

**Coastal Coho Recovery Project
Stakeholder Team
First Kick-off Meeting
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Headquarters
Salem, Oregon**

**Draft: Facilitator's Meeting Summary
June 21, 2004**

Attendees for all or part of the meeting:

Stakeholder Team Members: Bill Bakke (Native Fish Society), Ed Bowles (ODFW), Tom Byler (GNRO), Tom Forgatsch (Agriculture/Cranberry Grower), Rosemary Furfey (NOAA), Wayne Giesy (Alsea Valley Alliance), Jennifer Hampel (Coquille Watershed Association), Cindy Heller (STEP), Wayne Hoffman (MidCoast Watershed Council), Kaitlin Lovell (Trout Unlimited), Jason Miner (Oregon Trout), Richard Oba (Oregon Coast Sport Fishing), Shawn Reiersgaard (Tillamook SWCD), Blake Rowe (Longview Fiber Co/OFIC), Shane Stewart (NW Steelheaders), Johnny Sundstrom (OR Association of Conservation Districts), Terry Thompson (OR Counties)

Alternates, Resource Advisors, and Other Interested Parties: Lindsay Ball (ODFW), Jim Brown (OR Governor's Office), Mark Chilcote (ODFW), Charlie Corrarino (ODFW), Rep. Jackie Dingfelder (OR Representative), Elizabeth Gaar (NOAA), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Bob Lohn (NOAA), Bruce McIntosh (ODFW), Jim Myron (GNRO), Jay Nicholas (OWEB), Scott Rumsey (NOAA), Mary Scurlock (Pacific Rivers Council), Heather Stout (NOAA), Cathy Tortorici (NOAA), Rob Walton (NOAA), Terry Witt (Oregonians for Food and Shelter), Ray Wilkeson (OFIC)

Facilitation Team: Donna Silverberg and Robin Harkless (Facilitators)

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Executive Summary of Oregon Plan to Stakeholder Team	Tom Byler, Bruce McIntosh	July 6: SEE NOTES BELOW
Schedule of upcoming TRT and IMST meetings to Stakeholder Team	Rosemary Furfey	July 6:SEE NOTES BELOW

Welcome – Lindsay Ball:

Members of the Coastal Coho Stakeholder Team introduced themselves, and Lindsay Ball, Director of ODFW, extended a welcome and appreciation to the team for their willingness to volunteer their time to assist in solving some of Oregon's fish issues. This group's mission, he stated, is to begin a discussion about how to move toward a de-listing of fish through management programs to protect fish to a level of sustainability. He

requested that the stakeholder team members maintain good contact with their constituencies throughout this process to ensure that it remains a very open process.

Commitment of State and NOAA Fisheries to the Project and Process:

Jim Brown, Governor's Natural Resources Policy Director, offered that the Oregon Plan for salmon and watersheds was initially designed to avoid listing by the federal government. There has been a huge amount of volunteer efforts from a variety of groups (i.e., timber, agriculture, soil and water conservationists, environmental groups and landowners). Most recently, the Governor's Office has begun looking at mechanisms to provide regulatory assurances. To do this, the state has begun an assessment of recovery and where we are with the Oregon Plan. Discussions are underway about the potential for assurances from NOAA. ODFW needs help framing a recommendation, via this group, for NOAA given all that has been done under the Oregon Plan. Jim noted his appreciation for the stakeholder team members' willingness to participate in this valuable process.

Bob Lohn, Regional Administrator, NOAA Fisheries, also extended his gratitude to the group for their willingness to commit to this process, and noted that the group members were chosen because of their expertise and willingness to commit their time to resolving issues around coastal coho. The tools of recovery, he said, lie not in the Endangered Species Act (ESA), but in the state plan. He commended the state on its efforts thus far, and said that the question remains: Are we there yet? NOAA's review of the Oregon Plan assessment will address: 1) Have the problems been identified? 2) Are they fixed? 3) Will they stay fixed? If the answer is yes, then management of the stock will shift back to the state. The species will continue to need support, but without federal oversight. The desired outcome of the stakeholder team review is a full, honest and public airing of the issues. If the conclusion is that we are there, then NOAA will take recommendations from the stakeholder group for what to do next in the recovery process.

The Proposed Listing Determination that came out on June 14 recommended listing the Oregon Coast Coho ESU as Threatened under the ESA, but there is language in the proposed rule that recognizes this assessment is underway. The coastal coho stakeholder team will answer: Are conservation efforts enough? If yes, NOAA will re-open the listing and look at the status again with the assessment of conservation efforts. Technically, the species is no longer listed and it is uncertain at this point whether the fish will be re-listed. This process will aid in NOAA's determination.

