rosemary Furfey (NOAA), Jay Nicholas (ODFW), Louise Solliday (OR Gov's Office)

Alternates and Technical Resources: Chris Bayham (AOC), Keith Braun (ODFW), Bob Buckman (ODFW), Todd Bukoltz (Tillamook Forest), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Mike Gray (ODFW), Dan Knoll (ODFW), Lance Kruzik (NOAA), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Jo Morgan (ODF), Jim Muck (ODFW), Jake Wynne (BLM)

Other Interested Parties: Mike Rashoe (STEP), Walt Morgan (public)

Facilitation Team: Donna Silverberg, Robin Harkless, Erin Halton

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Send clarifying language to facilitation team for November 14 & 15 meeting notes	Blake Rowe, Stan Van de Wetering	December 16
Send comments to Rosemary on coho progress report for NOAA	Stakeholder Team	December 16
Report on NOAA discussion with TRT re: products, alignment with recovery plan process.	Rosemary Furfey	At January meeting
Provide explanation of changes in spawner estimates and stakeholder input into re-designing spawner surveys	Jay Nicholas to Cindy Heller, Paul Englemeyer	Before January meeting
Discuss hatchery issues	Richey, Hoffman, Buckman, Nicholas	Before January Meeting
"Parking Lot Issue": Possible presentation on broad social and economic implications for coho recovery plan with stakeholder team. Discuss cost, returns, incentives.	Presentation by Tom Makowski (NRCS economist), NOAA economist	Future meeting

'Parking Lot Issue': Hatchery effects/role in conservation	Stakeholder Team	Future meeting
'Parking Lot Issue': Abandoned and dependent populations	Stakeholder Team	Future meeting
Share the latest information on tidegate research with the stakeholder team	Rosemary Furfey	January meeting
Check into how the Forest Practices Act addresses beaver trapping	Jo Morgan	January meeting
Fill in north coast chapter of coho plan with info from watershed council and other presentations, and share with stakeholder team	ODFW	January 13
Review list of stakeholder questions relevant to coho plan re: forest practices, for response at January 20 meeting	Kevin Goodson, Jo Morgan, Blake Rowe	January meeting
Develop process plan/schedule for the next four months and send to Stakeholder Team	Facilitation Team, Steering Committee	January meeting

Follow-up from Rockaway Beach Meeting

Comments on November 14-15, 2005 Summary Notes

- Page 3: Remove typo "**(Note:"** at end of 'Action' item.
- Page 5: Where the paragraph starts 'Implementation', begin sentence with "**Mark Trenholm explained that…**" to clarify.
- Page 5: Clarify under "Other Examples/East Humbug Creek Project" that Longview Fibre built the bridge, not the watershed council.
    - **ACTION**: Blake Rowe will send specific language to the facilitation team on this.
- Page 6, last paragraph: Add "**Upper**" to Nehalem for temperature, and remove 'primary' from temperature as a limiting factor. Also change 'habitat' to '**connectivity**' for flooding and floodplain.
- Page 12: Under *Questions*, 'How many smolts are seen in the Siletz area?' The facilitation team will check with Stan Van de Wetering to better clarify which area the 100 smolts are seen.
- Page 12: Under *Questions*, 'What happens to coho in the mainstem? Add 'i**n the Drift Creek portion of the estuary where there is a beaver dam**' to 'one site'.
- Page 13: Under '*Question to ODFW*': It was clarified that a substantial portion of the funding for implementation of broad-based effectiveness monitoring is coming from the Forest Service. While the 11/14 notes will not be changed because the issue was not part of our last meeting's discussion, the point is noted in these notes.
- Page 14: Under stakeholder comments on desired status: Change sentence to read: "Concerns remain for **some stakeholders** with the concept of intrinsic potential."
- Page 14: Remove from **ACTION** sentence: 'that has been peer reviewed and verified to support the historic numbers referenced' since co-manager review has occurred, but no "peer review".
- Page 15: Under the 'red flag' comment about 'historic TRT estimates': Add that

'This suggests we **may** need to bring hatchery fish into our targeted levels, and add to last sentence, '**if we intend to support fisheries and Oregon's economy**.'

