

Appendix 1 - Attachment IV
Summaries of the Stakeholder Team Meetings

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

**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 (Aalsea 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 Fibre 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 Multidisciplinary Science Team (IMST) 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.

NOTE:

These notes approved: July 19, 2004 Stakeholder Team meeting

DS Consulting Donna Silverberg and Robin Harkless

**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 (Alea 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

**Coastal Coho Recovery Project
Stakeholder Team --Third Meeting
Hatfield Marine Science Center
Newport, Oregon**

**Facilitator's Summary Notes
August 24, 2004**

The following notes are a summary of key discussions and presentations that are intended to point out future actions or issues that may need further discussion at upcoming meetings. These notes are not intended to be a verbatim “record” of the meeting, only a reminder for team members.

Attendees for all or part of the meeting:

Stakeholder Team Members: Bill Bakke (Native Fish Society), Paul Engelmeyer (public at large), Tom Forgatsch (Agriculture/Cranberry Grower), Wayne Giesy (Alsea Valley Alliance), Wayne Hoffman (MidCoast Watershed Council), Tom Kartrude (Port of Siuslaw), Kaitlin Lovell (Trout Unlimited), Jason Miner (Oregon Trout), Richard Oba (Oregon Coast Sport Fishing), John Phelan (LTM Inc.), Blake Rowe (Longview Fiber Co/OFIC), Sam Sasaki (City of Newport), Terry Thompson (OR Counties), Stan van de Wetering (Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians)

Resource Advisors

Ed Bowles (ODFW), Tom Byler (GNRO), Rosemary Furfey (NOAA)

Alternates and Technical Resources: Tony Amandi (ODFW), Robin Brown (ODFW), Bob Buckman (ODFW), Charlie Corrarino (ODFW), Ryan French (Confederated Tribe of the Siletz Indians), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Mike Gray (ODFW), Pete Lawson (NOAA Technical Recovery Team), Jay Nicholas (OWEB), Heather Stout (TRT), Terry Witt (Oregonians for Food and Shelter, alternate for Bill Moshofsky), Bronwen Wright (Pacific Rivers Council)

Other Interested Parties: Lily DeFriend (public), Jeff Jackson (USFS – Siuslaw National Forest)

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

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Update 7/19 summary notes to reflect suggested changes	Facilitation team	September 3
Draft abbreviated set of protocols relative to the assessment phase of the Stakeholder Team’s work	Facilitation team	September 3
Provide NOAA’s public meeting schedule for California	Rosemary Furfey	September 3
Provide names of the Core Team	Tom Byler	September 8
Provide the State’s definition of “Recovery” as noted in the Oregon Plan	Tom Byler	September 8
Post technical papers on the “Coastal Coho Project” web page – Oregon Plan website	Kevin Goodson	ASAP!

Welcome/Introductions:

Facilitator Donna Silverberg lead a round of introductions and welcomed the team members, resource advisors, and other interested parties to the meeting. Stan van de Wetering explained to the group that, due to Stan’s schedule, he has asked Ryan French to sit at the table for the Siletz Tribe. Stan and Ryan will work closely with each other in preparation for meetings. With notice, they will coordinate and provide responses from the tribe on particular issues that the team sees as needed.

Comments on July 19th Meeting Summary and Follow-up from Last Meeting:

Team members offered comments to the draft summary notes from the July 19th Stakeholder Team meeting. Comments and subsequent actions are summarized in bullets below:

- The 7/19 notes need to reflect discussions regarding the difficulty many team members expressed about developing a recovery plan without first providing targets or metrics. Not having targets from the TRT in advance of planning seems a backwards approach.
- In retrospect of the meeting, some members were uncomfortable with the notion that management strategies would be developed within sideboards established by “the Core Team” without knowing who comprises the Core Team nor what specifically those sideboards are. This was noted in the notes and protocols.
 - Tom Byler, Gov’s Natural Resources Office, responded that the intent of this idea was to support a collaborative effort between the Stakeholder Team, the state’s Core Team that is already in place working on the Oregon Plan assessment, and the TRT who is developing scientific products.
ACTION: To better reflect this, the protocols will be changed: In the Stakeholder Tasks section, bullet 3, delete “Within the sideboards established by the Core Team” and replace with “In concert with the Oregon Plan Core Team and TRT, identify...”
- Page 6, under ‘Scientific Assumptions’ section: The notes state that the concern raised about CLAMS not reflecting on the ground actions is “legitimate and will be addressed.” Because it is not feasible to ‘address this issue’ through CLAMS, the phrase “will be addressed” should be deleted. CLAMS, like other analysis models, can not do more than it was built to do. Ed Bowles, ODFW, agreed with the comment and further generalized that all analysis models should not be asked to do more than they are capable of doing.

General Comments/Discussion:

- What is the Governor’s Office vision for the Stakeholder Team and the effort it is undertaking? Tom Byler responded:
 - Relative to the state assessment, the Stakeholder Team’s charge is to review and provide observations and recommendations to the state related

to the state's assessment of the Oregon Plan in the coastal Coho ESU and then, eventually, how this assessment relates to Oregon Plan implementation statewide.

- After the state assessment has been completed, work through Oregon's Native Fish Conservation Policy planning and NOAA's recovery planning to develop recovery and conservation plans specific to coastal coho.
- Questions were raised about how comments from the Stakeholder Team will be incorporated into the assessment and/or given a response from the State. Tom Byler offered that no specific process has yet been identified for documenting and responding to the final recommendations and observations of the Team. Responses to comments could depend on the nature of the comments. For example, any comments that propose or suggest rule or legislation changes would require additional discussion with a broader group of stakeholders and interests before taking any action. There was a general sense from the Team that, if members are being asked to commit their time, it will be important to understand whether and how comments will be incorporated. A request was made to add a chapter in the Assessment Report about this committee, including the comments and issues it may raise.
- How well does the Governor's Office believe the Oregon Plan is working? Tom Byler responded: Generally, the Oregon Plan is working well. Specifically, they do not yet know. The state, through the coastal assessment, is working aggressively to get the criteria for judging the effectiveness of the Oregon Plan on the coast. Once they have this and can complete the analysis, which they are doing side by side with this stakeholder group, then they can answer the question. The state, including the Governor's Office, is not ahead of the group in making a judgment about the effectiveness of the Oregon Plan.

A question was posed to the group: What *IS* the Oregon Plan doing? Team members offered their thoughts:

- Working to get a lot done on the ground
- Bringing local, state and federal folks together to improve watersheds.
- On the ground projects are occurring – timber and other industries are doing well while other areas are not doing so well.
- One goal of the Oregon Plan was to avoid listings – in this regard, the Oregon Plan has not fully served its purpose.
- Seven years later, the Oregon Plan is still, amazingly, right on point: More attention, public involvement and focused agency cooperation has occurred than ever before on an ESA issue. Cooperative work continues to get done involving a number of different agencies. And the public is still engaged and enthusiastic. The fact that it has endured says something positive and remarkable about the plan and the process.
- Some members want an opportunity to look at additional, “dueling” science. It was noted that there is another team charged with doing that review and stakeholder team members are welcome to attend those meetings. The stakeholder group should continue to look at the social impacts of the Oregon Plan, as charged.

Follow-Up From Last Meeting:

Level of State Effort: Tom Byler provided general estimates of how much time and effort state agencies are putting into the assessment phase of the Oregon Plan. 14 staff are committed at 50% or more of their time (7 at ODFW; 3 at DEQ; 3 at DOF; and 1 at OWEB). Still many others (roughly 50 or more) are spending a lesser percentage of their time on the issues, but helping none-the-less. It is anticipated that there will continue to be additional help as the Coastal Coho Project continues for things from website maintenance to report editing. Needless to say, the state is committed to this project.

Federal Registry: Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, provided a handout with NOAA's recently extended comment period and schedule of community meetings on the proposed listing determinations and Hatchery Listing Policy. The comment period has been extended to October 20th. Public hearings particular to coho will be held on September 22nd in Newport, and October 7th in Roseburg. All comments can be reviewed after October 22nd either on a CD, on NOAA's website, or at NOAA's office. Proposed designations for critical habitat will not be addressed during this round of public hearings.

ACTION: Rosemary will provide the schedule of NOAA's public meeting dates in California to the Stakeholder Team.

In response to the question posed earlier about how comments will be heard and responded to from the Stakeholder Team, Rosemary offered that NOAA is very interested in incorporating comments into the listing policy and the Oregon Plan, and supports a very open discussion along the way. NOAA intends to listen at the meetings, read the state's report and see how comments and issues are incorporated into the state's assessment. Heather Stout, TRT, added that co-manager comments are being included as an appendix to the TRT's technical memos.

OWEB Materials: Jay Nicholas, OWEB, said that summary reports will be available on September 8th, and can be found on www.oweb.state.or.us, with a link to the Oregon Plan website, www.oregon-plan.org. On the Oregon Plan website, on the right hand side of the home page, there is a link to the "Oregon Coastal Coho Project", where the Stakeholder Team meeting notices, final summaries, the documents shared at Stakeholder Team meetings, and power point presentations will be posted.

Additional Stakeholder Team involvement: Tom Kartrude has joined the Stakeholder Team as the Port representative, from the Port of Siuslaw. The Pacific Fisheries Management Council has been invited to participate in this process. A PFMC contact has been added to the "interested parties" contact list to receive information about the work of this group. At this time they have not sought to be actively involved with the team.

Comments on Protocols: The following bullets summarize comments on and subsequent changes that will be made to the protocols:

- Section I. "Tasks", bullet three: Strike "Within the sideboards established by the Core Team" and add "in concert with the Oregon Plan Core Team and TRT..." Tom Byler

will provide additional information about the make-up of the Core Team at the next meeting.

- Related to the “Tasks” section: As noted above, before developing recovery plan management strategy recommendations, there needs to be a recovery plan target. Ed Bowles, ODFW, offered that the two cannot be fully sequential considering the TRT’s schedule. He noted that general goals will not change, even if exact numbers are not known. Still, some members felt that, based on past experiences, goals and targets may change so there is reluctance to move forward with developing strategies.

ACTION: Tom Byler will circulate the definition of ‘recovery’ as defined by the State Legislature for the Oregon Plan.

- Section III. “Consensus”: Leave a definition of consensus and any decision making discussion blank until it is clear what decisions are expected to be made, and until the substance of the product is known. One member suggested that a protocol or understanding that no “Stakeholder Team” recommendation will go forward unless there is a consensus should remain in the document. There was not agreement on this point. Instead, the group asked that the facilitators draft an abbreviated set of protocols that cover just the assessment phase of the Stakeholder Team’s work together. These could then be revised or updated when the Team is clearer about the product and decisions they will be asked to make.
- Section III.G., Regarding the facilitator’s report, will be moved to Section VI. with the other information about the facilitators’ roles. Language relating to any consensus decisions will be deleted. The final sentence will read: Members will have an opportunity to review and sign off on all summary notes and any report that is prepared. The remainder of the sentence will be deleted.

ACTION: The facilitation team will provide a revised version of protocols that includes the noted changes for Phase I of this project only.

What is the Oregon Plan Doing:

Jay Nicholas, OWEB, provided his perspective on what the Oregon Plan is doing. First, the Oregon Plan is a comprehensive, life-cycle based approach. Its goal is to protect, manage and restore fish, water quality and watershed health in Oregon. It is an umbrella of programs, with four elements: 1) Agency actions, 2) voluntary restoration actions, 3) monitoring, and 4) multi-disciplinary collaboration for scientific analysis. In years 1997-2003, \$110 million has been invested in restoration activities and \$15 million in monitoring in the Coastal Coho ESU alone. This funding has been provided by (approximately) 1/3 state, 1/3 federal and 1/3 private contributions. The important question is not “What do I think about the Oregon Plan?” but rather “What can we show?” Collaboration is critical to the success of reaching the Oregon Plan’s goals.

