

**Coastal Coho Recovery Project  
Stakeholder Team  
Eighth Meeting  
Cannon Beach Community Hall**

**Facilitator's Meeting Summary  
April 8, 2005**

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

Stakeholder Team Members: Bill Bakke (Native Fish Society), Paul Englemeyer (public at large), Wayne Giesy (Alsea Valley Alliance), Jennifer Hampel (Coquille Watershed Council), Cindy Heller (STEP), Wayne Hoffman (MidCoast Watershed Council), Bob Jacobson (Oregon Salmon Commission), Kaitlin Lovell (Trout Unlimited), Jason Miner (Oregon Trout), Bill Moshofsky (Save the Salmon Coalition), Richard Oba (Oregon Coast Sport Fishing), Shawn Reiersgaard (Tillamook Co. Soil and Water Conservation District), Dennis Richey (Oregon Anglers), Blake Rowe (Longview Fibre Co/OFIC), Terry Thompson (Assoc. of Oregon Counties)

Alternates and Resource Advisors: Ed Bowles (ODFW), Bob Buckman (ODFW), Tom Byler (OWEB), Brandon Ford (ODFW), Rosemary Furfey (NOAA), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Mike Gray (ODFW), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Bridget Lohrman (NOAA), David Loomis (ODFW), Bruce McIntosh (ODFW), Jay Nicholas (OWEB), Louise Solliday (OR Gov's Office), Heather Stout (NOAA-TRT)

Other Interested Parties: Walt Morgan (public)

Facilitation Team: Donna Silverberg and Robin Harkless (DS Consulting)

**Action Items**

Action	Who	By When
Email NOAA's comments about the state's assessment of the Oregon Plan to the stakeholder team	Rosemary Furfey-facilitation team-stakeholder team	ASAP
Request a presentation from NOAA on the economic analysis required for a federal recovery plan.	Rosemary Furfey	As appropriate with upcoming agendas
Put the power point of the Lower Columbia Coho plan on the coho project website	Ed Bowles	ASAP
Send the list of TRT representatives to W. Giesy	Rosemary Furfey	ASAP
Send a list of potential management actions to stakeholder team	Steering committee	May 2
Develop a press release template that can be given to local media for upcoming Coho Project meetings and events	Brandon Ford, Kevin Goodson	May 2
Revise Protocols on Decision Making	Facilitation Team	May 2

Provide executive summaries of Oregon Plan, Oregon Plan Assessment, ODFW Basin Plans	ODFW to stakeholder team	May 2
Provide the 'Vision' statements from NFCP, Oregon Plan, LCFRB plan	Louise Solliday	Attached to notes
Schedule meetings beyond the May 9 <sup>th</sup> date	Facilitation team & Stakeholder Team	Via e-mail, by May 9

**Introductions/Follow-up from 2/24-25 Meeting**

Comments on 2/24-25 Notes:

- Page 12, 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet “Comments”: Change from non-commercial ‘harvest’, to ‘land’
- Page 12, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet “Comments”: Change sentence to “The Pesticide Use Reporting System needs to be funded to write information about water quality needs”.
- Page 14, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet: Blake Rowe provided language to clarify the comment about shade.
- Page 14, last bullet: Blake provided language to clarify the comment about landowner economic involvement.
- Page 13, 1<sup>st</sup> bullet re: forest management: Delete “NOAA’s assessment was adopted by the state”—that is not an action the state can make.
- Page 16, 1<sup>st</sup> bullet “Comments”: Add ‘for passage and fine sediment’ to ‘quick restoration action’.
- Page 16, under “Comments”, add bullet: “Re: Adaptive management – now that stream complexity is a high priority, will it be prioritized for funding, more so than roads?” (This was in reference to the pie chart of investments. It was clarified that investments came from state, federal, and private funding sources.)

Comments from NOAA: NOAA’s comments to the state on its Assessment of the Oregon Plan for Coho are posted on NOAA’s web page.