- Page 17: First bullet, change beginning of first sentence to read: "Can we **use** the lakes system as a **model** for a goal or desired status…"
- Page 17, *Next step suggestion*: In middle of paragraph, change sentence to read: 'The recovery plan will set ESU-wide sideboards, and watershed councils **and many others** will implement the plan.'
- Comment: There is a watershed council-centric tone to the notes and discussions. In terms of economics, many others are supporting and doing the work on the ground. Only focusing on the watershed councils detracts from the successful partnerships that exist. In particular, we need to acknowledge private landowners for their involvement in recovery of the coho. (The group agreed with this point).

NOAA's Progress Report on Plan

Rosemary Furfey provided handouts of NOAA's draft progress report for Recovery Planning for Oregon Coast Coho. At the end of December, it will be posted along with other draft recovery plans, reports, etc, on NOAA's website.

Stakeholder Team members provided initial suggestions on the report:

- List the items in the last table in chronological order and clearly identify parties responsible for each task.
- It was clarified that Oregon is hoping to deliver a draft plan by June 2006, not December 2006.
- The state's coho assessment needs to be prominently identified in the report in addition to watershed council assessments.
- Page 5: Question about the TRT process for completing a limiting factors and threats assessment. Rosemary scheduled a meeting with the TRT on December 12, to brief them on the Coho Stakeholder Team and conservation planning process and to inquire about how to make use of the TRT product for this process, since the two groups schedules are off. NOAA (and others) wants to try to align the processes as much as possible. Rosemary will share more on this at the next stakeholder team meeting. Currently, ODFW is moving forward using the state's assessment of limiting factors. And so far, it appears they line up with what the TRT is finding.
    - A concern was raised. What happens if the two do not align? Rosemary offered that this concern addresses the dynamic tension between robust science and NOAA's process deadlines for the plans. As new information comes out with the draft plan, adjustments will be made where necessary. Kevin Goodson offered that ODFW will ask the TRT to identify any glaring gaps, and if necessary, the timeline might be adjusted to address those issues. But how do we incorporate TRT guidance without a product? Not just for viability but in other areas, e.g. developing management actions. We don't want to waste our time. It was noted that a co-manager document that speaks to this will be out next month and will be made available to the stakeholder team.
- What about those factors, e.g. water quality, that we want to protect, not just those limiting factors we need to fix? Where does sustaining fit in? ODFW suggested

that the plan will address these under 'current conditions' and 'future threats'. All factors that contribute to viability should be listed in the plan. Jay Nicholas noted that secondary limiting factors also speak to the need to support areas like water quality.

- Under "Background Information" on page 1: As written, the focus on historical conditions sets us up to strive for an unrealistic goal and states a clear bias about man's impact on fish. So many factors are involved in the life cycle of salmon, and there are many unknowns. We don't know that the fish were always thriving and maybe had natural ups and downs. Other stakeholders see NOAA's statement as one of fact; NOAA was encouraged to change the first paragraph to read the past "150" years, not 'several hundred years'.
- Page 7 '*Estimate Time and Cost of Recovery Actions*': Jo Morgan, ODF, shared an article from the Western Forester, "Societal Changes Lead to Forest Fragmentation". She offered that the article speaks to the need to understand economic and social projections while developing a conservation/recovery plan.
    - **'Parking Lot Issue'**: Tom Makowski, a social economist with NRCS, has offered to give a presentation to the stakeholder team on broad-scale social and economic issues. NOAA offered to invite their economist to join that discussion.
- NOAA is still on track to make a decision about whether or not to list coast Coho. Will the document be revised when the decision is made? Yes, the report that gets posted will have the most up-to-date information. NOAA will stay involved regardless of the decision, and language to that effect is included in the report. It was noted that the listing decision could help shape language in the 'Background Information' paragraph that raised concerns earlier, without changing the general path we are on: toward a sustaining coho population.
- Note the progress report is an internal document from NOAA staff to NOAA executives.
- Page 7: Concern was raised about NOAA economists offering time estimates; shouldn't it be Oregonians that set timeframes? The language needs to better reflect a partnership between federal agencies and locals in putting time and cost estimates on recovery.
- Cycles of fish numbers needs to be considered even in historical times; there has been and will always be ups and downs. For example, in the 1840's tribes had problems fishing because there were no fish. This should be noted.
- Better emphasize that this plan also serves as a state conservation plan. Describe this more clearly. Cite the coho project website under 'Additional information about salmon recovery activities and recovery plan products is located at…'
    - **ACTION**: Stakeholder Team members will send any additional comments on the progress report to Rosemary by Friday, December 16.

