

OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT
Stakeholder Team--Ninth Meeting
The Adobe Resort, Yachats
DRAFT Facilitator's Meeting Summary
May 9, 2005

Attendees for all or part of the meeting:

Stakeholder Team Members: Paul Englemeyer (Audubon-Public at Large), Tom Forgatsch (Farm Industry), Wayne Giesy (Alega Valley Alliance), Cindy Heller (STEP), Wayne Hoffman (Mid-Coast Watershed Council), Kaitlin Lovell (Trout Unlimited), Bill Moshofsky (Save the Salmon Coalition), Richard Oba (Oregon Coast Sport Fishing), Dennis Richey (NW Steelheaders-Oregon Anglers), Johnny Sundstrom, (Oregon Assoc. of Conservation Districts), Terry Thompson (Assoc. of Oregon Counties), Ray Wilkeson, OFIC (alternate for Blake Rowe)

Resource Advisors:

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

Alternates and Technical Resources: Bob Buckman (ODFW), Brandon Ford (ODFW), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Mike Gray (ODFW), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Heather Stout (NOAA-TRT)

Other Interested Parties: None present

Facilitation Team: Donna Silverberg and Jacqueline Abel

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Update contact list and send to stakeholder team, resource advisors	Facilitation Team	June 6
Revise Protocols to clarify stakeholder team's review, correction, and sign-off process of report	Facilitation Team	June 6
Explain on website that these meetings are part of larger public process	Kevin Goodson	ASAP
Forward Newport Times article to stakeholder team	Louise Solliday	Done: May 12
Formulate Q's for TRT, particularly about product timelines	Steering Committee	ASAP
Send revised 'guidance document' to stakeholder team for review and approval	Facilitation team	June 6

Introductions/Follow-up from April 8, 2005

Louise Solliday reported that the Oregon Plan assessment of coastal Coho will go to NOAA this week, and will be posted on the website soon after, possibly by the end of

next week. Ed Bowles added that the assessment is being reviewed by Oregon's DOJ now, and includes updates/changes: new population models, the Umpqua is divided into four populations, and assessments for Floras have changed. There was a question on population estimates changing. Bowles responded that they will go into more detail later. Louise reminded the group that there will be a number of cover memos that explain the changes and responses to feedback.

Notes were reviewed from the April 8 Meeting: Wayne Hoffman brought up changes he had sent Robin regarding the last bullet on p. 7. The newest version of the notes was distributed to those who wanted copies, and Wayne said this version now reflects his change. No other comments or corrections were made.

Revised Protocols for Stakeholder Team

Donna briefly explained her changes, and asked for comments and discussion of the Revised Protocols.

Comments on Section II:

- Tom Byler will no longer be participating, although he remains committed to and supportive of the process.
- Question about whether Cindy Heller and Wayne Giesy should be designated as public at large, as well as Paul Englemeyer, or remain identified by their respective interest groups: All three were appointed as 'public at large' representatives. Consistency is important as well as knowing what organization individuals are linked to. It was decided that the membership portion of the Protocols should be consistent with the representation list on the webpage.
- Additional technical resource people have been added as we move into this phase. Mike Gray, Bob Buckman, Dave Loomis and Brandon Ford are new technical resources from ODFW, as is Jeff Lockwood from NOAA.
 - **ACTION:** The facilitation team will: update the contact list to match what is on the website (including broad category and specific affiliations of team members), add current contact information for the new technical resource folks, and distribute the updated list to the stakeholder team and resource advisors.

Comments on Section III-Decision Making

- Check the numbering; some versions show multiple "C"s.
- Question regarding III (G) about where the cutoff is on getting minority views into the report vs. stakeholders talking directly to the Commission, etc. Will there still be an opportunity to correct errors, and get minority views included, after the facilitators draft a report? After the facilitators draft a report, will it come back to the entire stakeholder group for review and sign off? When is the report finalized for transmission?
 - **ACTION:** The facilitators will add language to III (G), which clarifies the intention that the stakeholder team will be given the opportunity to review, make corrections, and then sign off on the report they are to draft, before the report is transmitted to the Commission, Governor and NOAA.

Consensus was reached on adopting the Protocols with the change to III above.

Website Update

Kevin Goodson reported about efforts to update the website, and that most of the information from the last meeting is now on the website. The assessment will be added soon. http://www.oregon-plan.org/OPSW/cohoproject/coho_proj.shtml.