Cycles in Ocean Productivity – Pete Lawson:

Pete Lawson, NOAA Fisheries, presented data and information that supported his 1993 paper on Cycles of Ocean Productivity. His paper was circulated to the group prior to today’s meeting. Pete discussed coho abundance from 1960-2003, provided a conceptual

model of ocean cycles and compared coho cycles to other life cycles. He said there seems to be a correlation between coho survival and periods of El Nino and La Nina weather patterns. As such, there appears to be a decrease in favorable ocean conditions since 1976. Pete provided graphs and analyses of both long and short term cycles. Improvements in climate and decreased harvest correlate to improved survival numbers. (Stakeholder Team members noted to keep in mind the time lag of fish counts and harvest, and natural mortality factors.)

Pete's overall message from the presentation was that when conditions in the ocean are good, stock status seems to also improve. He cautioned that people should not be overly optimistic about these stock status numbers unless and until extreme measures (habitat improvements, harvest changes, etc.) have already been put into place that helps to support the stocks. Successful assistance to the fish can be determined only after a long period of time. The types of measures that will be needed to support healthy stocks will require long term vision and commitment—both of which may be difficult to maintain in political and social circles without a continued focus and refocus on the issues.

Comments from Team members:

- The “dead zone” is a local characterization of an area that is overly nutrient-rich and causes mortalities. This zone likely does not have a large effect on salmon because they are a highly migratory species.
- Habitat conditions may be more improved than we are aware. There could be a more encouraging habitat trend than what was presented in the past. This assessment should acknowledge that, if true.
- More human interference in the streams could have an impact on the survival trend presented.
- The real question remains: Are we doing enough to reverse the decline?

Oregon Plan Assessment: Introduced Fishes:

Mike Gray, ODFW, presented information in a power point presentation on introduced fishes and their potential impact to coastal Coho survival. His team has looked at the impact on three scales: population, Oregon Plan monitoring area, and ESU. Introduced fishes seem to have a variety of impacts on Coho which are difficult to confirm, although those impacts are not widespread on the ESU as a whole. Any risks seem to be on the population level and even those are not high.

Overall, evidence does not suggest that introduced fishes have a significant impact on the recovery and sustainability of coho in the Umpqua/Mid-Coast. The strongest potential for impacts occurs in the Mid-South coast, where coho appear to be remaining stable. The Lower Umpqua shows a low impact to coho, and a greater potential to impact chinook. In the Coos and Coquille, there appears to be a potentially moderate level of impacts.

In summary, risks are greatest at the population scale, and appear to be greatest on the South coast. Impacts can be difficult to confirm. Exposure is not widespread on the ESU level. Elimination of introduced fish would be difficult, if not impossible. However,

control/reduction of introduced fish is possible and impacts are being managed by those tools available to ODFW.

Comments from Team members:

- No mention is made of the density dependence of predators (which some introduced fishes are) on the overall abundance levels of Coho.
- There is a hope that the assessment will address not only how to avoid extinction, but rather how to sustain Coho over the long term.

NOTE: A much fuller discussion than was presented today is in the report, which will be posted to the Oregon Plan website in the near future.

Oregon Plan Assessment: Fish Health:

Tony Amandi, ODFW, presented information about potential health impacts on the overall survival of coho salmon. He began by noting that fish health was not found to be an issue impacting the decline of Coho in 1997 and that this still holds true today. That said, there are a number of causes for disease in coho salmon: parasites, bacteria, fungi, viruses – infectious and non-infectious, environmental, nutritional, genetic, and unknown. Pathogen susceptibility comes when there is a host, agent, and an environment which supports the pathogen (e.g. warmer water and lots of fish in that water). Coho are most susceptible to coldwater disease, bacterial kidney disease (BKD), EIBS and coho anemia disease. Most pathogen detection occurs in hatcheries. Tony acknowledged that there is very little known about pathogen levels in natural environments. He also noted that there is little that can be done by way of pathogen control in the natural environment, but improvements can be made in hatchery environments. To reduce the impacts of pathogens on naturally reared stocks, ODFW developed the Fish Hatchery Management Policy and the Fish Health Management Policy in 2003. BKD has the highest potential for impacting naturally reared stocks of coho. Tony mentioned that efforts have begun to collect baseline information on pathogens present in natural environments through sampling of naturally produced fish collected through other monitoring projects currently underway.

In summary, Tony noted that extreme environmental events could correlate to impacts of pathogens on survival, but that pathogens currently present minimum risks to the overall status of the ESU as a whole. He noted that pathogens that can be managed are being managed effectively.

Comments from Team members:

- Team members appreciated the thoroughness of the presentation and that it was held AFTER lunch, not before!

Oregon Plan Assessment: Predators:

Robin Brown, ODFW, presented information on predators as a potential impact to the survival of Coho salmon populations. His presentation today focused on the stellar sea lion, California sea lion, and Pacific harbor seals. A task force comprised of NMFS, State Fish and Wildlife agencies, University of Washington, Yukon Nation, Humboldt State

University, and Moss Landing Marine Labs looked at study development, analysis, and approach to answering questions about pinniped predation on salmonids. A number of studies were conducted, which Robin highlighted during today's presentation. They are summarized in bullets below:

- Willamette Falls study – California sea lions impacts on winter steelhead and spring Chinook were concluded to be negligible except when low numbers of winter steelhead were expected to return.
- Lower Alsea River – Harbor seals, found 4.3-9% of fecal samples contained coho and chinook; also found a small percentage of the 59 seals studied did most of the river activity – most of their upstream migration occurred at night.

The conclusions drawn from these and other studies were that only a few particular, individual animals are responsible for a disproportionate amount of predation on salmonids. Predation on healthy stocks is not a significant concern. However, predation on weaker stocks may have an impact that could be reduced by management actions. Although Robin's studies did not go into any detail, he noted that avian predation also is believed to be a minor factor in coho survival.

Overall, relative to other factors, predation is not believed to be a major limiting factor, but unabated predation could be a problem. Predation issues are most important when stocks are in a depressed state and would likely require management changes.

Comments/Questions from the Stakeholder Team:

- This was new and very useful data – will it be available to others? Final reports will be posted on the NOAA website and the Oregon Plan/Coastal Coho Project website. It was noted that funding on predation may not go beyond this or next year.
- Paul Englemeyer will provide additional information on avian predation, via a website of good bird studies and analyses of avian predation on salmon.
- There was no discussion of habitat conditions relative to predation areas – could this be a potential next step?
- Predation should continue to be considered as a potential impact for which there could be mitigation to help improve survival – nothing is insignificant.
- Another outcome to consider: A bad situation could be made worse if predation stays fixed in specific areas.

General Comment for consideration:

While each of the presentations today suggested that the overall impacts of the particular issue studied are small, it is important to note that, taken in bulk, they may have a larger impact on the species. On top of this, the group should bear in mind that it could cost less overall (financial, political and human resources) to get a 2-3% survival improvement in many areas than to get 20% improvement in just one area.

Prior to adjourning the meeting the group was reminded and informed of the following:

Next Meeting, September 8, Tillamook:

A draft agenda was distributed to the group today. Between now and the September 8th meeting, Team members will receive the following documents:

- Final July 19th notes;
- Draft notes from today's meeting;
- Updated protocols
- Names of the Core Team;
- Schedule of NOAA public meetings in California;
- Technical papers up on the Coastal Coho Project web page (even if in DRAFT form)
- Final Agenda for the September 8th meeting

Stakeholder Team Meetings Schedule:

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

- Wednesday, September 8 (Tillamook);
- Monday, September 27 (Charleston/South Slough Estuarine Reserve);
- Tuesday, October 19 (TBD); and
- Tuesday, November 16 (TBD)

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

**Coastal Coho Recovery Project
Stakeholder Team
Fourth Meeting
Department of Forestry
Tillamook**

**Facilitator's Meeting Summary
September 8, 2004**

Attendees for all or part of the meeting:

Stakeholder Team Members: Paul Engelmeyer (public at large), Wayne Giesy (Alsea Valley Alliance), Jennifer Hampel (Coquille Watershed Assoc.), Wayne Hoffman (MidCoast Watershed Council), Bob Jacobson (Oregon Salmon Commission), Tom Kartrude (Port of Siuslaw), Kaitlin Lovell (Trout Unlimited), Bill Moshofsky (SOS), Richard Oba (Oregon Coast Sport Fishing), John Phelan (LTM Inc.), Blake Rowe (Longview Fibre Co/OFIC), Terry Thompson (OR Counties), Stan van de Wetering (Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians)

Alternates and Resource Advisors: Bruce Apple (ODEQ), Greg Beamer (WRD), Aaron Borisenico (DEQ), Ed Bowles (ODFW), Tom Byler (GNRO), Debbie Colbert (OWRD), Charlie Corrarino (ODFW), Liz Dent (ODF), Ryan French (Confederated Tribe of the Siletz Indians), Rosemary Furfey (NOAA), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Rick Hafele (ODEQ), Les Helgeson (Native Fish Society, alternate for Bill Bakke), Dave Jarrett (WRD), Kim Jones (ODFW), Rick Klumph (ODFW), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Bridgette Lohrman (NOAA), Ted Lorenson (ODF), Bruce McIntosh (ODFW), Eric Metz (DSL), Mike Mulvey (DEQ), Jay Nicholas (OWEB), Pat Oman (OWEB), Russ Patterson (STEP, alternate for Cindy Heller), Jeff Rodgers (ODFW), Christine Simon-Buell (SWCD, alternate for Shawn Reiersgaard), Heather Stout (TRT), Andrew Talabere (ODFW), Ray Wilkeson (OFIC), Julie Wirth (OSU), Bronwen Wright (Pacific Rivers Council)

Other Interested Parties: Sandy Bell (Tillamook Co. SWCD), Mitch Cummings (NRCS, Tillamook), Lily Defriend (public), Chuck Hurlimon (Tillamook Co. Commissioner), Gus Meyer (Tillamook Co. SWCD)

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

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Update 8/24 summary notes to reflect suggested changes	Facilitation team	September 20
Develop message to share with press about the Coho Stakeholder Team and Coastal Coho Project process	Facilitation team and Steering Committee	September 20
Share criteria for allocating water rights	Debbie Colbert to facilitation team for distribution	September 20
Share information on water quality at urban sites	Rick Hafele to facilitation team for distribution	September 20

Welcome/Introductions:

Facilitator Donna Silverberg welcomed the group to its fourth meeting and led a round of introductions.

Comments and Follow-up from Last Meeting:

Team members offered comments to the draft summary notes from the August 24th Stakeholder Team meeting as well as general comments about the meeting. Comments and subsequent actions are summarized in bullets below:

Pinnipeds

- A more in-depth discussion on predators other than pinnipeds is expected in the draft assessment. There is additional data produced from NOAA’s at-sea researchers on other predators that should be considered, as well as a Nehalem cormorant project.

- A question was raised about last meetings presentation: how in-depth was the study on the sea lion/seal studies? The focus was on specific, known problem areas. From that, the researchers determined that there is an impact on the fish from specific problem animals, but not on the overall sustainability of the fish. It was noted by one member that pinnipeds need to be studied closely because on the ground observations suggest there IS a problem--“Seals are all over the place”! Ed Bowles, ODFW, noted that the State and Federal government are looking at the problem and are hoping to make changes that will allow flexibility in the Marine Mammal Act so pinnipeds can be managed more effectively. It was suggested that managing individual problem seals seems like a ‘low-hanging fruit’ in terms of limiting factors for coho. NOAA and the state took note of the suggestions offered by Stakeholder Team members.
 - **ACTION**: Ed Bowles will provide a follow-up briefing to the Stakeholder Team on the pinniped issue, from a national perspective that he will gain at an upcoming meeting, at the September 27th Coho Stakeholder Team meeting.