Follow-up: Smolt Estimates

Kevin Goodson shared information on fish spawning estimates converted to smolts, per a request at the last meeting. He provided an explanation of the handout, noting that the numbers in the document are not exact, but rather the tables provide estimates.

ACTION: The facilitation team will email the tables to the stakeholder team. The email

will include an explanation of why the numbers are different from those on the assessment on the website (generally, because spawning survey data had to be broken down differently). The estimates on the website will be updated using the new format. A suggestion was made to ground truth the estimates to answer whether the numbers make sense. The 'picture' version of the third table in the handout can be found on page 15 of the Oregon Plan coho assessment.

Mid-Coast Populations Outline

As time for discussion was short at the last meeting, Stakeholder Team members were given the opportunity to provide additional comments on the Mid-Coast Populations draft of the Coho Conservation Plan. Comments and questions are summarized below:

- When the plan is written, how will it be organized? At this point, ODFW plans to divide the document into ESU-wide and basin/area specific components. ODFW staff welcome suggestions for different format ideas.
- On the land use planning slide, the reference to 'setbacks from waterways' needs to be refined to point out that setbacks were needed for fish and population growth. Customization ideas (for site specific development) should be included.
- What is the role of estuarine habitat? Estuarine habitat is addressed in the research chapter (and needs to be emphasized more in this chapter).
- All our rivers are on the (303)d list, so highlight areas where water quality is a future threat. This will need to be addressed during full seeding discussions too.
- Have you changed the draft with our comments? Later drafts will reflect stakeholder comments. (E.g. HIP and hatchery smolt releases will be further elaborated on in a future draft.)
- Question about methodology: Are your estimates for numbers of spawners different from what was used in the 1980's? Jay Nicholas offered that major changes in methodology occurred in 1990: With more people resources, more sites, and counts done more often, counts became more accurate and precise. He added that another revision is about to happen, with a shift in focus to population scale monitoring. (Comment: ODFW should include confidence levels at each stage of the modeling effort, and should provide them into the future to show an increase in confidence; otherwise it looks like you are comparing apples to apples when you are not. The table becomes meaningless over time if you do not include confidence intervals.)
- How do we input into the process of re-designing spawning standard surveys?
    - **ACTION**: Jay Nicholas will look into this and get back to Paul Englemeyer. (The state is also looking at re-designing habitat surveys, doing more surveys, and, as stated earlier, getting better estimates on a population scale.)
- **ACTION**: Cindy Heller would like to better understand how estimates were 'changed'; Jay Nicholas will talk with her.
- Water quality and stream complexity are different than hatcheries in terms of the scale at which you are looking; clarify what specific part of the hatchery complex you are addressing. Bob Buckman responded that it varies greatly by area and in many areas, e.g. the Salmon River, it is a complicated issue. Suggestion: Be more specific and clearer about this. What role should hatchery fish play in coho recovery? Where are the problems and why do they exist? Which stocks are