**ACTION:** Rosemary will forward NOAA’s comments to the facilitation team to be sent out to the Stakeholder Team.

OMB Directive: As requested at the last meeting, Rosemary reported that staff at NOAA is attending trainings to understand how to incorporate guidance from OMB on the listing decision. Currently, NOAA is using criteria from a 1994 joint USFWS/NOAA ‘guidance document’ on peer review. Sixty nationally based peer reviewers will look at the proposed listing decision. The final listing decision will likely not undergo peer review.

State’s Plan on the “Response to Comments”: Louise Solliday reported that the state has received comments from 20 individuals/groups. The authors of the report relative to each comment have received those comments and are revising their reports in response. The comments received will be included as part of the final package to NOAA—including the stakeholder team meeting minutes. A cover memo on the reports will include the changes made to the reports and the rationale for those changes. It was also noted that the IMST’s comments are available on the web. The final assessment package will be sent to NOAA at the end of April.

### **Entering Phase Three--Producing**

Kevin Goodson, ODFW, and Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, provided a handout of a side-by-side comparison of the components of a state conservation plan and those of a federal recovery plan so the group could understand what they might be producing during this phase of the project. Rosemary offered that each recovery domain will be different in terms of the type of draft plan due to NOAA by the end of 2005. A question was asked about how funding issues fit into the recovery planning process and procedures. Rosemary offered that one benefit of having a recovery plan is that actions within the plan will be prioritized and expedited through the federal process. Members of Congress are looking to move forward with recovery plans for salmon. NOAA's Regional Administrator has promised the completion of preliminary draft plans by 2005. It was clarified that recovery scenarios will address goals (the parameters), actions (the means of reaching those goals), and threats criteria. Actual numbers are needed for expressing the goals or targets. Rosemary clarified that there is no specific formula for recovery plans –flexibility is built in to provide for adaptive management.

### **Comments/Questions from Stakeholder Team Members:**

- What is the difference between the recovery plan process and the listing process? What if the fish are not listed? NOAA's final Oregon coast coho listing decision in July 2005 will guide whether a federal recovery planning process needs to occur. However, the State's conservation plan will move forward regardless of the federal decision. NOAA has made a commitment to continue as a co-manager in the State's process as there are other 'authorities' and interests from NOAA besides the Endangered Species Act (e.g. Magnuson Stephenson Act provides NOAA the general authority to improve fisheries). It was noted that the need for a conservation plan for coho will be ongoing regardless of NOAA's listing decision.
- What type of analysis is NOAA using to determine recovery goals and actions? A variety of habitat models are being developed by NOAA's Science Center. The 'properly functioning conditions' matrix is only one tool in the 'tool box' for habitat. For now, NOAA is using the population viability model.
- When does NOAA expect a 'final' plan? The goal is to fill in as much of the plan as possible by December 2005, with a final plan completed in 2006.
- What is the peer review schedule? Peer review is required every 5 years under the Native Fish Conservation Policy, but the plan can be revisited and revised more often, depending partly on how 'desired status' is described.
- How will amendments to the plan be made? ODFW will discuss and determine the process, which will be identified in the conservation plan. Likely ODFW and an advisory group (perhaps even this stakeholder team?) will be responsible for review and revisions. Changes to the federal recovery plan will follow a process of input from an advisory group, federal notice of any proposed changes to the plan, and time for public comment before any change is made. Folks were reminded that recovery plans are non-regulatory, so procedures are not as restrictive as a regulatory plan would be.