Press/Outreach Plan

ODFW reported that a press release was prepared in advance of this meeting, quoting Terry Thompson, and that it was printed in the Newport Times. Stakeholder members commented on how to provide a better process for the public who do attend the meetings. They noted that allowing for public comment at the end of the day may not be satisfying for the public at this technical stage of the process. Kevin Goodson suggested that when the meetings are announced, the announcement should notify the public about the technical nature of the meetings. Stakeholder team members asked if there would be a public process at the end of the stakeholder team's work and whether they would be asked to participate in that effort. Kevin responded that there will be a public process, and he hopes to have members of the team attend public meetings in their local areas—as their individual time allows.

ACTION: It was agreed to include on the website an explanation that these meetings are part of a larger process, and public input may be most helpful at a later stage.

ACTION: The facilitator could explain the agenda at the beginning of the meeting and invite any members of the public to ask questions so they do not have to wait until late afternoon.

ACTION: Louise Solliday will email the Newport Times article to the Stakeholder Team. (NOTE: The article was forwarded and sent from the facilitation team on 5/12.)

Future Stakeholder Team Meeting Dates

- **Friday, June 17 at the Port of Umpqua in Reedsport from 9 am– 4 pm.**
- **Friday, July 29 at the new Hatchery Research Center on Fall Creek (Alsea).** A barbeque will be planned following the grand opening, the night before the meeting. Members will be able to stay in the dorms at the center (single hotel-type rooms, not bunkbeds!) or elsewhere, to be determined.
- **August:** No date has been set. It was noted that a number of people will not be available the last week, but earlier in the month seems too soon after the July meeting. Early September in Newport is the likely next meeting.

Building the Foundation for Conservation and Recovery Planning

Louise Solliday, Governor's Office, made a presentation from the "Coastal Coho Project Related Mission Statements" which summarized missions from other related or similar projects. It was noted that an additional relevant model is the statement in the Executive Summary of the Coastal Coho Assessment that will be out this week.

Stakeholder Team Member Comments/Questions:

- Are we seeking to create a *mission* or *vision* statement for the Coastal Coho Recovery Project? What is the difference? (A mission statement says what the purpose of a group is while a vision statement is future/aspirational in nature).
- Need to focus on the ‘reasonable and achievable’ when considering an endpoint (e.g. ‘natural wild’ and harvest may not be achievable in the near future).
- Harvest-ability should not be measured by numbers of fish from a hundred years ago. So much has changed and natural production can probably never take over what hatcheries are now producing.
- More positive view about what we can achieve with science and can do major strides with natural production, fears invasive species like isopods.
- There are more opportunities on the coast than on the lower Columbia; have success story with fall Chinook’s natural production, other possibilities for change.
- Water quality improvements will also help improve the species.
- Do fish carcasses from returning salmon create pollution and water quality problems? One response was that carcasses are not a problem because salmon are attracted to clean water, and carcasses are quickly cleaned up by other species.
- Abundance should be the focus rather than scarcity: Abundant salmon are coming in; economic timber is coming out; can we get there in 30 years? Fire and 2,000,000 pounds of fish fertilizer are missing from the Siuslaw. Maybe we can get by with less numbers, and need to focus on balance, not on numbers.
- Perhaps the approach should be to achieve progress to make stream areas as good as they can be, then address what society wants to take out in fish numbers. The Hatchery Research Center plans to study indigenous strains that can support native fish.

Oregon Coastal Coho Project: Guidance for Conservation Planning

Donna Silverberg distributed a “Guidance for Conservation Planning” document that attempts to synthesize the long list of values put forth by team members at the last meeting. A question was asked about TRT’s role in the recovery project. They will be providing technical review and refinement of the science used in the recovery process. Clarification of the relationship between and the timing of the TRT’s work regarding the Coho Project will be discussed further at the Coho June meeting.

ACTION: the Steering Committee will formulate questions for the TRT, particularly about timelines for products. Heather Stout, NOAA-TRT, reported that the TRT plans to have a response on the viability document out by end of July.

A question about the guidance document was raised: Why not use language from the Oregon Plan for the Coho Project mission statement? It was clarified that the stakeholder team previously discussed this and felt that they wanted more specificity than the Oregon plan mission; the Guidance document is an attempt to propose a Coho vision, and to outline goals and values that need balancing.