affected? How can we correct these issues?
    - **ACTION**: Dennis Richey, Cindy Heller, Bob Buckman, Jay Nicholas and Wayne Hoffman will have more discussion offline about this.
- ODFW should consider the full watershed (above barrier habitat) in terms of gravel recruitment potentials and others. (ODFW agreed.)
- **'Parking Lot Issue'**: Hatchery effects/role in conservation. Remember that ocean harvest has essentially disappeared. So don't just blame hatcheries for losses. The role and impacts of hatcheries are dynamic issues. ODFW agreed there is a lot of scientific uncertainty. A suggestion was made that the hatchery discussion should include a history of hatchery vs. wild spawner numbers in the system over time.
- For current habitat conditions, aquatic habitat inventories will be valuable to use.
- NOAA comments:
    - Suggested the state look at NOAA's guide for plans
    - Actions should be broad and capable of being completed by many different groups including federal partners.
    - Line out format to match the outline of the federal recovery plan.
- What are current coho habitat conditions on the Salmon River and what is the potential for restoration of that habitat? This area is more suited for steelhead, so holds a below average potential for coho.
- Bob Buckman shared more details on the potential for adult/smolt returns and the potential for harvest for wild and hatchery fish. Les Helgeson suggested that folks look on the Native Fish Society website for a review of the 'native brood concept': www.nativefishsociety.org .
- Dependent populations need to be treated clearly since the Mid Coast has most of them. ODFW is designating all coho equivalents as a population. Still, make clear that ODFW will do different monitoring in key areas where the population has the greatest potential, e.g. the Lakes system.
- Describe how these management actions are inter-connected in helping us get to a recovery goal, and what they are going to do to get us there. This will be done qualitatively and quantitatively in the draft.

South Coast Populations

Mike Gray, ODFW, presented a draft chapter for south coast populations, noting that three ODFW districts exist within the area, including south coast at Gold Beach, where Todd Confer is the district biologist, and the Umpqua, where Jim Muck is the district biologist. The presentation was provided as a handout at the meeting.

Noting that the lakes will have separate consideration and a separate presentation in January, Mike focused today on four populations in the Umpqua (lower middle, south and north); Coos; Coquille; Floras and Sixes.

ODFW used the 2005 Oregon Plan assessment for coho, watershed council assessments, ODFW district/research assessments and others to develop this chapter. The Coquille Tribe's Limiting Factors Assessment (which is on a fine scale) and Coho Basin Plan were also considered. The highest priority for the south coast is to move the North Umpqua from fail to pass+.

Major limiting factors identified: For coastal population areas overall, stream complexity is the primary factor – more specifically, large woody debris, floodplain connectivity, off-channel rearing, and channelization. Also identified were water quantity for Middle/South Umpqua; hatchery impacts for North Umpqua; and water quality as secondary for nearly all populations. At a finer scale, sediment and other limiting factors were identified; ODFW encouraged using a finer scale assessment.

Future threats identified: Increasing water demand, urban/residential development encroaching on floodplain and wetland loss, human impacts on water quality, reduction in restoration resources and competing societal concerns.

Management strategies for habitat: Winter and summer habitat were deemed limiting, and areas of focus are on improving riparian condition and channelization. Mike discussed a number of habitat strategies. (An additional strategy, land acquisition, was not included on the handout.)

Restoration, while in the past has focused on stream restoration in forest areas and riparian restoration in lower/agricultural lands, is moving more toward complex, overwinter habitat and floodplain connectivity.

Management strategies for harvest: No current in-basin harvest exists, but there is potential in the Coos, Coquille, and Umpqua.

Management strategies for hatcheries: Historic hatchery releases have been reduced (smolt numbers were included in the presentation). ODFW is considering a number of hatchery strategies, including maintaining the current program to evaluate whether recent changes have addressed the bottleneck; eliminating the program; adjusting the stocks used; eliminating North Umpqua stocking; and eliminating the North/South Umpqua stocking.