8/24 Meeting Notes

- The increased level of detail was appreciated.
- It was noted that the summary conclusions may read to be more final than they were intended to be. **ACTION**: Revise the August 24th notes to clarify that no *conclusions* have been made for any of the limiting factors presentations. All summaries are tentative and everything is still on the table as potential limiting factors.

Core Team Members

- Tom Byler, Governor’s Office of Natural Resources, provided a handout that described the Core Team and its member makeup, as well as a definition of ‘recovery’ from the Oregon Plan statute. The Core Team, which is made up of cabinet level agency representatives, will play a more interactive role with this group during the next phase (post-assessment) of the Coastal Coho Stakeholder Team process.

Protocols

- The Stakeholder Team accepted the revised protocols dated 9/1/04 with one minor edit: strike the word “consensus” at Section V. (C).
- Team members questioned and discussed how they might talk to the media (and others) about this process to keep a broader public informed. As outlined in the protocols, members are specifically tasked with keeping their constituents informed. Members are strongly encouraged to be constructive, to avoid creating controversy, and to focus on the issues (not the people) when talking to the press. ODFW will have an outreach coordinator on staff by mid-October to help with getting information about this group out to a broader audience. The Team needs to think carefully about the timing of getting the word out to the public and how the message is presented. One suggestion was to share an executive summary of the process and what the group is doing that could be shared with the greater public. Many members felt it is important to let people know that this process is happening and that input can be provided at the meetings.

- **ACTION**: The facilitation team will work with the State to draft information describing this process that can be shared with the media and/or constituent groups, which contains information that will grab the public’s attention.

Habitat Issues:

Bruce McIntosh, ODFW, introduced today’s presentations on the habitat assessment of the Oregon Plan. He emphasized that these are draft works in progress. He clarified that there has not yet been a coho limiting factors analysis overlaid onto the individual analysis for the Oregon Plan Assessment. The limiting factors analysis is expected to be complete in early Fall. Until then, the state is looking for input and responses from Team members regarding the beginning information coming out of its review.

Consumptive Use: Debbie Colbert, Oregon Water Resources Department (WRD), presented information on the impact of consumptive use of water on streamflow as a potential habitat-related factor for decline. In the 1997 Federal Register, NMFS listed insufficient streamflows as one factor for decline. Using existing datasets, WRD analyzed consumptive water use with respect to natural stream flow.

For the purposes of the analysis, ‘natural’ streamflow is the flow in a stream when there is no consumptive use and no flow regulation or where you have “added back” the consumptive use portion of the streamflow. For this analysis, “natural” streamflow was the 80% exceedance natural stream flow – the streamflow exceeded 80% of the time at a particular point on a stream. There was discussion of whether it is appropriate to refer to the 80% exceedance flow as “natural” streamflow.

Consumptive use is any water use that causes a net reduction in streamflow. In her presentation, Debbie noted that the consumptive use estimates generally assume all water rights holders are using the full extent of what they may divert in the month of August. However, many water right holders do not use all of the water that they are allowed to use during that month. Some water right holders are “turned off” because their water rights are junior to other water rights on a stream. As such, the analysis of consumptive use as a percent of the 80% exceedance streamflow is a worse case scenario. Consumptive use estimates are monthly, not instantaneous or daily estimates. Debbie presented consumptive use as a percent of the 80% exceedance flow for each monitoring area. Approximately 80% of the North and Mid Coast monitoring areas have consumptive use less than 10% of the 80% exceedance flow. Less than 3% of these monitoring areas had consumptive use more than 100% of the 80% exceedance flow. The mid-south coast and Umpqua monitoring areas had higher consumptive use as a percent of the 80% exceedance flow, with approximately 9% of the total areas having consumptive use greater than 100% of the 80% exceedance flow. A next step for this analysis will be to look at areas where consumptive use has a higher impact on streamflow to understand what type of use is occurring. Once it is understood where and why consumptive use is high, then the actual impacts on fish can be explored.

Debbie shared preliminary findings from the study which still need to be connected to the needs of fish. Again, the study looked at just the month of August:

- Consumptive use of water is not a widespread issue.
- Consumptive use generally increases from north to south in the ESU.
- Since 1997, stream flow restoration activities coincide with areas of highest consumptive use impacts on stream flows.
- Consumptive use has not substantially increased since 1999 and is not likely to increase in the future (**NOTE:** the latter part of this statement was questioned by some of the Team members. The researchers may need to re-think this statement as nearby communities continue to expand and use water.)

Question to NOAA: Do the conclusions drawn in 1997 still hold true today with regards to insufficiencies of flows? It was not clear what limiting factors analysis was done then nor what is the current understanding. Rosemary will report back on this.

Does WRD or ODFW consider winter spawning needs with flow needs? Not in the data presented here, but future analyses will evaluate this.

ACTION: Methods and criteria for allocating water rights used by the WRD will be forwarded to the Stakeholder Team.

Estuaries and Wetlands:

Eric Metz, Division of State Lands (DSL), presented information on analyses of estuaries and wetlands relative to potential factors for decline. He noted that the data from this U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's National Wetland Inventory study and presentation is brand new, and was being shared from a high level, low detail perspective. Initial data suggests that wetland loss has been minimal since 1982 (less than 2 acres per year). Most wetland changes have been from one type of a wetland to another as a result of nearby development. Eric offered that there are many acres of degraded habitat available for restoration and/or management. Options for improvement include freshwater enhancements, dike removal and creating better transitional habitats. Areas for restoration and management include:

- Transitional marshes
- Lowland beaver ponds (enhance corridors linking the habitats)
- Upper estuarine salt marshes

Stakeholder Team Member Comments:

- This analysis speaks to potentials, not realities. It was suggested that the next step be to look at a realistic approach to habitat restoration.
- It was suggested that the GIS data concerning updated wetlands/floodplain maps be shared with Gordie Reeves, so that he can incorporate the data into his CLAMS data set.
- Restoration in wetlands/estuaries needs to be done in areas where it will be useful to the coho species based on life cycle, salinity and other needs.
- Many trade-offs will need to be considered with wetlands. Any changes will require balance with other species use and needs – not just for the coho.

- The analysis did not include historic wetlands, which can be located through soils maps.
- One member commented that mitigation efforts relative to wetlands has been ‘marginally successful’, at about 50%.

Eric concluded by saying that the next step is an inventory of the whole coast that will be included in the final assessment report.

Water Quality Factors for Decline:

Rick Hafele, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), presented information on water quality, noting that the analysis was a coordinated effort between WRD, DSL, ODF, DEQ, ODFW and federal agencies.

Findings and details from the analysis (which has not yet been connected with needs of coho):

- 42% of large river sites have excellent to good water quality
- 58% have fair to poor water quality
- 39% of large river sites show an improving trend, while 0% are declining.
- The reasons for decline include temperature, fine sediment, dissolved oxygen and total solids.
- A more detailed data and analysis from this inter-agency effort will be available in a report.
- Water quality standards were used where available. Where not, reference sites (areas with the least human disturbances) were used to set benchmarks – a document on these reference sites is available to anyone interested.
- North and mid-coast are seeing the most improvements.
- The analysis on wetlands focused on just a narrow strip along the coast.

Stakeholder Team Comments:

- Statistical concerns were raised because no error band was shown for reference sites as was shown for random sites.
- What was the range of vegetation succession and disturbance used in the reference? General concern was raised about how well reference sites reflect natural conditions.
- It was clarified that this analysis does not focus yet on coho effects; that will come as a next step.
- Concern was raised that for as much political pressure that is put on urban areas, not enough or sufficient data is available to answer questions that may be raised by urban dwellers. While data on urban areas was not used in the analysis, data is available at six urban sites.
 - **ACTION:** Rick will forward information on urban sites to the facilitation team, for distribution to the Stakeholder Team.
- Methods can be found at: www.deq.state.or.us/lab/qa/techdocs.htm.
- It was stressed again that this is very preliminary information, and researchers are thus far unable to extrapolate from the data any conclusions about particular land-use practices.

- It was noted that some public members may not agree with the analysis based on a contradiction with what they are seeing and doing on the ground (e.g. A DEQ ambient monitoring site shows excellent water quality, but other areas of the watershed have poor water quality based on data from other sites and sources.)
- OFIC's representative gave notice that, as currently characterized in this presentation, it will strongly disagree with the methods and conclusions discussed. OFIC is not in agreement with how DEQ did its work and, especially, how it was depicted in the presentation. (Handouts from this presentation will be distributed after the presenter can correct some labels of depicted graphics).

In-Stream Habitat Conditions: Jeff Rodgers, ODFW, presented information on in-stream habitat conditions including channel form, substrate and roughness. Preliminary results of 1998-2003 data taken from sites chosen within the range of coho (and looking at the worst 25% of conditions) are:

- No detectable trends in parameters from random samples (i.e. implies stable conditions)
- Higher channel entrenchment
- Less large wood overall
- Umpqua has less large wood than other areas and therefore has the poorest conditions found in the area
- Public land has more large wood than private lands

Habitat Restoration Analysis:

Jeff Rodgers continued with a presentation on in-stream habitat relative to habitat restoration as a potential factor for decline. Since 1997-2003, roughly 451 miles of instream restoration has occurred to address factors for decline. Research shows that increasing large wood debris in streams can increase overall habitat conditions. It will continue to take time to get (and keep) large woody debris in streams to break channeled streams into fully functioning multi-channel streams. It was noted that work may need to be done in other, "better", areas and that it will likely take a long time to do work that will actually show survival improvements. The best place to focus restoration efforts (areas with 'high intrinsic potential') is in low gradient, unconstrained, low-to-moderate mean annual flow areas.

ODFW has found the best sites to do beneficial restoration for coho are:

- 38% agricultural lands (lowland/ low gradient)
- 15% private non-industrial forest lands
- 22% private industrial forest lands

Stakeholder Team Comments:

- It seems ODFW is counting on the wood placed to stay in place. In actuality, the wood often gets washed out in flood or flashy weather events. Yes, habitat is continually changing; in-stream restoration work is a band-aid.
- As a next step, link water quality and habitat restoration reference sites to areas known to be good for coho and then compare other areas to that.

- A suggestion was made to work toward building complexity within the pools. It is possible to create pools and complexity through careful restoration efforts.

Riparian Areas:

Liz Dent, ODF, presented information on riparian area conditions, implementation and effectiveness. Shade over the stream channel and large conifers were the focus of the study. In summary, she concluded (and reminded the group, similar to the other presentations, these are preliminary findings) that:

- There is a greater percentage of streams that have lower (less) shade than is observed at reference sites.
- The greatest departures were observed in the Umpqua.
- There is a low level of large conifers in all riparian areas.
- If we assume all restoration projects took place in coho areas, restoration treatments equal about 14% of total coho miles.
- Effectiveness is increased with preparation and maintenance practices, through planting, fencing and voluntary retention.
- Urban and ag/grasslands have substantially “lower” shaded streams than to other land-use categories.
- There is a need to evaluate function and diversity of coho miles.

Liz described the logic path used by the habitat assessment team as: First, what is the status or condition? Then, what practices are affecting the conditions (How is land being managed)? Positively? Negatively? And finally, what can be done to change and improve the condition?

Implementation: Since 1997, 1372 restoration projects over 938 miles have been underway—almost twice as many riparian projects as in-stream projects. Projects have included riparian planting and fencing, voluntary tree retention, and hardwood conversion, to name a few. They have learned that survival of trees can be increased by site preparation and protection against herbivores and that there are other practices which can enhance the success of riparian restoration efforts.