Stakeholder Team Member Comments/Questions:

- The specifics in this document are more valuable to our work than the bare bones mission from the Oregon Plan.

- The statement needs some word-smithing, but is a good first draft.
- From Lower Columbia Plan, add Harvest “The health of other native fish balanced predator/prey relationships” should be inserted as a second sub bullet under bullet #2. Is there a common understanding by everyone about what “balanced predator/prey relationship” of the above change means? Details about the “balanced predator/prey relationship” will come later.
- “Conserve Oregon’s Coastal Coho” (in paragraph starting “To support”) does not mean much to the average reader: suggest “protect and restore.” “Conserve” means no fishing to some public. Suggestion: “conserve, restore and utilize”. There was general agreement that “conserve, rebuild, restore and utilize” hits all levels of understanding.
- Concern about suggested change from “supportive” to “sustainable”, change to “functional habitats”.
- Should we get down to more details, and how much time will it take?

The next several comments were relative to the first bullet and its sub bullets:

- ‘Abundant’ term raises concerns. Doesn’t this mean sheer numbers of fish and this is scientifically debatable? Suggestions included “productive” or “an abundance” or “productive and abundant” or just start with “Salmon in our rivers...” The group agreed to support this.
- Second sub bullet under first bullet: get rid of ‘command’; Add livability to economic well-being. Shouldn’t there be more than fish runs and tourism that support economic well-being such as property values, clean water and livability, community, etc?
- Add “exist in *and contribute to*” to last sentence of second sub bullet; this may address some of the concerns in the suggestions above.
- What does ‘conscientious industries’ mean in sub bullet #2? It was agreed to remove ‘conscientious’.
- Last bullet: concerns about “subsistence” insert “*nutritional and*” after subsistence. Some concerns were raised about this, but no changes suggested.
- 2nd big bullet suggests you cannot have one without the other; delete “without sacrificing” and insert “compatible with”; this change was agreed to.

Additional general comments:

- Are we trying to reflect too many minute points? What is our intent with this document? It is intended to be a summary of the team’s ideas to date, including points from the executive summary; so this is the “non-executive summary”!
- If any bullet paragraphs become too long, then divide into two.

ACTION: There was general agreement to the document in principle, with some changes from the group discussion. A revised version of this document, with the changes made at the meeting, will be circulated to all via email for final approval at the next meeting or on-line.

Oregon’s Current Fish Management Construct on the Coastal Coho ESU

Bob Buckman (ODFW District Biologist) provided a handout and presented information on “Localized Coho Management North and Mid Coast”. The presentation was intended to bring the group up to speed with the current management guidance and actions in the field.

Questions were asked about the effect of straying on numbers. Stakeholders made comments about the “full seeding” term used in the model and whether it shows the entire picture. ODFW reported that the model has been recalibrated. Bob clarified that while the information in today’s presentation was based on the old model, it is still accurate, as long as the fish behave like they did in the past. Bob ended by saying he shares optimism expressed by stakeholder team members about the ability to recover and restore coho. “Much work is already going on to get us there”, he said.

Mike Gray (ODFW District Biologist) presented information on “Current Management of Oregon Coastal Coho – South Half”. Two handouts were provided. The primary message from this presentation was that there have been many changes since the plans were written, including the listing. As such, the objective and operating principles do not fit with today’s goals and objectives; they need updating. There is more to be done here than the Mid-North Coast.

Next steps: There was a request for ODFW to review the Bilby study on functionality in streams and NOAA studies on PCBs and urea. (Note: Heather Stout forwarded the study on PCBs downstream of carcasses and it was sent to the Stakeholder Team on 5/10.)

Desired Status/Condition of Coastal Coho –Stakeholder Team Discussion

Goal: to provide enough qualitative direction to inform ODFW technical staff so they can develop numbers and initial management options.

Kevin distributed “Examples of Conceptual Objectives for Viability and Harvest of Coastal Coho – for Discussion”. After an initial discussion, ODFW agreed to come back with fleshed out information based on ideas generated today. It was clarified that the group is generating ideas today that will be refined at the next meeting.