Overview of the Project:

Tom Byler, Governor's Office of Natural Resources, said that ODFW, the Governor's office and all of the state's natural resource agencies are involved with the Coastal Coho Project. For the assessment phase, the involvement of NOAA Fisheries and the stakeholder then are both critical. The state needs to be an honest view from the public represented through this process. The key elements are:

1. Assessment of the project
 - a. At a more detailed level than annual reports
2. Interface with Federal ESA requirements
 - a. Inform for status listing

- b. ESA assurances – find ways to reward good work where merited by making assurances that regulations will not interfere.
3. Conservation and recovery planning

ACTION: Members of the stakeholder team requested an executive summary of the Oregon Plan. The following websites can be accessed and should serve as a starting point:

Oregon Plan Biennial Report (http://www.oweb.state.or.us/publications/OR_Plan_Report01-03.pdf)

Oregon Plan Website (<http://www.oregon-plan.org/>)

IMST website (<http://www.fsl.orst.edu/imst/>)

Ed Bowles, ODFW Fish Chief, also shared information on the overview of this process. He said that ODFW will take the next step with the Native Fish Conservation Policy (NFCP) and develop a plan for conservation of the Oregon coastal coho. He noted that the Oregon Plan has an unprecedented Cabinet level commitment to work with volunteers on the ground to help recover and maintain healthy streams and species. The assessment is a self-audit of how the plan is working. Ed provided a power point presentation, which is available in hard copy. A summary of the presentation is highlighted in bullets below:

- There are three primary arenas for this project: Oregon Plan assessment, ESA listing determination, and conservation/recovery planning.
- The Oregon Plan assessment will: involve 15 teams and all Oregon Plan partners, assess fish management and habitat, link to state/federal science products to answer whether it is addressing bottlenecks, and identify additional activities and commitments, if necessary.
- NOAA's status review and listing determination will be informed by the Oregon Plan coastal coho assessment.
- ODFW would like the stakeholder team to help identify those actions that could help to reduce the gap between the desired and existing status of the fish.
- Peer review groups include: Oregon management partners, Independent Management Science Team and the Technical Recovery Team (TRT). ODFW only has regulatory responsibilities of hatcheries and harvest. They will coordinate with other agencies that control habitat, pathogens, etc.
- Public involvement will include: Stakeholder team, town hall meetings, NFCP Task Force, and ad hoc outreach, as viewed necessary or useful. Invitations from stakeholder members would be helpful to achieve a thorough public involvement process.
 - The stakeholder team will provide input and serve as liaison for the Oregon Plan assessment, and will help develop or refine conservation measures.
- Timeline: Proposed listing determination – June '04; Coastal Coho Oregon Plan Assessment – Fall '04; Conservation/Recovery Plan – Summer/Fall '04-Fall '05.

- The NOAA/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Policy for Evaluating Conservation Efforts (PECE policy) is a key new evaluation tool for the Oregon Plan assessment, and requires a review of whether the Oregon Plan conservation efforts are adequate and sustainable. The Federal PECE policy document was available at the meeting, and the stakeholders were encouraged to review it for their work in this process.

Question from the Group:

- Will this process re-do assessments that have already been done? No, this assessment is intended to make sure all the appropriate data is brought together to develop a gap analysis. The intent is not to recreate the wheel but instead to capture all current and recent reviews in one place.

NOAA's Recovery Planning:

Rosemary Furfey, the Coastal Coho Coordinator for NOAA Fisheries, spoke of NOAA's recovery planning. She clarified that a recovery plan is non-regulatory and advisory. Stakeholder involvement is critical for on the ground ideas and buy-in of the recovery plan. The TRT, headed by NOAA, will serve as a science advisory group to the stakeholder team. Heather Stout, NOAA, represented the TRT at this meeting and TRT members plan to attend future meetings. Other members of the TRT are: Clearwater BioStudies, Inc; US Forest Service, OWEB and NOAA Science Center staff. While the public will have an opportunity to review and comment on draft TRT products, the Coastal Coho Stakeholder Team will be informed about the following draft TRT products as they become available:

- Historical Populations report
- Population Viability Analysis
- ESU Viability Criteria
- Limiting Factors analysis

ACTION: Anyone that is interested is welcome to attend the monthly TRT meetings, which are held in Corvallis. NOAA will provide a schedule of upcoming TRT and IMST meetings to the stakeholder group. (*NOTE:* The following information was shared by Rosemary Furfey after today's meeting.)

Next TRT meetings:

- Friday, July 16, 2004 at Forest Service Lab on OSU campus in Corvallis
- Monday, August 9, 2004 (same location as above)
- tentatively: Tuesday, September 28th, a joint meeting with SONCC coho Work Group (meeting location to be determined)

TRT web information:

NOAA Northwest Science Center TRT web link for agendas, meeting dates, and draft products:

www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/trt/index.html

Related Processes of Interest – Scott Rumsey:

Scott Rumsey, NOAA, provided a handout of his presentation of the proposed NOAA ESA Listing Determination and proposed hatchery listing policy. Each hatchery stock will be evaluated on/inventoried to find a level of divergence from naturally produced

stocks. Relative to coastal coho, hatchery populations are considered ‘discreet’. Overall, the hatchery policy is trying to acknowledge both the benefits and the risks of hatcheries. Scott explained the indicators of an ESU’s viability include:

- Good abundance (to a set level)
- Spatial structure good enough to survive catastrophic circumstances (near and far)
- Genetic diversity good enough to support a variety of circumstances such as disease
- Productivity to a level that will allow the population to continue without need for supplementation.