Stakeholder Team Comments:

- The team was encouraged to include red alders, not just conifers as trees for successful restoration efforts. Red alders also provide the side benefit that if cut (by a beaver or other) then four more trees will likely grow!
 - **ACTION:** Wayne Giesy, Alesa Valley Alliance, will share information with Liz on red alder studies.
- Clarify in the presentation that hardwoods were included, not just conifers.
- Suggestion: expand the data set on total conifers to include those less than 20” dbh, for long term potentials and trends. Liz noted that there will be additional work and analysis done in this area.
- Depict more clearly the severity of the problem.
- Call it “stream cover” instead of “shade”.

- Productivity may depend on some in-stream sunlight, which was not presented from the studies. Look into this further before setting a firm belief that more shade equals better productivity.

Presentation Wrap-Up:

Bruce McIntosh, ODFW, thanked the stakeholder team for their input and respect shown to the presenters. The analysis team is trying to bring a lot more data to the table than ever before and they are continuing to figure out the best way to present it. At the same time, they are listening to the input from the stakeholder team and making every effort to fold their ideas into the final work product. He expressed appreciation for the level of patience offered and was pleased that the process is still moving forward as well as it is.

Ted Lorenson, head of the Habitat Team for ODF, shared his thoughts on the process, offering that the stakeholder team and the people working locally on the ground are in a data gathering phase together. What was shared today was the beginning of their analysis. He said that they are trying to understand how we got where we are in the landscape and with what conditions. He is hoping the data will help make sense of which actions are making a difference and which are not. This is an opportunity to make good decisions based on good data that is now available. He encouraged the group not to view the presentations as a threat, but instead as an opportunity to have an upfront discussion of the data and facts. He prodded the group to be disciplined in its discussions by being clear about what are facts and what are interpretations of facts. Once this is clear, then the group can have open and fair discussions of the differences--with an overall focus on making the Oregon Plan effective and efficient.

Question to Ted: What is ODF doing to further contribute to the Oregon Plan? The agency is developing rules and approaches to meet needs identified through the Oregon Plan work.

Public Comment:

Heather Stout, TRT, distributed the TRT Historical Populations document to the group. She noted that the TRTs work on 'intrinsic potential habitat' is in Appendix 3. The document will be rolled out to the public on September 23rd in Newport. The TRT is meeting in Ashland on September 28th. All are welcome to attend either of these meetings. Comments on this document are due November 15th.

Next Meeting, September 27, 9am-4pm in Charleston:

Follow-up from today:

- Information to share with media/constituents about the Stakeholder Team group and process
- Water Resources Dept. criteria for allocating water rights
- Follow-up on seals from national perspective – Ed Bowles
- Follow-up on stream flows as potential limiting factor: NOAA's perspective
- Continue from 9/8: Habitat restoration--fish passage and roads
- Presentation on Hatcheries Assessment for Oregon Plan
- Status update on Oregon Plan assessment

Stakeholder Team Meetings Schedule:

Based on the availability of the stakeholder team members, the next scheduled meeting dates have been set for: Monday, September 27 (Charleston); Tuesday, October 19 (TBD); and Tuesday, November 16 (TBD)

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

email changes or comments on these notes to robin76@cnnw.net

DS Consulting

**OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT
Stakeholder Team--Fifth Meeting
South Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve
Charleston**

**Facilitator's Meeting Summary
September 27th, 2004**

Attendees for all or part of the meeting:

Stakeholder Team Members: Bill Bakke (Native Fish Society), Paul Engelmeyer (public at large), Tom Forgatsch (Farm Industry), Wayne Giesy (Alsea Valley Alliance), Jennifer Hampel (Coquille Watershed Assoc.), Cindy Heller (STEP), Wayne Hoffman (MidCoast Watershed Council), Bob Jacobson (Oregon Salmon Commission), Tom Kartrude (Port of Siuslaw), Bill Moshofsky (Save the Salmon Coalition), Richard Oba (Oregon Coast Sport Fishing), John Phelan (LTM Inc.), Shawn Reiersgaard (Tillamook Co. Soil and Water Conservation District), Blake Rowe (Longview Fibre Co/OFIC), Johnny Sundstrom (Oregon Assoc. of Conservation Districts), Terry Thompson (OR Counties), Stan van de Wetering (Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians), Bronwen Wright (Pacific Rivers Council—alternate for Kaitlin Lovell)

Resource Advisors: Ed Bowles (ODFW), Tom Byler (GNRO), Rosemary Furfey(NOAA)

Alternates and Technical Resources: Liz Dent (ODF), Ryan French (Confederated Tribe of the Siletz Indians), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Diane Kightlinger (ODFW), Mark Lewis (ODFW), Jeff Lochwood (NOAA)

Other Interested Parties: John Bragg (DSL/Sough Slough NERR), David Gifford (Oregon State Police), Mike Graybill (South Slough NERR), Louise Solliday (OWEB/Gov's Office)

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

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
--------	-----	---------

Incorporate suggested changes to 9/8 notes, finalize	Facilitation team	October 15
Public outreach materials, including press release, talking points, executive summary of presentations on web	Diane Kightlinger	On-going
Viability criteria to Stakeholder Team	ODFW	ASAP

Welcome/Introductions:

After a round of introductions of the stakeholders, resource advisors, and other interested parties in attendance, Mike Graybill from the South Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve (NERR) welcomed everyone to the facility and talked to the group briefly about NERR’s focus on science, education and stewardship of estuaries, and its overall mission of improving understanding of estuaries. He briefly described some of the habitat restoration and fisheries management work that the organization is working on. He also noted that the NERR is celebrating its 30th anniversary this year, and encouraged the Coastal Coho Stakeholder Team to visit again and tour the research grounds to see first hand what is happening in the estuary. Mike and his colleague, John Bragg, provided materials to the Stakeholder Team, and said they will continue to track the important work of this group, offering assistance if needed on estuary information.

Comments and Follow-up from Last Meeting:

Team members offered comments to the draft summary notes from the September 8th Stakeholder Team meeting, as well as general comments about the meeting. Comments and subsequent actions are summarized in bullets below:

9/8 Summary Notes

Estuaries and Wetlands Presentation:

- Page 5: It should be noted that the analysis did not include historic wetlands, which can be located through soils maps.
- Add to notes: Mitigation efforts relative to wetlands has been ‘marginally successful’, around 50%.
- Further explain in the notes Gordie Reeves’ work on coho intrinsic analysis.
 - **ACTION:** The facilitation team will work with Paul Englemeyer to add language in the notes that explains the connection to Gordie Reeves.
- Note that the analysis on wetlands focused on just a narrow strip along the coast. A suggestion was made that the final report should include inland analyses as well.
- More discussion is needed on the important roles of beavers and beaver trappings and the complexity of the issue and its relationship with important elements of coho habitat (e.g. temperature, pools, and water quality issues).

Riparian Areas Presentation:

- Members would like to see the final riparian analysis have more than an assumption about coho habitat miles. Clarification of what metric is used will be important also (miles and percentages, if appropriate).
- Page 7: Change the third bullet “Lower shade…” to “The greatest departures were observed in the Umpqua.” Move this bullet to just below the first bullet, and change

the first bullet to read: “There are a greater percentage of streams that have lower (less) shade than is observed at reference sites.” Change the fourth bullet to: “If we assume that all restoration projects took place for coho, restoration treatments equal about 14% of total coho miles.”

- Comment on page 7 on ‘large’ conifers: 20” dbh is not considered ‘large’ for this area – note this in the analysis.
- There are additional studies done on riparian areas – including the ‘Golder study’ on the effects of ocean waters on water levels. Fresh water upwellings exist and should be noted in the assessment as their uses do not affect upriver water levels. A suggestion was made to pass this study on to the Water Resources Department.
- Include the number of miles of riparian area that was studied in the analysis.
 - **ACTION**: Liz Dent will add to her presentation that, of roughly 6,000 miles of coho streams, what percent have received restoration treatment.
- Page 5, Stakeholder Comments, second bullet: There is a problem with “reflecting a range” and then setting targets within that range. Also, disturbance and succession are not built into the criteria. To clarify this point change second bullet ‘range of vegetative succession *and disturbance*’.

In-Stream Habitat Presentation:

- It is important to note that there is no indication that things are getting worse or better. As such, clarify on Page 6, first bullet: add (*i.e. implies stable conditions*) to ‘No detectable trends in parameters from random samples’.

Consumptive Use Presentation:

- There are some who have concerns about water withdrawals. On page 3: add sentence that captures the bigger issue: it does appear to many on the ground that there may be a problem with consumptive use.
- Page 4: Water use could be better measured. The analysis focuses mostly on water rights, not monitoring stations.

Other Comments:

- Re: Wood placement in streams: Wood does move, but usually not very far: more often it stays within the reach where it was placed. Still, to be most successful with placement for a longer duration, it may be necessary to use bigger, longer pieces of wood. Some stakeholder team members felt that the current guidelines for wood placement seem to be working well. Others noted that the actual delivery of a 70’ log (for example) is often very difficult in some areas that would benefit from larger debris because the available roads can’t carry such pieces. Delivery would have to be made by helicopter.
- At the last meeting, strong concerns were expressed about characterization and land-use categories. How will changes to the presentations, based on feedback from this group, be shared with the stakeholder team? Ed Bowles answered that some presentations will be changed (particularly the slides from the last meeting on land use categories that some members had concerns about) prior to being put on the web. The web page will highlight that all presentations are preliminary. Because of the

tight timeframe, the assessment report will be the place for stakeholder team members to make certain that comments made were adequately incorporated.

Seals and Sea Lions

Ed Bowles reported on the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission meeting in Seattle, at which the management of growing pinniped populations was discussed. Currently, there is little flexibility for effective management pinnipeds within the Marine Mammal Protection Act, which is up for re-authorization by Congress. The states, led by Senator Stephens from Alaska, are working to move forward amendments to the bill that would provide authority to the states to effectively manage seals and sea lions, both at the population and troublesome individual animal levels. Ed shared Oregon's data sets with the PSMF group to support site/animal specific actions. They have three months to get information to the appropriate federal bodies. Ed will keep the stakeholder team group informed as things move forward. ODFW is also hopeful to get a congressionally funded comprehensive research and monitoring program put into place for a broader scale understanding of the issues and implications for coho (and other species). The Stakeholder Team will have a chance to review draft legislative proposals around May 2005.

Stakeholder Team Comments:

- There are native cultures that have historically hunted seals. If they are interested, perhaps they could be encouraged to have a more active harvest as they are allowed to "take" seals through treaty rights. This may be a source for 'management' of particular rogue pinnipeds for the state—and for coho.
- Who initiates the change in management? It is a joint state/federal effort, on a case by case basis. Clarify in the notes that the state is asking for the authority to effectively manage the mammals.
- What is the balance, historically, of pinnipeds to coho? Robin Brown's analysis briefly addresses this and it will be in the assessment report.
- What about starry flounder if they are listed? ODFW has an interest in looking at this problem as well. Balance of the whole system is necessary to recover and maintain a healthy ecosystem.
- A strong argument could be made that by not managing, we (society) are making decisions to allow starvation and disease to manage the pinniped populations. ODFW is encouraged to move away from this type of policy and forward with getting a better management authority so better policy can be implemented. ODFW recognizes this need and is moving forward and also noted that this is a highly controversial issue.

Information for Constituents

Diane Kightlinger was introduced as ODFW's new Oregon Plan Outreach Coordinator. Coming from a successful history as a science writer that can be understood in popular reading materials, she will help ODFW and the stakeholder team members translate Coastal Coho Project science and policy into understandable products. In the short term, she will develop materials for Stakeholder Team members to pass on to their constituents. This information will include a press release, talking points, and an executive summary

of what this process involves and of the presentations for the website, as requested by team members.