Research needs identified: Wetland/floodplain function and restoration methods; inventory/ground truthing/understanding of HIP habitats; tidegate function benefits and detriments; better link from project effectiveness to overall watershed improvement; determine juvenile coho distribution/use in certain areas, e.g. New River basin lakes; and beaver experiments.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments:

- Did you consider hatcheries further? The new Hatchery Research Center needs at least a mention. What about predators—regardless of federal concerns, locals are concerned, so you should include something about them? ODFW will look into predators, especially in the Lakes complex area. Predators are definitely an area for further research.
- Have you evaluated overall responses to fish passage improvement through culvert improvements? That level of monitoring is not happening. OWEB, larger timber companies, ODF, and watershed councils are working on prioritizing culvert replacement needs (and at this point have addressed most culverts in high and medium priorities) but not necessarily monitoring their effectiveness. It is

known that the success rate of passage for fixed culverts is high. ODF has done some monitoring and evaluating of both state and private areas. The results of that evaluation can be found on their website.

- Re: water quantity: Agree with the draft that water storage is a limiting factor. And, water quality and quantity go hand in hand. Liked seeing this in the draft. Attempts have been made to increase storage, e.g. Johns Creek. Water quality problems exist with mercury and nutrients, and nothing is being done at Sixes, Elk Creek and Floras.
- Need timelines, cost, what success means, and how success will be measured. This will be important in getting public support, even for the smaller focused chapters. (Note: There will be a separate chapter on time and cost estimates.)
- Stream complexity as a primary limiting factor has been clearly identified for uplands, but not lowlands (agriculture). Ground truthing has shown that agricultural lands are not doing as well. A request was made for a presentation on stream complexity in lowlands. It was noted that this comment, 'not doing as well', calls into question components of SB 1010, which is a complaint-driven process. Registering this complaint is the way to get it addressed (not a presentation) which eventually could lead to regulation. Another option is to make stricter laws for agricultural land. (A response was that the agricultural processes are just starting to play out and to work. Feedback will be necessary to make changes to the process). ODFW noted that they focused only on winter habitat stream complexity restoration.
- What is <u>protection</u>? Clearly describe this.
- There was no discussion on 'stripe bass' for other non-coho fish in the area. Include it in the list more specifically (it was covered under 'other'). Exotic species are included in the assessment as a primary factor.
- Mitigation opportunities for hydro in the Umpqua: line them out clearly so we (the stakeholders) can endorse them.
    - Jay Nicholas noted that answers to many of the above questions/comments are addressed in the assessment and encouraged the group to look at it again.
- Mike Gray had mentioned in his presentation 'excessive nutrients as limiting factors'. What does this mean? Water quality is broad, and this is one component of why something might be on (303)d list. It referred to looking at water quality issues on a finer scale.
- Re: sediments – do you have information about what the benefits are to placing large woody debris, and over what period of time? Yes there are a lot of studies on this. Is ODFW's preference to take a chance with where the wood might fall, or to strategically place the wood? The state is moving toward a more natural influx of wood in streams, after providing a foundation for them to do that.
- RE: Tidegates – who selects the area and what is the cost? Cost varies depending on the tidegate work – it can be relatively inexpensive or very expensive. Funding support for more expensive tidegate work is not always available because it is difficult to show a benefit. John Souder has been working with researchers in Coos, and there are other areas of research on tidegates that will be informative.
    - **<u>ACTION:</u>** Rosemary Furfey will share the latest information on tidegate research with the stakeholder team. NOAA funds, and plans to continue

funding, research and other work on this.