- **ACTION**: Issues around a peer review process for state conservation plans will be revisited and clarified at a later date.
  - Do you envision two plans – a conservation and recovery plan? No, there is a desire to produce one plan that can be used by both NOAA and the State. If the fish get listed, then NOAA will take elements from the local plan and identify any gaps that have been or need to be filled. One option is to use the local conservation plan and add a ‘wrap around’ to make it a NOAA recovery plan.
  - A comment was made that the science underlying the recovery plan may be different than what underlies the conservation plan. Staff to the TRT noted that the TRT is working to match up state and federal science so this does not happen. There has been a verbal commitment from the federal TRT, as a co-manager, to support development of Oregon’s conservation/recovery plan.
  - ‘Desired status’ vs. ‘status of ESU’ are not the same (as shown on the comparison handout). The fish could be de-listed by the feds far sooner than when broad sense recovery goals of the state are met. What if the science does not match up? There may be a need for a minimum federal requirement and then a higher bar goal for the state conservation plan.
  - There is interest in inviting an expert from NOAA to provide a presentation to the stakeholder team about the economic analysis of the recovery plan. The PECE analysis looks at certainty of implementing a recovery plan in terms of addressing threats and maintaining viability. ‘Cost effectiveness’ could really be a ‘cost analysis’.
- ACTION:** Request a presentation from NOAA on the economic analysis required for a federal recovery plan.

### **Lower Columbia Coho Plan**

Ed Bowles, ODFW, provided a power point presentation highlighting elements of the Lower Columbia Coho Plan, as an example of what a conservation plan can look like. He noted that this example does not include the habitat components that will be needed in the Coho plan. The purpose of a conservation plan is to de-list and avoid future listings by the federal government. The elements of a conservation plan include:

- Management unit boundaries
- Desired status
- Existing status
- Causes for the gap
- Management actions: informed, realistic and implementable
- Monitoring and evaluation: this is important because there are so many management uncertainties that may need to be changed mid-course

For the Lower Columbia Coho plan, criteria for de-listing and long-term recovery were identified for all components – abundance, productivity, and distribution. In identifying gaps between desired and existing status of the fish, ODFW looked at manageable vs. non-manageable actions to identify which actions could address the gaps. For hatcheries, a suite of strategies were identified throughout the ESU for long term management criteria.

Comments/Questions from Stakeholder Team Members:

- The conservation ‘driver’ appears to be the strongest stocks in the ESU, not weak stock management as guided by the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC). Why is this? Ed responded that recently some hatcheries have opened up, so these areas will be revisited. In other areas, there are multiple drivers, not just weak stocks.
- How are tributaries in Washington taken into account? The Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB) plan includes multiple species. If Lower Columbia coho are federally listed, Oregon’s Lower Columbia Coho plan and the LCFRB plan will be combined and built upon to meet federal requirements.
- The health of Sandy stocks shows an upward trend in the plan, but total numbers are still low. This stock is not doing as well as coastal coho. A suggestion was made to look at fish per mile in the 1960’s, not just recent numbers and trends.

**ACTION:** The power point presentation will be made available on the web as a PDF file.

**Stakeholder Team Process Issues**

The facilitation team emailed a ‘Pathway to a Conservation Plan’ diagram to the stakeholder team prior to today’s meeting that provided a visual of what the conservation process might look like. Kevin Goodson also presented a variation on the diagram that removed the time frames for addressing each step of the process.

Questions/Comments from Stakeholder Team Members:

- There likely will need to be more iteration, more discussion between the stakeholder team and the state in June/July than shown in the diagram. Let’s not let too much time pass between getting together to discuss the plan we are producing together.
- How (and why) is the conservation plan different from the Oregon Plan? The intent is not to re-do anything that has been done, but to build on the work of the Oregon Plan and focus the measures for specific species. Where the Oregon Plan is broad, the conservation plan will be a refined. The conservation plan will focus more on the gap analysis and clearly identify, quantitatively, the desired status of the species.
- A suggestion was made to be clear and to educate everyone about where we are and what we know as a result of the Oregon Plan. On the diagram, begin the process with identifying known management actions and limiting factors, etc, then move into ideas for additional strategies and actions.
- How does this pathway get at all of the goals stated in the beginning of this process last June? From the state’s perspective, the goals WILL be met through this process. The connection of the coastal Coho work to the greater Oregon Plan audit still needs to be clarified for many.
- It was noted that the TRT may not be able to respond within the timeframe laid out in the diagram. On the other hand, since work often matches the timeline established, it could save time in the long run to set a timeline, and get as much done as possible in the time provided.