A question was asked about the point at which materials will be ready to be released to constituents. It is important for this process to be open and accurate--and it is tricky because much of the analyses, presentations and other materials are preliminary at this point. ODFW and the other agencies, as well as many stakeholders, want to be certain that what is released to the public does not create unnecessary controversy because of its preliminary (and therefore not as clear) nature. The Oregon Plan data sets can be accessed by the public. However, the group should be aware (and communicate this to their constituents) that, because there is not enough staff to organize all the information, it is not necessarily user-friendly. OWEB and the OSU's Institute for Natural Resources are developing a web-based data base with information on the Oregon Plan. Jay Nicholas, OWEB, is the lead on this. The next step is to combine data sets from other agencies, such as ODEQ, and make the data base accessible. A Team member commented that a better use of the Stakeholder Team's time is for members to comment on where they see problems with the assessment, and not do public outreach on the science – other teams may be better suited to do this.

Response to 9/8 Question:

Stream Flows as a Limiting Factor: NOAA's Perspective

Rosemary Furfey described NOAA's process for determining limiting factors for listed species. The "Biological Review Team" (BRT) looked at a body of science during its 1995 review of coho for the original listing in 1997. Part of this included information from states, private entities and others to analyze and make a determination of limiting factors. They looked at the best available information and cited this in the Federal Register. She noted that, at that time, Oregon had named stream flows as a factor for decline in its assessment of coho. She clarified that water withdrawals will continue to be considered as a potential limiting factor during drought conditions and with the increase of municipal water use. Rosemary noted that references for making the limiting factors determinations are available to anyone who is interested.

Hatchery Effects in the Context of the Oregon Plan Assessment

Mark Lewis, ODFW, presented information along with a handout on the effects of hatcheries as a potential factor for decline. His preliminary assessment of hatcheries relative to coastal coho, is:

- Hatcheries are likely to no longer be a significant limit on sustainability of the ESU, due to:
 - Changes in hatchery management,
 - Reduced release numbers, and
 - Reduced proportion of hatchery adults spawning in the wild
- Effects are limited to a few populations and localized reaches.

The analysis looks at four risk categories: genetic, ecological, operational and management. The genetic impact category showed that the ESU has shifted from a period of high hatchery percentages and low abundance to a period of lower hatchery

percentages and higher abundance—except that the percentage of hatchery fish has remained high in the North Umpqua. The ‘ecological risk’ category shows a dramatic decline of all (juvenile, smolt and adult) hatchery coho releases due to implementation of strategies found in the Wild Fish Management Policy since 1994, implementation of the Oregon Plan, budget cuts, and prioritization of hatchery programs. Looking at operational impacts, researchers found past water quality violations, but none in the last year, and coho habitat impacted by hatchery barriers in the ESU. Finally, management effects include the Native Fish Conservation Policy, the Fish Hatchery Management Policy, and Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans.

Stakeholder Team Comments:

- Change the # of *Smolts* to # of *Adults* on the Freshwater Escapement graph.
- Include additional information on smolts released relative to catch numbers and allotments. Share with the stakeholder team a cost/benefit analysis (Mark’s analysis looks just at wild fish impacts. There is a cost/benefit analysis, which ODFW is taking into consideration.)
- Include life-cycle monitoring data for stray rates.
- Add ‘zero wild coho’ to the assessment.
- It was clarified that reductions in juvenile coho releases were not the same for each program, but that *some* reduction occurred in almost all hatchery programs.
- “High quality habitat” information is still needed.
- What impact do Columbia River smolt releases have on the coastal ESU? This should be evaluated.
- Provide the scientific basis for stray rate percentages and criteria (Oregon 10%, NOAA 5%)
- The impact of transporting fish on stray rates should be clarified: as written, refinement is needed to speak to the management practice and improvements needed.
- Re-think how to display the data so brood years and other factors might be seen more clearly.
- Include in the final report:
 - The mechanisms of ecological impacts (i.e. predators, estuary, etc.);
 - Incidental catch in the ocean and justifications for the mortalities that result; and
 - An inter-system analysis for steelhead and other species.
- Explain on the graph the line regarding the Oregon Plan start date relative to adult returns (or, change the graph to reflect the actual Oregon Plan start date!)
- Budget numbers for coastal hatcheries: include the size of the facility, not just dollars per fish
- Develop a productivity metric to see differences between hatchery and wild fish for freshwater and ocean survival. The Oregon Plan should include a long term monitoring and evaluation of salt/freshwater survival of mixed/wild fish.
- What contribution and effect do hatchery fish have on recreational fisheries?

Hatchery Listing Policy

Ed Bowles gave a power point presentation on the proposed Federal Hatchery Listing Policy. He noted that most of Oregon’s hatchery programs were begun as mitigation

projects. The new policy suggests that the primary purpose ought to be for conservation. ODFW is reviewing hatchery programs and their objectives to determine whether they are still appropriate. If so, are they meeting their stated or other legitimate objectives effectively? Ed also summarized five key points from and about the policy:

- Genetic resources that represent the ecological and genetic diversity of a salmonid species can be found in hatchery fish as well as fish spawned in the wild.
- Hatchery populations included in an ESU will be based on the degree of genetic divergence between hatchery and wild populations.
- Status determinations are based on the status of the entire ESU, recognizing the necessity of conserving natural populations and their habitat.
- The policy considers abundance, productivity, spatial distribution, and genetic diversity in evaluating viability of natural spawning populations for status determinations.
- The policy recognizes the role of hatcheries in fulfilling trust and treaty obligations with regard to harvest and provides a mechanism for using listed hatchery fish surplus to conservation and recovery needs of the ESU.

NOAA currently is conducting public meetings on the proposed policy. Rosemary encouraged members of the Stakeholder Team to take the opportunity to comment. Coastal coho may undergo a status review when the Oregon Plan assessment is completed. NOAA's deadline for making listing determinations is June 2005.

Habitat Restoration

Logic Path: Liz Dent, ODF, provided a handout of the 'Logic Path' that is used by the Habitat Assessment Team to analyze habitat effects. She noted that the Stakeholder Team thus far has been presented only the first 'box' or step on the path, which is a broad assessment based on factors for decline. Next steps include looking at habitat in the context of coho, determining natural and human-caused factors that affect these conditions, looking at what programs are in place to change any negative impacts, and determining whether these programs are effective.

Ed Bowles noted that ODFW is working closely with the Federal Coho Technical Recovery Team (TRT) and wants to maintain synchronicity between TRT products and the Oregon Plan assessment process. A TRT meeting was held on September 28th in Ashland. ODFW will provide an update to the Stakeholder Team of where the TRT is with its products at the next coho stakeholder team meeting.

Fish Passage Improvement Projects and Habitat Access Conditions: Liz Dent said that handouts and a report are forthcoming on the topic of fish passage. The analysis asks: What percentage of stream miles have improved fish access from passage improvement projects under the Oregon Plan? What type of habitat was accessed? And, what percentage of stream miles have limited access, are accessible, or have unknown access? What percentage was passing fish? Data sources included: OWEB, ODF, ODFW, BLM, US Forest Service, industrial landowners in the coastal coho ESU, and others. They asked: did the barrier pass, not pass, or is it unknown the passage of fish? Over 4,000 crossings and barriers were included in the data set. The data was then overlaid onto one

‘common stream layer’, which came from CLAMS, and predicted intrinsic habitat potential (High or Low) for coho for over-wintering habitat. Intrinsic potential was based on gradient, flow and valley width.

Liz highlighted the strengths and limitations of the model and analysis:

Strengths – it is the only data set of its kind at this scale. The majority of known crossings and barriers are in coho habitat. And, the tool can be used for future prioritization that can be adapted to other species.

Limitations – not all the data is there: 22% of the crossings could not be accurately located and were not included in the analysis. And ‘limited access’ covers crossings that are either partial or complete fish passage barriers, so it is a broad and vague category.

Of all 4,000 crossings (which includes non-coho ESU areas), 43% pass fish, 20% are limited, and 37% have unknown access. Important factors needed for studying the effectiveness of fish passage includes the physical attributes of the crossing and actual fish movement. Very few studies have been done on this, and Liz noted that it is an important piece that remains for the future.

Liz provided preliminary conclusions:

- A relatively small percentage of coho streams (10-11%) remain inaccessible, but 1/3 of coho streams are still ‘unknown’.
- The habitat team suggests focusing efforts more on coho streams could efficiently address existing known blockages in a short amount of time (currently, there appears to be equal distribution of projects and data on coho vs. non-coho streams).
- Oregon Plan activities have improved access by 6-10%.
- ‘Stream simulations’ seem to be the best strategy for fish passage improvements of culverts.

Stakeholder Team Comments:

- Note: a dramatic shift in focus has occurred from just adults to all (including juvenile) passage. Many culverts were not built to pass juveniles, so they need to be considered from this perspective—and maybe retrofitted at a later date.
- Include in the analysis: “Gradient is a significant factor in forested areas.”
- Summarize the projects by source. (Liz noted that this is done in the annual report).
- What is the improvement over one year? Where are local dollars going? People want to know if good things are coming out of what they are putting in. A cost/benefit analysis would be useful.
- Metric: instead of ‘miles of habitat’, use high intrinsic potential/low intrinsic potential
- Continued reporting on the status of inventory is strongly encouraged, including dates and condition of culverts
- The amount of ‘unknown’ landscape shown in the model does not mesh with on the ground knowledge—which includes more known areas. Liz agreed that the results from the study were surprising.
- Culvert analysis vs. miles of spawning habitat (not just over-wintering) would be useful information for the assessment.
- Add non-fish bearing stream information.

- How many natural barriers are being addressed with fish passage projects? Ed noted that this is not a ‘high priority’ data base for OWEB funding or restoration projects and therefore little is being done at this time.
- The report should answer: Are the state guidelines working and are they realistic?
- County roads make up many coho passage areas. Counties are suffering to meet the current standards and need funding aid from the Federal government.

Riparian Characteristics: Liz provided follow-up information based on discussions at the last Stakeholder Team meeting on density of large riparian conifers. After summarizing the analysis described at the last meeting, Liz reported on changes that had been made to the analysis:

- Added ‘very large conifers’ – 35” dbh – this revealed a vast difference between percentage of stream miles with large conifer trees at reference vs. random sites.
- Added the density of all conifers per 1,000 feet.

Stakeholder Team Comments:

- Large woody trees came from debris flows – not all debris was from riparian smaller trees but from further outside the riparian area.
- Big trees come from little trees. Regeneration is important for riparian ecology.
- What are riparian requirements? A minimum number of trees and size. There is no requirement to leave all large-diameter trees in riparian areas, and no requirement that those trees within a 25’ buffer cannot be cut.
- Are there regulations on non-fish bearing streams? There is a provision in the Oregon Plan about this, but no regulations exist as of yet. A request was made to specifically address this issue.
- Don’t forget the role of uplands and hardwood in the overall ecology of streams and habitats.
- Other habitat issues that ought to be included in the assessment:
 - Need more information on TMDL’s
 - SB 1010 – how effective has it been on the Oregon landscape?
 - How are forest practices doing re: the Oregon Plan?
 - What about large trees?
 - Goal 5 protections?
 - Flood plain zoning fill
 - Presentation on sufficiency analysis for water quality

Status Update of the Oregon Plan

Tom Byler, Governor’s Natural Resources Office, provided an updated schedule for the next four months of work on the Oregon Plan:

- December 1: Substantive draft assessment available to stakeholder team and IMST for peer review; feedback and comments will need to be done quickly.
- January 31, 2005: Final assessment completed and to NOAA.
- Early 2005: Stakeholder Team look at policy implications of implementing the Oregon Plan relative to coho
- January 10: Legislature in session; begin talking with legislators about the Oregon Plan and coastal coho project in order to keep the momentum going.

