

**Coastal Coho Recovery Project
Stakeholder Team
Second Meeting
Florence Events Center
Florence, Oregon**

**Revised: Facilitator's Meeting Summary
July 19, 2004**

Attendees for all or part of the meeting:

Stakeholder Team Members: Paul Engelmeyer (public at large), Tom Forgatsch (Agriculture/Cranberry Grower), Wayne Giesy (Asea Valley Alliance), Jennifer Hampel (Coquille Watershed Association), Cindy Heller (STEP), Wayne Hoffman (MidCoast Watershed Council), Bob Jacobson (OR Salmon Commission), Kaitlin Lovell (Trout Unlimited), Jason Miner (Oregon Trout), Bill Moshofsky (Oregonians in Action), Richard Oba (Oregon Coast Sport Fishing), John Phelan (LTM Inc.), Shawn Reiersgaard (Tillamook SWCD), Blake Rowe (Longview Fiber Co/OFIC), Sam Sasaki (City of Newport), Johnny Sundstrom (OR Association of Conservation Districts), Terry Thompson (OR Counties)

Alternates and Resource Advisors: Ed Bowles (ODFW), Bob Buckman (ODFW), Tom Byler (GNRO), Charlie Corrarino (ODFW), Ryan French (Confederated Tribe of the Siletz Indians), Rosemary Furfey (NOAA), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Pete Lawson (NOAA Technical Recovery Team), Bruce McIntosh (ODFW), Jay Nicholas (OWEB), Tom Peterson (Florence STEP), George Westfall (ODFW), Ray Wilkeson (OFIC), Bronwen Wright (Pacific Rivers Council)

Other Interested Parties: Charley Dewberry (public), Jeff Jackson (USFS – Siuslaw National Forest), Walt Morgan (public), Tom Shafer (OWEB), Louise Solliday (public), Mark Trenholm (Tillamook Estuary Partnership), Thomas Way (public), and Terry Witt (Oregonians for Food and Shelter)

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

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Estimate of how many state agency representatives are working half+ time on the Oregon Plan assessment	Tom Byler	August 24 (report at the meeting)
Ocean Conditions Study to Stakeholder Team	Pete Lawson/facilitation team	August 3
Post materials on Coastal Coho Project web page; notify Stakeholder Team when web page is available	Tom Byler	August 24

Welcome – Introductions:

Facilitator Donna Silverberg opened the meeting with a welcome to the stakeholders, resource advisors, and other interested parties in attendance. She distributed a draft set of protocols to guide the team and its effort, for discussion at the next meeting. Members of the stakeholder team introduced themselves and answered the question: Why is it important to you and your organization to support healthy runs of coho in Oregon and participate in this process? The following bullets summarize those comments:

My organization and I want to....

- Support healthy fishing-related businesses
- Be prepared to implement strategies to support salmon runs
- Be mindful of regulatory effects and water/life quality issues
- Support Oregon's coastal economies
- Support sustainable fisheries
- Do what we can to foster good habitat, good science and appropriate rules
- Find a way for hatcheries and other industries to provide more support to healthy salmon runs
- Provide input to the review of the Oregon Plan in order to continue effective implementation of the programs that support it
- Assist in the review based on the perspective from on-the-ground efforts and the people working on those efforts
- Get informed and expert assistance from the public in reviewing and assessing the effectiveness of the Oregon Plan
- Make certain salmon are around for enjoyment by the community and to support the sustainability of other species in the watersheds
- Assist in the rebuilding of salmon stocks to effect local economies and support healthy watersheds
- Support local economies and make the necessary linkages to water supplies and water quality issues—both for the Team and for my community
- Protect economies and jobs and help with the review and evaluation of Oregon Plan
- Conserve and protect native salmon and other fish species
- Make link between communities and resource conservation
- Support the future of salmon for the economy and quality of life in Oregon
- Help by bringing balance, realism and good science to issues facing landowners, fish and others who share an existence within the watersheds
- Move the Oregon Plan forward in its development by assisting a detailed check-in of its progress, value, and gaps
- Restore wild coho runs for tribal culture and subsistence, and species sustainability

In summary, the Stakeholder Team shares a number of common interests and goals:

Support local economies, utilize and examine good science, conserve and protect the species, assist in review and assessment of the Oregon Plan to help move it forward, implement realistic strategies to support salmon runs, improve the

effective role of hatcheries, link communities to resource conservation (and visa versa), bring balance to the issues, and restore coho runs for cultural purposes.