Stakeholder Team Member Comments/Questions:

- Viability - We should set different criteria for different populations of fish, by basin
- Need to micro-manage; one number for the whole coast will not work.
- Will oral agreements made 20 years ago be honored now?
- No commercial fishing representative is present today—we need that view in the mix.
- Couple the objectives with time periods: short, medium and long term desired status.
- Viability is a floor; where does it stand on a spectrum? What is the highest bar we want to reach? Set steps and timelines.
- How many objectives are there? ODFW clarified viability and harvest are the first two that come to mind. Also, the four examples given on viability are meant as a range; with harvest, the examples are also a range, and can be played out as setting high bars.
- Focus on fishable, harvestable levels, rather than bare bones viability.
- Viability criteria should not be static; nature will provide that viability will go up and

down.

- We currently have a model for harvest criteria, but we do not have any inland-side harvest criteria. Identify when we can have inland fisheries.
- Can we gauge inland fisheries? Can we limit them down toward the mouth, rather than opening the whole basin? Limit access in some areas.
- Spawning surveys do record number of jacks and adults, so there is a data set if someone wants to predict next year's run.
- Viability should be the floor; endorse making allowances for ups and downs, precautionary approach, and ecosystem-based management that reflects natural fluctuations.
- Identify all the feeding grounds, then seed those areas in bad years.
- What I want falls somewhere between micro management and a broad-brush approach: viability criteria for the ESU, management schemes for the basin. Example: Bob could close the fishery, if needed, for a basin specific reason.
- American Fisheries sent in comments in 1997 that get at viability. Did ODFW respond, and would it be useful to review this?
- Would like to see not just harvest, but objectives to address factors for decline and primary limiting factors, and whether or not ODFW has management authority over all of these. (ODFW agreed we should look at all Hs, not just hatcheries and harvest. That is the value of the multi-agency core team ODFW is working with on this).
- Habitat in the ocean can be looked at; consider examples from other places.
 - Caution that what works elsewhere may not work in our climate and location. Most ocean work has been done in tropical areas.
- Timelines? Short-term buy in to #6, and long term to #7 under Harvest. A good motto would be: "A salmon in every pot".
- We need more clarity on existing goals in draft basin and sub basin plans. Give us tools (e.g. assumptions about numbers and models used, escapement goals etc.) so we can understand more about habitat goals. ODFW responded: We want guidance from the stakeholder team about what you want. The staff will work to provide what you ask. It would not be useful unless we know generally what societal values you want to see reflected. ODFW can provide qualitative feedback rapidly, but the quicker you can get to balance the issues, the better.
- Until we understand the tradeoffs, it is hard to choose.
- Some support exists for the fisheries folks to pony up support; sport and commercial folks also may be willing to pony up if matrix for basin supports it.
- Transparency in models is important. It is important for people to understand what is or is not in the model. It does not have to be technical.
- ODFW could come back with a proposed status and give some explanation of how we got there.
- Factors for decline and using a model – what can ODFW do? ODFW: We can tell you about either the viability or harvest desires with a modeling exercise. Such a model cannot provide cause and effect on management factors like habitat or hatchery. We can figure in ocean by a straight number about variability or make assumptions based on past seasons.
- The group needs guidance on the risks and costs from ODFW to be able to create a balanced approach.

- Financial analogies using an investor mentality is good, but also look at it like a business owner with a business plan for coastal Coho standpoint. What would we offer? Why can't we have #6 now, and #7 long-term? Offer what we want, show what the cost will be and then present it to the public and let them respond.
- Mortality rate on ocean fish – a modest rate is 20%. Say 'keep your first two fish, whether marked or not'.
- The TRT has suggested 2,000,000 as a possible number for historic conditions. How about returning to 50%, or producing a million fish, as the kind of feedback that ODFW can use to give us more data? It was noted that it might be better to use regional numbers because the historic number above includes Canada.
- The management practice of 'catch and release' kills too many fish. Death rates are really low because many people avoid the fish counters.
- Remember, whale data underestimated the total number of whales!

Can we give ODFW direction? The facilitator summarized what she heard the group ask of ODFW for the next meeting:

1. ODFW will run some numbers of possible status objectives for the next meeting.
2. The group needs some 'view' of what any proposed 'number' might mean before they can answer the qualitative aspects.

NEXT STEPS: The June 17 meeting will be from 9:00 to 4:00. The agenda will include:

1. Quantitative discussion with information presented by ODFW (first on Agenda)
2. What have we learned from and about the Oregon Plan?
3. A review of the Final Assessment sent to NOAA will be at end of the day. Those interested can stay to ask questions (only schedule 1/2 hour or so).
4. What effect will NOAA's decision about whether to list the coho have on the work of the Stakeholder Team?