Ed Bowles noted that the State is working with the TRT to get their scientific criteria needed for making the assessment. Because of their significance, the delivery of these criteria will, in part, control the timeline. A request was made for materials (draft assessment documents) to be sent to the Stakeholder Team as soon as possible and prior to the next meeting. Ed responded that, to avoid unnecessary confusion or controversy, the agency plans to make a presentation of the draft assessment before providing the actual assessment document to the stakeholder team. He wants to be certain the information and data is clear before the group reacts to numbers or words in a document.

A concern was raised that consumptive users (specifically ports and fisherman) are not being factored into these issues or analysis, and that science is the only focus. Tom Byler responded that, by design, this first phase was meant to be a scientific assessment. The next phases will broaden the focus to include social impacts and policy implications—for ports, fisherman and everyone else.

Another concern raised was that any work done by this group could ultimately be overridden by NOAA. Rosemary Furfey responded that NOAA is relying on this stakeholder team to provide input about societal goals as the recovery plan is developed. The Team and all of its input are very much needed for NOAA's recovery process. NOAA is not backing away from its commitment to this entire joint process.

Next Meeting, November 15th and 16th, Roseburg:

The October 19th meeting was canceled to allow the State more time to work on the analysis and compilation of data for the assessment. Stakeholder team members agreed to plan for an extra-long meeting, possibly a two-day meeting on November 15th and 16th. This will allow a full presentation and question and answer session on the draft assessment (relative to coho only). The State's viability criteria will be sent to the group as soon as possible, which may or may not be by November 15th. An agenda and logistics for the November meeting will be sent when it is developed by the facilitation team, with input from the state and team members.

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

**Coastal Coho Recovery Project
Stakeholder Team
Sixth Meeting
ODFW Southwest Region Headquarters
Roseburg**

**Facilitator’s Meeting Summary
November 15-16th, 2004**

Attendees for all or part of the meeting:

Stakeholder Team Members: Paul Engelmeyer (public at large), Tom Forgatsch (Farm Industry), Wayne Giesy (Alega Valley Alliance), Jennifer Hampel (Coquille Watershed Assoc.), Cindy Heller (STEP), Wayne Hoffman (MidCoast Watershed Council), Bob Jacobson (Oregon Salmon Commission), Tom Kartrude (Port of Siuslaw), Kaitlin Lovell (Trout Unlimited), Jason Miner (Oregon Trout), 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), Stan van de Wetering (Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians)

Alternates and Resource Advisors: Ed Bowles (ODFW), Tom Byler (GNRO), Mark Chilcote (ODFW), Charlie Corrarino (ODFW), Steve Denney (ODFW), Rosemary Furfey (NOAA), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Les Helgeson (Native Fish Society, alternate for Bill Bakke), Diane Kightlinger (ODFW), Lance Kruzic (NOAA), Pete Lawson (TRT-NOAA), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Bruce McIntosh (ODFW), Kelly Moore (ODFW), Jim Muck (ODFW), Jay Nicholas (OWEB), Ray Wilkeson (OFIC, alternate for Blake Rowe), Terry Witt (alternate for Bill Moshofsky, Oregonians for Food and Shelter), Bronwen Wright (Pacific Rivers Council)

Other Interested Parties: Walt Morgan (public)

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

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Incorporate suggested changes to 9/27 notes, finalize	Facilitation team	December 15
Comments on public outreach materials, including press release, talking points, executive summary of presentations on web	Stakeholder team to Diane Kightlinger	December 1
Draft Assessment Report to IMST and Stakeholder Team	ODFW	Mid-December
Comments on draft report due	IMST, Stakeholder Team	February 1
CD with slides from Nov. 15-16 presentations	ODFW	Mid-December
Information/estimate of jobs created through restoration efforts	Paul Englemeyer	January 10 meeting

DAY ONE—November 15, 2004

Welcome/Introductions/Housekeeping:

Comments and Follow-up from Last Meeting:

9/27 Summary Notes

- Page 5: Hatchery Effects: It was clarified that STEP programs are included in Mark Lewis's assessment.
- Page 6: Hatchery Listing Policy, bullet 2: NOAA clarified for team members that the statement was true, that divergence is an element of the policy – it was further clarified at the break.
- Page 7: *Fish Passage Improvements Projects and Habitat Access Conditions*: Add the question: 'What percentage was passing fish?'
- Page 9, *Other habitat issues*: Add a bullet 'Presentation on sufficiency analysis for water quality'.
- General comment: Questions were raised about how Measure 37 will affect the Oregon Plan and this process. The State was not in a position today to address this, but agreed that it was important to flag now and will address it at a future meeting.

Information for Constituents and Website

Diane Kightlinger, ODFW, provided handouts of a number of documents to help communicate with constituents, as well as for inclusion on the website. The documents included stakeholder team talking points, FAQs, 'press release light', stakeholder team member list, and an acronyms list. Team members offered comments to the materials:

- In the FAQ, historical numbers of fish are cited; include current numbers as well.
- Language that landowners' contributions are a potential 'offset' implies there has already been harm to fish. Clarify the objectives of the state to be an 'opportunity to find ESU take liability protections where appropriate and allowed by NOAA Fisheries'.
- FAQ page 1-2, bullet 4): Change to 'NOAA will identify mechanisms under ESA for potential use...'
- General comment: Note that those in the timber industry are very interested in stopping those that are violating laws. Everyone is encouraged to report violations if/when they see them happening.
- **ACTION**: The stakeholder team will provide any additional comments on the documents to Diane by Wednesday, December 1. The final documents will be available close to December 3rd.

Introduction and Overview of Coast Coho Project Assessment:

Bruce McIntosh, ODFW, gave an overview of the schedule for the Oregon Plan assessment relative to coastal coho. Currently, he said, the state is in the process of addressing one question out of the PECE policy, which is the "certainty that the conservation effort will be effective". The draft assessment of the Oregon Plan as it pertains to coho will go to the IMST and the stakeholder group for review in mid-December. IMST will submit comments in February, and then it will be submitted to the Governor's office. The stakeholder team will meet with project lead Louise Solliday to discuss the second question in the PECE policy, the certainty that the conservation effort will be implemented, in January 2005. The final assessment will be submitted to NOAA to be included in their decision on the listing, in June 2005. The public will have two months to comment on Oregon's proposal prior to the state sending it to NOAA; it is

unclear at this point what the public review process will be once it is turned over to NOAA.

Biological Criteria:

A handout ‘road map’ was provided to the group of the integration of biological status and factors for decline into the coastal coho assessment. Bruce emphasized that today’s presentation and discussion would be focused on the right side of the map, ‘biological criteria’. Day two would focus on the left side of the map, ‘factors for decline’. He also noted that the assessment team is near the bottom of the road map: at the ‘evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of Oregon Plan measures that have been implemented to address the primary limiting factors’ point.

Stakeholders raised comments and questions:

- Limiting factors implies current status, factors for decline suggest an historical perspective, and the PECE policy describes ‘threats’, implying future action. It seems NOAA and the state will need to match this language up eventually.
- “Not viable” means...? In this context, relative to current conditions, viable = sustainable or will persist over time.
- How are PECE and recovery planning intersecting?
 - Oregon is committed to a conservation plan for coho, regardless of the listing. NOAA is committed to a partnership with Oregon on a recovery plan and will use the state’s coho assessment in its listing determination process.
- Is the PECE policy inclusive enough to capture all that we need to be addressing relative to future recovery, e.g., limitations from extending to private lands?
 - For now, the State is viewing the PECE policy as a framework for a recovery plan. Ed noted that the state does not feel constrained by the policy. Instead, it is being used in the interest of simultaneously assessing the Oregon Plan and developing NOAA’s recovery plan. Still, there are concerns from one stakeholder that PECE is a questionable track to be on, that we should be on the recovery plan track. One member suggested it be called a ‘rebuilding’ plan instead of a recovery or conservation plan.

Details of the Development and Application of Biological Criteria:

Ed Bowles, ODFW, extended appreciation to all who have worked on the biological assessment of the Oregon Plan, saying that a tremendous amount of thought, energy and expertise has been brought into it. He noted that it is still a work in progress and, as such, the conclusions are still preliminary. This presentation was the first roll out to the public.

Before moving into the details of the criteria, Ed offered an overview of background concepts of each of the criteria.

- *Productivity*: One operating assumption is that productivity, the ability to produce offspring, is a key element in recovery because survivability of the fish is critical to biologists. As in all systems, productivity is dynamic. So, to rely on static data or to view productivity as a straight line when other things in the system are changing does not tell the whole story. As the numbers of recruits per spawner increases, the numbers of returning recruits decreases. Eventually, productivity will reach ‘carrying

capacity’, when only enough offspring return to replace their parents (no increase in population size) or maybe even less than replacement return. What we know about capacity could change with new information; still, the concept of ‘carrying capacity’ remains the same. The question to be answered is: At low spawner densities, do parents produce enough adult progeny to replace themselves? During the record downturn of the 1990’s, did populations average above replacement?

- Another concept he touched on is ‘quasi-extinction threshold’ (QET), which is a population size somewhere greater than 0 fish, where a population will begin to decline to extinction. The concept was incorporated due to demographics and other ‘unknowns’, causing a great risk to not act at these levels.
- *Abundance*: Abundance is defined as ‘naturally produced potentially available to spawn’ viable salmonid populations. ODFW has committed to providing these criteria, but is not prepared to do so yet due to lack of better understanding of related issues (e.g. marine survival). Questions that ODFW is considering include: How many fish are needed at the front end of a bad ocean cycle to avoid getting close to extinction levels during the downturn? If standardized to poor ocean conditions, how high should abundance be at any point in time? How high should abundance be during good ocean cycles?
- *Persistence*: Considering possible combinations of habitat capacity, intrinsic potential, and ocean variability, what is the probability that populations will persist for the next 100 years?
- *Distribution and Diversity*: Are coho distributed throughout their natural range and occupying a variety of habitats? How resilient are coho populations in filling available habitats when ocean conditions become favorable? Is long term genetic diversity and adaptability at risk?

Next, Ed moved into the details of the biological criteria. The following summarizes how each of the criteria was defined in the assessment. NOTE: These criteria were applied at the population level, consistent with the TRT:

- *Abundance*: This will be addressed as mile posts rather than criteria
- *Productivity*: Pro1: during poor ocean conditions, average recruits per spawner (r/s) is above replacement when spawner density is <5 per mile. Pro2: during poor ocean conditions, average r/s is above replacement for all years below full seeding (Smax), or below 50% full seeding.
- *Persistence*: Probability is <5% of hitting extinction threshold over 100 years.
- *Distribution/diversity*: ≥50% of sample reaches within ≥50% of watersheds have ≥4 spawners/mile. Harmonic mean of forecasted abundance exceeds >550 spawners to avoid loss of 5% genetic diversity over 100 years. (Diversity is a product of local adaptations, so it is assumed for other species).

Next, Ed and Kelly Moore (ODFW) described how the measurements were done for each of the criteria, including assumptions that went into them. Details can be found on slides attached to the Oregon Plan/Coastal Coho Project website: <http://www.oregon->

plan.org/cohoproject/index.html. The following bullets highlight some major points made during the presentation:

- Resilience, relative to distribution and abundance, is a major factor. Kelly Moore pointed out that even during ‘bad’ years, there were areas of good abundance, and much improvement (resilience) occurred from 1998-2003.
- Populations that met the distribution threshold had a high capacity to re-establish threshold levels in previously unoccupied sample reaches and watersheds during periods of improved ocean conditions.
- Watersheds that do not meet distribution criteria should be evaluated.
- There was much investment in the Oregon monitoring program that allowed scientists to gather good data and apply it to this assessment.
- Shifts in run timing will be considered but are not currently built into the criteria.