A question was raised about the convening agencies' and whether they should be represented at the table since this is a stakeholder team comprised of public members. Team members felt their discussions and review would benefit from the side-by-side participation of Tom Byler (OR Governor's Natural Resource Policy Advisor), Ed Bowles (Chief, Fish Division, ODFW), and Rosemary Furfey (Coho Recovery Coordinator, NOAA). It was clarified that the three will not participate in any recommendations that might come from the group, but that they will participate in all meetings of the Team. For purposes of clarity, they will be listed and considered Resource Advisors to the group, rather than members of the stakeholder team (note: this change has been incorporated in these notes and in the revised draft of the Protocols).

Role, Tasks and Key Questions of the Stakeholder Team:

Ed Bowles and Tom Byler provided an overview of the overall purpose and tasks of the broader Oregon Coastal Coho Project:

1. Do an assessment/audit of the Oregon Plan on the coast and assess the effectiveness of the Oregon Plan in the coastal region and statewide, as appropriate – Phase I
2. Submit the completed assessment to NOAA Fisheries to inform its status review listing determination.
3. Inform ESA recovery planning and state conservation plan (guided by the Native Fish Conservation Policy)
4. Based on what we learn from the assessment, seek opportunities for regulatory assurances from NOAA to avoid “take” problems

Given this project perspective, a handout was provided that included specific tasks and key questions related to the role of the Stakeholder Team in this effort.

Stakeholder Team Tasks:

- track and provide input to the state on the Oregon Plan assessment during its development;
- provide feedback to the state on the completed assessment regarding issues, ideas or strategies that could improve effectiveness of implementation of the Oregon Plan in the coastal region and statewide;
- work with the state and NOAA Fisheries to identify recovery scenario measures and management options for an Oregon Coast Coho recovery/conservation plan; and
- inform their constituents and the public on the development of the assessment, the substance of the completed assessment, and recovery planning efforts.

Key Questions to guide review and feedback on information from the assessment of the Oregon Plan:

- Are the information, data and analyses in the assessment presented in a way that is logical and easy to understand?
- Did the State miss anything in its assessment of different aspects of the Oregon Plan?
- Are the results and conclusions understandable?

- What comments and recommendations does your interest group have on the assessment?
- Does your group have any comments and recommendations on the potential policy implications of the assessment?

Questions and comments from the Stakeholder Team:

- Many groups have already done assessments. The stakeholder team would be more effective if it were to get this information in writing.
- Will there be an opportunity to hear “dueling science” between NOAA and the State? Third party science?
- There is an important distinction between the interest in NOAA’s listing status and wanting to sustain fish throughout the state. One is a regulatory hurdle while the other has more to do with the quality of life.
- Moving forward with recovery planning without first having targets or metrics to guide any decision making seems like a recipe for disaster for many team members. The sooner such targets or metrics are created by the science teams and shared with the stakeholder team, the better off this entire process will be.

(NOTE: All handouts were sent prior to the meeting via email to the Stakeholder Team for electronic distribution and also provided during the meeting. All materials will be posted on the Coastal Coho Project web page (when it is developed) as a link to the Oregon Plan website (<http://www.oregon-plan.org/>). Stay tuned for more information.)

Timeline:

A handout of the proposed timeline for the group’s work was provided. The timeline highlights three phases:

- Phase I: Familiarize the team with the analysis and methodology of the Oregon Plan
- Phase II: Process the Information in the Assessment – what does it mean?
- Phase III: Produce conservation and recovery plan recommendations

Other Data and Input: As the team progresses with its review, the Technical Recovery Team (TRT) will provide documents to inform the overall assessment. The distribution of TRT preliminary analyses will start very soon to assist the state in its assessment effort. The TRT expects to finalize these analyses by June/July of 2005. The first document that the Stakeholder Team will review is NOAA Fisheries’ ‘Historical Populations Report’, which is now ready to distribute. ‘Viable Salmonid Populations Criteria’ and the ‘Limiting Factors Analysis’ are expected to be completed and sent out to the group in the Fall and next year. The state’s Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team (IMST) will be involved later to peer review the state conservation assessments prior to sending them to NOAA.