The ESU status assessment is based on the entire ESU (natural populations, isolated hatchery stocks, and mixed populations). There was a concern raised that a population moving from endangered to threatened could occur based only on hatchery population health. It was pointed out that “viable” means there must be naturally spawning stocks in healthy condition (not just hatchery stocks) and there are times that naturally spawning stocks are not healthy without the aid of hatcheries.

There are different interpretations of the word “adequate”. This has been a critique of the policy, so the question is who determines adequacy? Biological review teams will offer their best professional judgment and ultimately, NOAA will make a determination. Quantitative targets would be preferred but at this point, however, NOAA does not have the latest viability criteria that the coho TRT are currently producing.

Scott noted that the proposed listing determination and hatchery policy comment period is open through September. NOAA expects to finalize the listing determinations 9-12 months from now. Scott walked the group through the listing determination review process:

- Determination of “species”
- ESU status assessment
- Evaluation of protective efforts
- Proposed ESA listing determination

Scott also walked the group through the proposed listing determinations by ESU, including the number of hatchery programs within each ESU. A question was raised about the Lower Columbia coho – will their listing affect fisheries? NOAA responded that this change should not affect fisheries much.

The group was reminded that the hatchery listing policy and the ESA Listing Determination were presented to allow folks a view of the broader issues around the fish, and that the charge for the stakeholder team is to first provide advice on the Oregon Plan – and then move on to the conservation and recovery plans. Information related to the proposed hatchery listing policy and proposed listing determinations can be found at www.nwr.noaa.gov/lsrcd.

Getting Started:

Donna Silverberg, facilitator, explained the role of the facilitation team: to keep the group focused on its tasks and moving forward with their dialogue. The facilitation team will

provide written summaries of each meeting and will ensure that all members have an opportunity to speak and be heard at each meeting. As impartial third parties, the facilitation team will seek to run fair and evenhanded meetings and will support the team's communication between meetings.

She then led the group in a discussion about the stakeholder process timeline, expectations from members, and logistics. Group meetings will be held about once a month (roughly ten meetings) for a year. The expected outcome is a review and audit of the Oregon Plan, first specific to the coast and then to inform the rest of the state. During the review process, the stakeholder team can decide whether there needs to be full agreement on their recommendations. It was noted that the group could be very influential with policy makers if there were consensus recommendations resulting from the review (i.e. use of Measure 66 funds, rulemaking, statutory changes). The stakeholder team is not being asked to be scientists, but instead to look at methodology and results of the science and provide insight on the policy implications of that science.

Other suggestions and questions were offered:

- How will ODFW evaluate 'effectiveness'? ODFW is working to establish the bar. At this point the evaluation is broken down into populations: abundance, productivity, and distribution. There will be more information on this during a subsequent meeting.
- To answer 'how well are we doing' with the Oregon Plan – avoid looking at fish numbers and instead inventory habitat projects and then answer the question: What does this mean?
- The facilitators will keep the list of email addresses. Information or messages for distribution to the full group from the stakeholder team should be sent via the facilitation team.
- This stakeholder team should discuss: Are DLCD and other regulatory agencies' responsibilities adequate to recover habitat, and are the agencies doing an adequate job of meeting those responsibilities?
- How/when will other public members be able to comment? There will be time on each agenda for public comment, after the stakeholder team participants have had a full discussion on any given topic. The facilitation team will clarify this on future agendas and at the meetings.
- A request was made to send substantive documents to participants three weeks in advance to allow enough time for review and preparation for discussion. ODFW will try to get some documents to folks in advance. There will be time at a subsequent meeting to comment on any documents that are distributed at a meeting.
- A concern was raised that certain industries may be pointed out as not doing an adequate job. This could create a great deal of tension. It was clarified that Oregon is not intending to write new administrative rules or to create new measures under the Oregon Plan. Instead, the state is hoping to acknowledge what has and is being done and look for opportunities to refine the Plan where appropriate. One important issue is whether state funds are being invested appropriately or could they be invested wisely.
- What types of products are expected from the group? This needs to be answered before having a discussion about group protocols and ground rules.

- The Pacific Fisheries Management Council should be a participant, or somehow bridged to the work of this group.
- The agencies were cautioned: do not ask members to review drafts that are going to be changed again prior to the meetings.
- It was clarified that, at a minimum, this group will review the effectiveness of regulatory programs. Then the group will look at whether the programs are adequate to fill bottleneck areas impeding the conservation of coastal coho.
- Commercial fishers should be represented on the stakeholder team.

Next Meeting, Monday, July 19, 9-4:

The next Coastal Coho Stakeholder Team meeting will be held in Florence, Oregon. Meeting summary notes, an agenda and meeting location with a list of local hotels will be distributed two weeks prior to the meeting.

Thank you all for your continued participation in the Coastal Coho Project. We appreciate your efforts and commitment to the collaborative process.

DS Consulting Donna Silverberg and Robin Harkless