**ACTION:** A request was made for a complete list of the make-up of the TRT, as a technical resource group to the conservation planning process. Rosemary Furfey will send that list to Wayne Giesy.

## **Representation on the Team**

The group was asked to help clarify if all of the necessary people or groups are represented in the Stakeholder Team. A few questions were asked to sort this out:

### ***Who IS represented?***

Stakeholder Team members offered the spectrum of interests they represent on the team. While all represent a particular interest on the Stakeholder Team (see the membership portion of the Protocols), many can present the perspectives of more than one group—and communicate regularly with more than one group. The breadth of these interests include: Watershed councils, Trout Unlimited, Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Tillamook Creamery, Tillamook Estuaries Partnership, commercial shellfishers, seafood processors, Alsea Valley Alliance, Audubon Society, Trust for Public Land, Pacific Forest Service, educators, land acquisition bodies, the public-at-large, forest landowners, STEP (education, habitat improvement, fish culture, M&E), STAC, NW Steelheaders, Oregonians in Action, homebuilders, forest resources, OR Cattlemen, OR Farm Bureau, OR Anglers, OR Counties, trollers, OR Salmon Commission, OR Trout, Or Coast Sport Fishing Alliance, and the Native Fish Society.

***Who is missing from the table?*** Consumers of salmon (processors, markets, etc.); agriculture (note: clarify Shawn Reiersgaard’s role as SWCD and dairy farm representative); another tribal voice; habitat groups (ONRC, Sierra Club, etc.); true public at large (those without vested interests or who are unassociated with a group); tourism or chamber of commerce; students; BLM.

### ***Who needs to be communicated with about this process?***

The Coast Guard, state police, community police, federal landowners and salmon fishers all have perspectives and information that will be helpful as this process moves forward.

### ***Outreach Issues***

The team welcomed ODFW’s new outreach coordinator, Brandon Ford, who will be working closely with the stakeholder team and the Coastal Coho Project. It was suggested that Brandon could help with outreach to the fishing industry and other members of the public by connecting with local press as an outreach tool.

After further discussion, the stakeholder team agreed not to add anyone to this group at this time because of the immense amount of time this group has spent getting up to speed on the substantive issues. They also agreed that a communication strategy is needed for outreach to those identified and not at the table once ‘desired status’ issues are developed.

- **ACTION**: Kevin Goodson and Brandon Ford will work to develop a press release to send to local media before each upcoming meeting.

## ***Protocols-Decision Making***

Donna Silverberg provided a handout of the Coho Stakeholder Team's current protocol on 'commitment to cooperation' and suggested revisions based on the protocols developed by the Native Fish Conservation Policy Task Force regarding commitments to the 'decision making process'. She noted that as this planning process continues, the stakeholder team will need to be clear about its decision-making process and protocols for reaching agreements. The revisions were intended to help clarify that process.

Stakeholder Team members provided comments:

- The NFCP Task Force process went surprising well, even though many were doubtful of the consensus process. We should use that same process.
- Regarding 'consensus', clarify members 'present' for consensus – so if not present, a member cannot later break a consensus reached by the group. This will encourage members to be at the meetings.
- Bullet 'F': The report should be sent to "NOAA" also. Change to "Oregon Fish and Wildlife" Commission.
- A stakeholder team recommendation will be made to the Commission only if there is consensus. Will all other issues also be shared? How? They will be shared in the facilitator's report and, if desired, whoever has alternative views, they may share those directly via a written or oral presentation.
- The stakeholder team needs to agree first on what we are looking for consensus on, relative to values/desired status and management actions. It was noted that a consensus recommendation will need to match up with TRT (science) goals.
  - **ACTION**: The steering committee will send an initial list of potential management actions to the stakeholder team to begin discussion of areas where consensus might be sought.
  - **CONSENSUS & ACTION**: The group agreed to revise the September Protocols to include the facilitator's suggested revisions with the above noted changes and adopt them as their decision making methodology.