ACTION: This is obviously a very large effort. A request was made for the State to provide an estimate of how many state employees are working at least half of the time on this assessment process. Tom Byler will provide this information at the next Stakeholder Team meeting.

Coastal Coho 101:

Kevin Goodson presented information about the biological attributes of coho populations, and provided information about Oregon's viability criteria as documented in the state's Native Fish Conservation Policy (NFCP) and consistent with NOAA's Viable Salmonid Populations (VSP) concept. The facilitation team will email Kevin's power point presentation on "coastal coho biology 101" to members of the stakeholder team and any other interested parties. As noted above, the presentation will also be posted on the Coastal Coho Project web page on the Oregon Plan website once available.

Other Related Information: At the suggestion of team members, Pete Lawson, chair of NOAA's TRT, agreed to provide his ocean conditions study, "Cycles of Ocean Productivity", via email and will present information about the study at the next Stakeholder Team meeting. The Stakeholder Team will also receive ODFW's stock status report, a study done at the University of Washington on climate change predictions (there will be a workshop in Portland in September on this), and some Canadian studies on ocean conditions.

Comments and Questions from the Stakeholder Team:

- The difference between near term and long term limiting factors, other than ocean conditions, that would give a different view might include: habitat, harvest levels, and other dynamic disturbance activities that are periodic and punctuate equilibrium. In order to persist over time, there needs to be enough good conditions to support survival through bad conditions – a 'mortality budget' analogy was used.
- It was suggested that calcium and other nutrient studies be included in the assessment. Information on the topic can be found in: Southern California; studies done by EPA on the Oregon coastal range; and Oregon DEQ.
- How many factors will be included in NOAA's listing decisions? Pete Lawson offered that NOAA will look at many factors – including landslides, fires and floods – but not necessarily at a highly detailed level.
- Past prediction models from the Pacific Fisheries Management Council have not shown the best accuracy for predicting run size. Which models will be used and how do we have trust in the reliability of the outcomes?
- The relationship between river habitat, land habitat and ocean conditions must be considered. For example, if the relationship between these is good enough during good ocean condition periods and can support large numbers of fish, why is it not good enough when there are not so many returns?
- Look at real, on the ground data, not just predictive models. Bob Buckman noted that in freshwater, the egg/smolt survival for wild fish is ~6%, and much higher (80%) for hatchery fish. Bad ocean conditions years show 1-2% marine survival for wild fish (.5-1% for hatchery fish), while good ocean condition years show 6-15% survival (3-6% for hatchery fish).
- NOAA was urged to provide financial assistance to the state to help support its review of hatchery conservation programs for the coastal coho.
- Has there been any effort to assess habitat conditions/improvements since the Oregon Plan was created? Is there information about what the fish need?

- In order to improve the economic base through more and healthier salmon runs, there needs to be improvements in hatchery management. Improvements to the way the fish are handled in hatcheries would increase numbers of hatchery fish that can be harvested.

Overview of the Oregon Plan:

Introduction: Jay Nicholas, OWEB, provided a brief overview of the Oregon Plan, which began in 1995 with an expressed need for a disciplined, coherent plan for salmon recovery in Oregon. This comprehensive life cycle management plan involves agency programs, voluntary restoration programs, monitoring, and science oversight. Now, eight years later, the question is: How are we doing? The assessment of the Oregon Plan will look at the details of what is happening on the ground.

PECE Policy: Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, provided an overview of NOAA and the USFWS' Policy for Evaluation of Conservation Efforts (PECE) when making listing decisions. The policy was adopted in 2003. It identifies criteria NOAA will use to determine whether conservation efforts contribute to making a listing unnecessary, and can be used for states and others that want to develop formalized conservation efforts. This is the policy that will be used to determine NOAA's decision regarding the Coastal Coho listing—and is why this Team is important in helping to identify all the on-going, on-the-ground conservation efforts. The two criteria listed in the PECE policy are: 1) Certainty of implementation, and 2) Certainty of effectiveness. In reviewing comments when developing the policy, timing for how long the conservation programs were in place was important in determining whether or not conservation efforts met the criteria.