- More emphasis on beaver management could be key to building stream complexity. Apply the research.
- Water quantity issues: Have you looked at new water rights on the south coast? The WRD has a computer system that subtracts out new uses and adds supply (e.g. winter storage). It was noted that many new wells have been issued and so it does not appear there are any controls on actual use.
- We might be missing something if we don't include economics in this discussion. If the stakeholders understood the economic value of putting large wood in streams, and then could share that with landowners, landowners might see the incentive for doing this.
- Past/present focus on riparian restoration in lower watershed agricultural lands: much of the restoration work done by the Coquille Watershed Council has been done in lower agricultural lands, as a good first step to get landowner buy-in. Do not put this as a lower priority, because it is an important first step. ODFW – the past/present focus for restoration is not meant to imply that they will no longer occur, but that the future focus will become more important. The message to the public should be done so in a way that does not scare them off with a perception that we are asking for too much.
- What does "Exclude Sixes from desire to move toward pass" mean? The purpose was to acknowledge there is limited coho habitat in the Sixes so try to reach a realistic viability criteria. Still, how to address abandoned and dependent populations will need to be resolved at some point.
    - **'Parking Lot' Issue:** Abandoned and dependent populations discussion.
- Elk and Sixes – to residents, pinnipeds are the most limiting factor and have gotten worse.
- There may be a correlation between extra woody debris and increased lamprey numbers.
- 'Large woody debris' as a term is misleading to sound like 'waste'. It is not debris, it is wood. This is an important piece for our message to the public.
- Re: Stream complexity: focus on those areas that are most important to coho, where it supports their life cycle. Do not focus on uplands, headlands, etc. where wood placement will not result in a near-term or certain change, at least not as a primary management action.
- Move away from viewing other social demands for funding as a biological threat to coho recovery. The public will not appreciate this. 'Competing societal concerns' is not a limiting factor.
- Re: Funding – Oregon will take a big cut on the Pacific Coast Salmon Funds. So while NOAA says they support this process, it does not appear to be true.
- Suggestion: Look at the potential impact to coho of banning beaver trapping on state forest land. Beaver are very valuable to coho. ODFW – beaver management is allowed on a site-specific, not landscape scale. This could be a problem.
    - Tracking of beaver trapping ended. Why? The Oregon Plan assessment report addresses this. Follow-up on this is needed. (**NOTE**: Jeff Lockwood, NOAA, sent an email message to the stakeholder team on 12/9, as follow-up to this discussion.)

    - **ACTION**: Jo Morgan will look into how the Forest Practices Act addresses beaver trapping.
- Comment: The Coquille valley is fully connected to the floodplain. As we look at improving complexity, we could reduce this floodplain. There is always a trade-off.
- What was the effect of removing most of the beaver from Oregon on coho in 1820-1840? And how did the beaver recover? It was noted that the beaver population went down again in the 1920's, so there have been ups and downs in beaver numbers. Is there a correlation with coho numbers?

Desired Status for Coastal Coho: Follow Up

Based on the presentation and discussion at the last Stakeholder Team meeting, stakeholders talked with their constituents and received comments on the desired status components the group had agreed to. They are as follows:

- Concern that using a full seeding-based approach may lead us to something less ambitious than where we want to be (if we focus on current habitat). If you choose this approach, make sure we have a clear idea of how the concept of full seeding relates to the potential for restoring habitat. Look for opportunities without social dislocation.
- Need benchmarks for specific habitat parameters (e.g. pieces of large wood, pools, etc.)
- Need to discuss realities of high intrinsic potential areas that cannot be reached (e.g. built areas that won't change).
    - Full seeding needs to consider these realities
- Funders and legislators need a shorter time frame for achieving desired status. A timeline with benchmarks (in palatable steps) will assist with support from people and funding sources. (50 or 100 years is too long.)
    - Consider a step approach to attain desired status. (As the native population improves, show how an expansion of fisheries, which could include both hatchery and native fish, will occur, to show an economic net positive over time.)
- Comment: 'Actions' are more important than desired status, since we will be revisiting the plan at regular intervals, e.g. every 10 years. Priorities will change over time. We need a goal, but actions are where the change will occur.
- Oregon is doing a lot of good work but it does not necessarily show. How you articulate the plan will be important. If you show how it will improve economies and in turn support things like education, legislators will be more likely to fund the continuation of what we are trying to do.
- RE: South Coast presentation placeholder for timeframe and economic analysis. In the Stakeholder Team principles, we say we want to enable fisheries to demand premium prices. That suggests a scarcity of coho is better (because that raises prices). Instead, change language to competitive prices rather than premium. Our desired status, then, is to have enough of a marketable quantity to get a return, at a competitive price.
- Wayne Hoffman provided a handout with thoughts on the full seeding issue for discussion at a later time.