Stakeholder Team Questions and Comments:

- There are concerns with using 5% probability of nearing extinction (QET) in 100 years – this is the definition of ‘endangered’. It was clarified that the graph presented is relative to population levels, not at the ESU level.
- Who will review this? NOAA, TRT and other fisheries scientists will review the assessment.
- How has the monitoring strategy changed? Since 1997, the State went from straight random samples, to partnering up with statisticians to do more accurate modeling, resulting in tightened confidence intervals.
- It is difficult to reconcile data sets/numbers and what is seen on the ground with regards to habitat. How can we reconcile these assumptions with the criteria? This is a task for the TRT and ODFW to look at in the future.
- A concern was raised with changing habitat miles each year. One way to ground truth data is to do snorkel surveys, when there are discrepancies between on the ground and modeling data. ODFW recognizes the importance of working toward linking up with local knowledge. This coastal coho project has actually led different projects and agency staffs to talk to each other and coordinate for the first time in memory.
- Re: confidence limits: scales have been switched from population to larger scale levels -- caution against confusing the two when viewing this presentation. It will be a challenge to use the criteria on a larger scale model, like ESU, and mixing data on small/large scales. ODFW has an interest in looking at the full life cycle, and then looking at specific parts of the life cycle.

Application of the Biological Criteria:

- 1) At least 10 independent populations pass all population criteria.
- 2) For each strata, either 50% or 2 independent populations pass all population criteria (1 population must be classified as functionally independent, except in the Lakes strata).
- 3) Preliminary application of criteria to Oregon coast coho populations shows a rating for each criteria for each population, then a combined rating for each population.
- 4) The PRELIMINARY strata and ESU assessment is as follows: 12 populations pass; all strata pass; ESU passes.

Question: How is harvest built into the assessment? ODFW uses the Hatchery Fish Management Policy and Amendment 13 as guidance. They looked at persistence under different fish management scenarios – base, base with hatchery improvements, and outcome if historical 70% rate had not been changed. While there may be some controversy over whether hatcheries can be used to improve persistence, ODFW believes that improvements to hatcheries lessen the risk to fish with respect to viability. Factoring in historical harvest rates shows what would occur if harvest practices had not changed, showing that changes in harvest and hatchery programs show great impacts/improvements to productivity.

Additional Stakeholder Comments and Questions:

- When will the slides be available for distribution and/or on the web?
 - **ACTION:** The presentation will be burned on a CD for members who wish one, as well as available on the web, by mid-December.
- Can the numbers be tweaked? For example, extinction threshold at 1 fish/mile makes the conservation groups very nervous. The group was reminded that they are not being asked to provide a scientific peer review of the assessment, but are being asked to provide feedback based on their experience and knowledge.
- When did the criteria for groupings of populations get put together? ODFW tried to be consistent with the TRT's approach, and are still working on requirements for 'failed' populations within the strata, as well as criteria or a description for abundance.
- What about habitat? Habitat is included in the distribution analysis. Suggestions: better measures and clarity could be added to draw this out more clearly.
- Suggestion: Include a commitment of resources or actions for those individual populations that are 'red'.
- Was there any consideration of changing habitat in relation to viability? It is a slow changing factor which poses a challenge, but ODFW can look at it long term, with a future focus, through the recovery plan process – this will be NOAA's decision.
- If Measure 37 is implemented by June 2005, it may affect the listing decision and affect future actions. Some felt that we should not focus on these unknowns when planning. Instead the group should wait to discuss the implications of Measure 37 after all legal processes are completed.
- What about dependent populations? They are not part of viability criteria, because they are dependent. The TRT should be looking at them. Pete Lawson, NOAA-TRT, offered that they are looking at some percentage of dependent populations, although the details are not yet worked out.
- ODFW: Those factors for decline with certainty of occurrence will (should) be looked at. ODFW would like feedback on any gaps that are seen with the criteria.
- Is the PECE policy being implemented anywhere else in the U.S.? There are many areas where it is in some stage of use.
- Human population growth on the coast is a certainty, and should included in the threats category. No analysis on population growth as criteria has been included for any ESU at this point. Some feel that land-use in general is a factor for decline, other perspectives say there is no trend in habitat so use caution when calling it a 'factor for

decline’. The assessment does include habitat within distribution criteria; this fact needs to be made more explicit in the discussion and a comment should be included about land-use as an issue.

- 10 Mile Lake and others have extreme population growth (both human and fish) now and projected in the future, which will impact water quality. The State’s water quality model does not go to that small of a scale and there are not enough samples to be able to characterize trends at these specific locales.
- ODFW’s sampling and methodologies are impressive, and productivity is up; still, they were urged to take a more precautionary effort with threshold numbers.
- Stakeholders thought the state should consider opportunities for future jobs that may be available (or negatively impacted) as a result of this assessment. The goal is to strike a balance between people, jobs and fisheries.
- There are examples where human and fish populations have increased and there does not seem to be a problem (such as 10 Mile Lake). Such growth can be positive for all if there is an intention to provide clean water and adherence to effective standards.

Wrap-Up Day One:

Tom Byler, Oregon Gov’s Office, thanked the ODFW and other folks for putting the assessment together. He noted that this is groundbreaking information that has made significant steps forward and is an unprecedented effort by the state. This will be the foundation for recovery planning on the Oregon coast. Tom also noted that collective decision-making is desired as we move forward with this process.

Next Steps for Peer Review:

The IMST will receive the draft assessment in mid-December. The stakeholder team and TRT will also be asked to review the assessment. Ed Bowles and Tom Byler noted that they gave a briefing of this project to the Legislative Water Committee, who supported the work that is being done. The Stakeholder Team will be involved in an economic analysis during the recovery phase of the project, as recovery scenarios are brought to the group for feedback. It was noted that the Oregon Plan should include an economic component, as it is difficult to assess the plan without it.

DAY TWO—November 16, 2004

Welcome, Introductions and Housekeeping:

After a round of introductions, Ed Bowles gave a brief summary of yesterday’s presentation of the preliminary population strata and ESU assessment. The (**preliminary**) biological assessment found that the coastal coho ESU “passed” based on the State’s biological criteria and as guided by the PECE policy. Bruce McIntosh introduced today’s focus on the factors for decline, or ‘threats’, to try to answer the question in the PECE policy about the ‘certainty that the conservation effort will be effective’.

Jay Nicholas, OWEB, displayed a number of updated story boards to visually explain the process and components of the assessment of the Oregon Plan relative to coast coho. He provided an example of ESU, monitoring area and population scale actions. All the

materials will become available on the Oregon Plan website, and included as part of the draft report that goes to the IMST in December.

When the Oregon Plan was first developed in 1997, the Core Team made a list of limiting factors. Jay walked the group through each limiting factor and addressed:

- What we have done
- Observations
- Interpretation
- Rank restoration opportunities (small, medium, large dots)
- Future needs

Jay noted that a significant amount of state funding went into monitoring in this ESU, by DSL, ODF, WRD, DEQ and ODFW. A Stakeholder Team member requested information on budgets: pre-listing, the last 7 years, and current comparisons. Tom Byler offered that this will likely be addressed in Louise Solliday's presentation to the stakeholder team in January. Restoration funding, including Federal, State and private groups equaled approximately \$107 million in this ESU from 1997-2003.

ACTION: Paul Englemeyer, public at large, offered to find an estimate of how many jobs have been created through restoration efforts to address the criticism that jobs are lost by the added regulation. It may be that different jobs are created. It was noted that some jobs put money into government funds while others take from those funds. Another request was to match volunteer efforts to dollars to better tell the story of public involvement in this entire process.

ACTION: Jay was urged to double check the activity type vs. where money was spent as the numbers do not currently match up.

Jay went on to note that watershed assessments looked at 6,000 coho miles, and showed that the proportion of private forest and agriculture lands to other types of land is higher where coho reside. High coho potential areas show increases in private forest and agriculture, and a slight increase in urban areas. Jay noted that finding intrinsic potential is a step in the right direction; the next step will be to ground truth their findings. (note: this information can be found in the NOAA TRT's Historical Populations document that was provided at a previous coho stakeholder team meeting.)

Jay showed a map of spawner distribution, which increased in the ESU from 1998-2003. There was interest expressed in seeing marine conditions vs. stream conditions and their impacts on survival, as well as an average across the ESU for spawner numbers to show the 'common' case. An additional comment on the slides was that the ranges are not consistent in their comparisons and may be misleading. It would be more convincing a case if the story was told differently in the slides. One member commented that it was great to see the agricultural lands represented on the story boards.

The following is a summary of the preliminary assessment of the limiting factors, and is organized by numbers. Stakeholder comments are added in *italics*:

- 1) What we have done

- 2) Observations
- 3) Interpretation
- 4) Rank restoration opportunity (small, medium, large dot)
- 5) Future needs

Marine Habitat:

1. Monitored coho survival at all hatcheries; wild coho survival monitored at five life cycle monitoring sites.
2. Hatchery survival decreased in the 1990's. Hatchery survival increased with the Oregon Plan, as did wild coho from 1999-2003. *Comment: clarify under 'observations'-smolts out, adults back and catch plus escapement*
3. Marine survival rate of hatchery and wild coho increased coincidental with the Oregon Plan.
4. N/A
5. Adjust harvest levels consistent with marine survivals, adult escapement and population needs.

Fishery Harvest:

1. Harvest rates dictated by PFMC Amendment 13 will constrain harvest of wild coho consistent with recovery needs.
2. Harvest rates decreased just before the Oregon Plan (ocean and river), then flattened.
3. High harvest rates on coho prior to the Oregon Plan have been reduced by management activities. Harvest rates are no longer limiting recovery. small dot
4. Maintain PFMC Amendment 13 to restrain harvest consistent with population productivity

Hatchery Impacts:

1. Hatchery and Genetic management plans have been drafted for all hatcheries, awaiting approval by NOAA. Hatchery practices managed consistent with local population status and recovery needs.
2. Reduced releases and strays since 1980. *Note only looking at coastal coho.*
3. Not constraining coho recovery. Percentage of hatchery coho in natural spawning areas has declined and is now within policy guidelines. (*note: hatchery and ceasing misspelled on slide.*)
4. Done (over last 7 years). *A larger dot may be appropriate due to unknowns of management changes that may or may not prove to be effective.*
5. Continue implementation of the Native Fish Conservation Policy and Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans. *Comment: add "enhance management actions" and add "draft" before HGMP.*

Stakeholder Team Comments/Questions:

- How do you distinguish between hatchery and other impacts? The data comes from productivity measures. If there are productivity problems in the N. Umpqua, whether

it is a hatchery or other issue cannot be teased out. What is known about hatchery impacts is at the ESU level, at this point.

- Suggestion: Add to the ‘need’ column – The way humans handle hatchery fish will have an impact, including how long they are handled, the chemicals used, and overall management practices.
- The slides do not tell the whole story, need to show a bigger picture link to Columbia River activities – consider the other releases that are included in the Oregon Population Index.
- There is concern that Oregon Plan activities are taking full credit for improvement in hatchery impacts. Suggest putting the HGMP’s in the ‘need’ column as DRAFT plans.

Stream Complexity:

1. Conduct restoration to reduce sediment, recruit wood and increase complexity. In-stream miles treated = 524; riparian miles planted = 380; riparian miles fenced = 231. *Suggestion: add “especially for over wintering” and use “key pieces” language*
2. Coho streams have less large wood, more fine sediment and fewer streamside conifers than reference streams. *Also add ‘N Coast and S Coast areas tend to be better habitat than the U Umpqua’.*
3. Availability of complex stream habitat probably limits coho production. *Focus on “key pieces” here too*
4. Large dot – great opportunity, high priority for restoration.
5. Focus habitat restoration investments in areas of high intrinsic coho potential (*Jay noted that he will change this to ‘consider’ investing in..., look at habitat overall and find areas where restoration could be most effective. Also, prioritize projects that have shorter timelines to increase the returns on investments.*)

Stakeholder Team Comments/Questions:

- The observations are misleading based on one ‘bad’ population in the North Umpqua but otherwise good streams – the assessment is coastal oriented so sharpen the language to reflect this.
- Is the statement ‘fewer streamside conifers than reference streams’ relative to just those in the coho area? Yes. Suggest clarification of this point.
- Suggestion: Show only treated miles that are within coho stream miles – Jay responded that this is difficult to do and most are within coho stream miles.
- Clean up language in the observations on ‘large’ conifers to clearly and truly reflect what the reference sites are. Also keep in mind the timeline of restoration – sharpen the focus to show how long projects would take.