Scientific Assumptions for Assessing the Oregon Plan: Bruce McIntosh, ODFW, provided information (and a handout) of the assessment framework and scientific assumptions. The key questions that the assessment teams ask are:

- What are the primary factors that limit the sustainability of coastal coho?
 - Past, present and future perspectives
 - Biological needs of coho
- What does the monitoring data tell us about the primary limiting factors?
- Are Oregon Plan measures focused on the primary limiting factors?
- Are there any big issues that the State is missing?
- What corrective measures need to be taken based on the Assessment?

A concern was raised that the information in the US Forest Service Coastal Landscape Analysis and Modeling Study (CLAMS), which looks at trends and projections, does not accurately reflect on the ground actions. This is a legitimate concern.

Organizational Framework of the Assessment: Jay Nicholas, OWEB, presented information and showed wall graphs of the status of coastal coho. Three different environmental scales for assessing limiting factors are being reviewed/analyzed using available data to date: the population, population aggregate and overall ESU scales. Limiting factors that will be reviewed include: marine habitat, harvest, hatchery impacts, stream conditions, fish passage, water quantity and quality, and "other (which includes

toxics, hydropower, stream fertility, etc.) He noted that the survival rates for coho increased after the Oregon Plan was put together. He acknowledged that viability targets are missing from the framework. Once those targets are agreed on, there will be more capability to highlight appropriate areas where work can be done to improve coho.

Issues and Questions from the Stakeholder Team:

- How was the temperature standard established and is it appropriate for an in-river assessment? The IMST has a report on the EPA-Oregon DEQ temperature standard, which can be found at: www.fsl.orst.edu/imst/ -- under IMST Technical Reports.
- Suggestion regarding stream conditions: separate over-wintering from summer qualities, as certain conditions may be very improved for one or more populations (because of the timing) but still not good for others. This will better show that a good deal of effort has already gone into stream condition improvements.
- Request that the habitat assessment team consider “flashiness” of weather patterns vs. total runoff patterns (changes in the hydrograph). Is there a marked difference?
- Link state information with local watershed coordinator information to get the full picture of what is happening on the ground.

Analysis of Factors for Decline: Harvest Management:

Curt Melcher, ODFW Ocean Harvest Management, began the review of limiting factors with a presentation on harvest management as a limiting factor listed in the Federal Register and the Oregon Plan. Curt’s presentation is available in hard copy and will also be posted on the Coastal Coho Project web page when it is up and running. The data used in the assessment of harvest management came from the sport and commercial fisheries from 1970-2003. Federal fishery management plans must get approval from the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) which includes voting members from California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho and federal agencies. The original Oregon Plan harvest matrix was adopted by the PFMC as an amendment to the federal Salmon Fishery Management Plan (FMP) and later revised by the Oregon Coast Natural Coho work group. The revised harvest matrix was adopted by the PFMC as technical guidance and will be incorporated into the next amendment to the Salmon FMP (in 2005). One fundamental change in the new management approach is that preseason abundance forecasts are no longer the factor that determines allowable fishing levels. Instead, parental spawner levels and an index of marine survival determine the allowable fishery harvest rates.

Stakeholder Team Meetings Schedule:

Based on the availability of the stakeholder team members, the next scheduled meeting dates have been set for:

- Tuesday, August 24 (Newport);
- Wednesday, September 8 (Tillamook);
- Monday, September 27 (TBD);
- Tuesday, October 19 (TBD); and
- Tuesday, November 16 (TBD)

Please mark your calendars and plan for all-day meetings. Supporting documents for the August 24th meeting in Newport will be sent out by August 3rd. The agenda will be sent by August 6th. A set of draft protocols was distributed and will be discussed at the next meeting. If you have comments prior to the meeting, please feel free to share them with the facilitation team via the email below.

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

E-mail changes or comments on these notes at
robin76@cnnw.net