Kevin Goodson presented an updated desired status based on the suggestions from the November stakeholder team meeting. He noted that the hope is to complete/finalize

desired status in February after the TRT product is available and reviewed.

Last meeting, the group agreed on a desire for 80% of full seeding during poor ocean conditions, with no backsliding from current conditions. Needs remaining: define full seeding, model the lakes system better, and identify a timeframe.

Full seeding, or 'production capacity', is the level of spawners needed to produce the most offspring (recruits). The recruit model for each population can estimate 'production capacity'. On the graph, NEQ is the number at which the population will level out (the equilibrium level); this is a precarious number based on many factors.

For the lakes: The recruit model for each lake population was based on actual performance of the fish.

Comment on the lakes:

- The problem identified with the lakes was that they have different outputs than other areas, so the suggestion was to use a different model, with higher expectations for the lakes.

Since the last meeting, ODFW looked at how to resolve the issue of improving habitat, and how that would impact the numbers. You need more spawners to get more smolts out in some areas, but not all. So the full seeding number may change. Suggestion: show success even if you DON'T reach 80% of full seeding.

ODFW was unable to resolve differences between Amendment 13 requirements and the recruit models. The recruit model shows only 77,000 with 80% of production capacity, not 100,000. They also have a concern about populations that are already above 80% capacity. To address this, the new desired status shows 80% as a long term average plus 25% increase for those populations already above 80%. This estimated total equals 99,000. Finally, ODFW found that improvement detection in the model was better if compared to the goal under average ocean conditions rather than poor. And again, production capacity may change with habitat changes; this emphasizes the need to explore better ways to look at capacity.

Comment: The future condition I want to see is excess returns in most years. Can't we set up our goals to reflect that? There is concern with using average ocean conditions to set targets. And, note that production capacity <u>will</u> change with changes to habitat.

Kevin provided three tables quantifying the three proposed alternatives for desired status.

<u>*Stakeholder Team Comments/Questions*</u>:

- I do not understand the model, and do not understand how a good ocean could hurt fish in some areas. (This is a glitch in the model).
- If the model works for most of the populations, but not all, it is a good model.
- What is 'average ocean'? Three x 'poor' ocean; 'good' ocean = three x 'average' ocean.
- The purpose of the recruitment models are to serve as tools to help make decisions,

identify goals based on an estimate of what a population can produce, and show the difficulty in turning up survival to achieve desired status for each population at each level. It will not be able to identify how many restoration projects will be needed to achieve increased survival—that's what people are for.

- Question on the Necanicum: 52% survival increase seems off. How did you do the math? It is more complicated than what is shown in the tables. The entire life cycle is considered.
- Studies have been done looking at, e.g., Lobster Creek and East Creek, where extensive habitat creation was done. Researchers found a 3-5 fold increase in smolts through these site-specific studies. Still, a percent increase in survival will not be used to target a number of restoration projects needed to get there. Over the next 10 years, we might be able to show effects on habitat improvement/expansion and will be able to determine trends in different habitat parameters with the state's ongoing habitat monitoring program.
- How will ODFW address this moving target of fish numbers and fisheries? Substitute the production capacity numbers for numbers in Amendment 13. Does ODFW envision changes to that process? Redefining seeding levels is a technical matter – changes would depend on agreement from the Pacific Fishery Management Council.
- Is there a top end of the model to show what habitat can actually produce? No, it just creates a curve based on current habitat conditions. Still, set the high desired status goal, and use the step up process (30, 50, 100 years) to reach your goal. Manage based on poor ocean conditions.
    - ODFW: The original focus on poor ocean conditions was because this would be critical to long term survival. The shift to focus on average conditions occurred in order to actually show the differences: improvements, deterioration, or no change. The poor ocean condition number will still be there.
- Sixes fails because there is not enough area to support coho. Distinguish this and the Salmon River from the others so as not to mislead. Still, recognize that they are individual populations and will need to be addressed.
- Re: current production capacity: Are we in an average ocean now? Current production capacity is habitat-based so the ocean condition does not apply. Comment: These estimates are quite a bit different than previous estimates. Why? ODFW acknowledges that these numbers do not add up with Amendment 13 numbers. This could be due to lack of habitat data in one vs. the other model, for example.
- Other recovery areas compared abundance with productivity using shaded boxes for different variables, and showing bottlenecks (limiting factors) for each species. A visual like this might be helpful for this group to consider. Maybe, but ODFW agrees with the previous comment that actions will be most important so we should not struggle too much over the desired status. We need to agree on something that is reasonable.
- In the context of historical numbers, the desired status numbers are not so extremely high.