### **Discussion to Establish Guiding Values for Process**

Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, provided a handout of the LCFRB Plan 'Vision Statement' as an example to begin discussions about the Coastal Coho Plan. The stakeholder team then brainstormed initial thoughts on:

#### ***What are the societal values that support salmon conservation in Oregon?***

- Fish in the river regardless of hatchery or wild origin
- Fish in the ocean
- Access to fish
- Economic well-being
- Strong fish runs means a stronger, vibrant economy
- Salmon represent the health and well-being of the state
- Return of the salmon is the return of life
- Potential salmon habitat is realized as salmon habitat
- Returning salmon are nutrients for fresh water system; there is a value for returns far above the minimum necessary to seed the stream with eggs, to adequately fertilize the streams and riparian areas.

- Healthy salmon runs indicate healthy ecosystems
- Hatchery and wild salmonids have value
- Recovery of salmon represents society's ability to work together to recover endangered species
- Commercial and recreational fisheries can harvest wild salmon in the future
- There may be some aesthetic limit to salmon recovery that society will support (e.g. they may not support large numbers of smelly carcasses in the tributaries behind their houses)
- It is worth spending public money on the recovery of salmon
- Productive salmon streams can and do exist in economically productive landscapes
- Salmon recovery without sacrificing local economies, local jobs and property rights
- Industry and environment can work and live together
- Wild fish returning to natural habitats
- Need for long-term vision to provide guidance and certainty for consistency and continuity of management practices
- More interest in results than methods
- Salmon as education tool
- Premium quality salmon products in markets – wild caught
- Less negativity and finger-pointing/more work together achieving positive results
- Oregon's new Hatchery Research Center symbolizes the desire to answer uncertainties of fish management and culture
- Sport caught salmon are highly valued
- Lifestyle value – 'Freedom'
- Recreational value
- Aesthetic existence value
- Cultural and subsistence values
- Sustained coho supported by broader state
- Cost-effective expenditures on salmon recovery
- Measurable results – good return on investments
- Salmon are research-able – better than most other species
- Future potential exists for the benefits of and from salmon

***Outcome values from ODFW's Perspective:***

- The 'Reds' and 'yellows' become 'green' (from the assessment), more cushion is achieved for 'green' populations
- Improvement to dependent populations so the system is functioning properly

***Next Steps:***

The state's suggested process is to move step by step, starting with a vision statement and desired status, and from that determine specific management actions for conservation. The above list will be reviewed and put into a working order for the group. It will serve as a starting point for the discussions on the 'desired status' of Oregon's coastal Coho salmon. It was also noted that:

- The foundation for the conservation planning work will come from the Oregon Plan, Oregon Plan Assessment and ODFW Basin Plans.

- **ACTION**: Staff will provide summaries of these documents as they pertain to conservation planning at the next Stakeholder Team meeting.
- **ACTION**: As a place to start for numerical values or outcomes in the desired condition, the team will look at: Vision, Mission Statements, and Goals from the Oregon Plan, NFCP, and LCFRB plan; definition of “recovery”; and the list of value statements expressed today. (*NOTE*: Louise Solliday provided a summary document of excerpts from the Oregon Plan, NFCP, and LCFRB plan. The document is attached to these minutes.)

**Next Meeting, Monday, May 9, 9am-4pm, Yachats**

An agenda and logistics will be distributed to the group prior to the meeting. The facilitation team will send out an email about potential dates for meetings further out, so team members can mark their calendars and set aside time well in advance of the meetings.