Next Steps

Desired Status:

- Request: Show us the structure of this model to help us better understand it. Then

have the group come back for further discussion. At this point there is not full agreement on the desired status.

- The TRT viability criteria document will add to this discussion. We need to understand the desired status to provide a measuring stick. Let's revisit this in February, when the TRT product is out so we can fold that into the discussion.
- Models are easy to attack. The data are best guess estimates. It is unrealistic for us to continue on this path; if so, we will never reach a conclusion. If necessary, step back and look at a broader scale rather than population scale. Choose a desired status number for the North Coast, South Coast and Umpqua.
    - ODFW: Yes we need to address our uncertainty with numbers at the population scale, but do not want to step back to a larger scale because there will be no agreement. (It was noted that in some areas it could work, e.g. the Umpqua.)
- We are too focused on the numbers. Capture what those numbers mean qualitatively. That is our desired status.
- Suggestion: Look at numbers in terms of the larger strata and TRT numbers/model. Then make a more informed decision. Hold a small group 'weeds' discussion for those who need more details.
    - ODFW: Part II of the May 13 Oregon Plan Assessment for Coho, page 15, discusses the older recruitment model. The assessment is on the Coho Project website. Suggestion: Refer back to this in the current desired status recruitment model to clarify.
- The Stakeholder Team was encouraged to consider the latest information and discussion on desired status, and suggest how we might resolve this issue. Donna Silverberg encouraged team members to work with others they might not normally work with to come up with ideas for resolution.

Forestry

- **ACTION**: Kevin Goodson, Jo Morgan and Blake Rowe will look at the Forestry questions from the 10/27 Stakeholder Team meeting, determine which of the questions relate to coho, and then develop answers to those questions for the January meeting. Jo noted that two of the proposed rule changes passed the Board of Forestry (re: riparian management areas above fish passage barriers, and wood from debris flow and landslides) and will be adopted in June. (The Board tabled the basal area issue because landowners came forward with compelling arguments about economic impacts, calling into question whether this would have negative or positive impacts, as well as other issues. This item will also come back to Board in June, with alternatives for achieving placement of wood into streams without raising the basal area.) Jo Morgan will be able to answer more questions on this at the next meeting.

Meeting Schedule

The next meetings were scheduled for **Friday, January 20 in Newport**, and **Thursday, February 23** (likely somewhere south, location to be determined). The facilitation team will work with the Steering Committee to lay out a process plan and schedule for the next four months and send it to the group in the next few weeks.

Agenda: January 20, Newport

- Report on TRT Products/Alignment with Conservation Plan Development
- Resource User Perspective: Municipalities and gravel
- Forestry issues wrap-up
- ODFW staff draft chapter of lakes populations
- ODFW staff draft chapter on north-coast populations
- Schedule for next few months

Other

Wayne Hoffman followed up from last meeting on the notion of putting in population monitoring sites to do sensitive restoration work. He contacted Jeff Light from Plum Creek, who indicated that his company would be willing to work with the Mid-Coast Watershed Council on a design. Wayne provided handouts that will be sent to the team members.