Fish Passage:

1. Improve passage at stream crossings. Crossings counted = 4,413; improved = 1,140; mapped = 3,392; assessed = 2,145; unknown = 1,247. *Include a mention of tide gates too. Expand beyond culverts (e.g. screens etc)*
2. Improved access result to date: non-coho distribution +16%; non high intrinsic potential (HIP) coho distribution +10%; and HIP coho distribution +6%.

3. It is unknown if coho have access to roughly 1/3 of their potential habitat. Access can be improved 10% by correcting documented problems.
4. Small dot (due to progress made to date) *May be more appropriate to have a medium dot because many culverts that currently are passable won't be after the next major weather event.*
5. Opportunity to increase access to high quality habitat may exist in local areas. Focus on passage inventory and restoration in areas of current high quality or of high potential. *Add "with local input and assistance" to the first sentence.*

Stakeholder Team Comments/Questions:

- 'Fish passage' includes water diversions, screens, ladders, etc., in some areas. Suggestion: Break culverts out into their own category. Culverts prove technically difficult when putting analyses together. Locals may have better input and can be relied on.
- Some team members felt fish passage should be a medium dot; many culverts passing fish now are severely undersized and will not remain passable with future weather events. Impaired culverts need more work. With new information, the assessment may change and possibly culverts will be included in other areas such as distribution.
- Include tide gates as fish passage or somewhere else in the assessment of limiting factors. Tide gates could be a short term fix, and provide a lot of 'bang for your buck'.

Water Quality:

1. Conduct restoration to reduce sediment, moderate temperature, SB 1010 plans completed; TMDL's are being developed. *Add DEQ, ODF sufficiency analysis and SB 1010 assessment*
2. Most water quality parameters show no significant difference from reference streams in the ESU, and no large river monitoring sites had a declining trend in water quality during 1993-2002. For large sites, 42% had excellent to good; 39% fair and 19% poor water quality. *Use the 303 data. Temperature data is not well supported. Qualify by adding "represent point at which temperature was taken"*
3. Although not currently a significant constraint on coho recovery, water quality has the potential of limiting coho production at local spatial scales.
4. Small dot
5. Take restoration action at local spatial scales as appropriate to maintain or improve rearing capacity.

Stakeholder Team Comments/Questions:

- Ambient sites are not included and therefore this is a skewed opinion of water quality, e.g. in the Siletz and below the Siletz. Qualify the data. The 303d list will be included in the report (some raised concerns about the credibility of the 303d data).
- The worst water quality problems are in areas of highest intrinsic potential – so the dot should be a medium.

Water Quantity:

1. 3,700 miles are protected by in-stream water rights; voluntary stream flow.

2. 70% of the ESU in August was <10% of 80% natural exceedance flow. 90% of the ESU had no change.
3. No downward trend in quantity has been seen through the assessment but quantity has the potential of limiting coho production at local spatial scales.
4. Small button *see below*
5. Take restoration action at local spatial scales as appropriate to maintain or improve rearing capacity. *Add conservation plans as a way to assist and funding for sub-surface water.*

Stakeholder Team Comments/Questions:

- Changing water rights in the future (e.g. PUD's) suggests water quantity will be more of a problem than depicted in the information. Suggestion: Talk with local water resources folks about coastal needs and expansion – it is a problem.
- Be creative in finding ways to store water – agriculture can provide examples of how this is being done. Put funding into this area of the problem.
- How will future issues be implemented? The document is intended to be big picture and informative, but also recognize that it will be used at a local level so the message being sent is critical.
- Keep the assessment simple and forward looking.

“Other Factors” (including toxics, ph, hydropower, disease, predators, etc.):

1. Assessed data, literature and local observations.
2. Data, analyses
3. Although not currently significant constraint on coho recovery, ‘other’ activities have potential to be limiting factors.
4. Small dot
5. Remain alert to potential.

Stakeholder Team Comments/Questions:

- Use two buttons in the ranking, one for short term and one for long term restoration potential as they may be quite different.
- Need to add estuary and wetlands to the list

Biological Status of Populations:

Needs for populations that ‘fail’:

- High: Stream complexity is a high need throughout the populations (except Salmon River)
- Medium: hatchery impacts, water quality, water quantity
- Low: Fishery harvest, fish passage, ‘other’ factors

Suggested change: Nestucca-medium button for passage (at the hatchery)

Opportunities for populations that ‘pass’:

- High: Stream complexity
- Medium: water quality
- Low: Fishery harvest, hatchery impacts, passage, quantity, ‘other’

Clarify buttons to show ‘other/spawning gravel’

Stakeholder Team Comments/Questions:

- Many comments have been made, including from Federal agencies, that fish passage is a major issue and opportunity, and consider it a high priority. After doing the assessment, the State team found that it was not a major issue – surprisingly. This could be included as a caveat or mentioned somewhere to be consistent with others.
- Include wetlands in the ‘other’ category – or show where wetlands are addressed elsewhere. NOAA expressed that this area needs more discussion in the state’s assessment.
- Include in the report the scientific oversight team’s report on lowland and upland issues.
- Tidal areas may become areas of high productivity in the future, and could become an opportunity for restoration. As it sits, the ESU is viable now, but this issue will be considered next.

Conclusion:

The State has not yet made a listing recommendation but has recommended a ‘pass’ for biological criteria status. If the Federal listing is pursued, the State will be looking for areas within the ESU where assurances from take may be granted – areas of good status and/or opportunities for increasing intrinsic potential.

Stakeholder Team Comments:

- As of yet, beavers are not a problem and need to be welcomed back into the system to increase complexity.
- Why would we want to de-list if doing so would mean losing funding to continue with the effort? The State is committed to its conservation plan effort and the federal recovery plan effort, regardless of a listing. Clean Water Act considerations and the energy of lots of people keep the state committed to these efforts. There was additional discussion about the pros and cons of de-listing, and the group decided it was worth setting time aside at a future meeting to continue with this discussion. There was general agreement to move forward with the conservation effort, as has already been done at least since the beginning of the Oregon Plan, even if coast coho are not listed as endangered.

Wrap-Up/Next Steps/Certainty of Implementation:

Tom Byler and Ed Bowles thanked Jay, Bruce and many others for the enormous effort put into assessing the Oregon Plan. They noted that the Stakeholder Team is in a unique position to help the State and NOAA as the project moves forward. The next step for the group will be to review an agency-by-agency review of programs, looking at certainty of implementation relative to budget, FTE, etc.

As noted before, the draft report will be done in mid-December, at which time it will go to the IMST and Stakeholder Team for review. The State is requesting that comments be submitted by February 1st. Ed Bowles emphasized that, while not all comments will necessarily be included in the report (given the amount of time left to complete it), all

input will be considered and feedback from the state will be given. He stated that the Stakeholder Team is the State's focus group, so your input is particularly valuable.

A suggestion was made to reference the meeting summaries somewhere in the report, as a link or appendix. It is important to show the work of the Stakeholder Team somewhere so the greater public understands what the process is. One Team member requested that there also be a link back to the Biological Review Team conclusions somewhere in the report.

Finally, a concern was raised that for some pieces of the assessment, groups not currently involved need to be brought into this process to offer their insight and expertise (e.g. water quality and quantity experts). Tom Byler thanked the group for the suggestions and clarified that the role of the Stakeholder Team is to offer guidance on the on-the-ground policy implications of recovery scenarios that come out of the assessment. The state will be looking to the IMST for its technical expertise.

Next Meeting, February 24-25th, Newport:

The group agreed that the longer time together allowed for a more in-depth presentation and discussion of the issues. As such, the next Stakeholder Team will be a two-day meeting to allow time to discuss the following agenda items:

- Draft Assessment Report
- Certainty of Implementation Issues– Louise Solliday, Gov's Office
- Process for Future – Group roles, protocols, decision making

An agenda and logistics for the January meeting will be forthcoming.

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

DS Consulting Donna Silverberg and Robin Harkless
E-mail changes or comments on these notes at
robin76@cnnw.net

OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT
Stakeholder Team--Seventh Meeting
Embarcadero Resort, Newport

Facilitator's Meeting Summary
February 24-25, 2005

Attendees for all or part of the meeting:

Stakeholder Team Members: Bill Bakke (Native Fish Society), Paul Engelmeier (public at large), Tom Forgatsch (Farm Industry), Wayne Giesy (Alsea Valley Alliance), Cindy Heller (STEP), Wayne Hoffman (Mid-Coast 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), Sam Sasaki (Newport City Manager), Johnny Sundstrom (Oregon Assoc. of Conservation Districts), Terry Thompson (Assoc. of Oregon Counties), Stan van de Wetering (Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians)

Resource Advisors: Ed Bowles (ODFW), Tom Byler (OWEB), Rosemary Furfey (NOAA), Louise Solliday (GNRO)

Alternates and Technical Resources: Bob Baumgartner (DEQ), Robin Brown (ODFW), Bob Buckman (ODFW), Debbie Colbert (WRD), Charlie Corrarino (ODFW), Tom Davis (Alesia Valley Alliance, alt. for Wayne Giesy), Liz Dent (ODF), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Mike Gray (ODFW), Ray Jaindl (ODA), Pete Lawson (TRT-NOAA), Mark Lewis (ODFW), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Ted Lorenson (ODF), Kurt Melcher (ODFW), Bruce McIntosh (ODFW), Eric Metz (DSL), Jo Morgan (ODF), Darrin Neff (BLM-Tillamook), Jay Nicholas (OWEB), Jeff Rogers (ODFW), Christine Simon (alt. for Shawn Reiersgaard), Heather Stout (NOAA-TRT), Tom Wainwright (NOAA-TRT), Matt Walker (BLM-Tillamook), Jeff Weaver (DLCD), Ray Wilkeson (OFIC, alternate for Blake Rowe), Chuck Willer (Coast Range Associates), Bronwen Wright (Pacific Rivers Council), Brad Wurfel (ODFW)

Other Interested Parties: Joel Gallil (News Times), Mitch Lies (Capital Press)

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

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Email NOAA’s response re: OMB directive to have independent review of listing decisions	Rosemary Furfey to Stakeholder Team	April 8
Gather additional information about TRT preliminary documents and opportunity for additional comment	Rosemary Furfey	April 8
Small group session to discuss Viability assessment document with ODFW and other Core Team members	Anyone interested	March 11, 2pm @ ODFW HQ in Salem
Public Q&A with candidates for Director of Hatchery Release Center	Anyone interested	March 11, 1-2 pm @ ODFW HQ in Salem
Develop and circulate ideas for an approach to the conservation planning process to the Stakeholder Team in advance of the next meeting	NOAA, the state and the facilitation team	April 1

DAY ONE

Summary of Where We Are

Comments on 11/15-11/16 Meeting Notes:

- Pg. 9, *Fishing Harvest*: Concern over the reliability of the hooking mortality estimation on catch & release of coho. It is higher than assumed in the analysis.
- Pg. 11-12 *Water Quality*: Concern had been raised before on ‘ambient sites’ and this (and other) comments appear to have had no affect on the assessment reports.
- Clarify and list all affiliations with the Steering Committee member names. Who gets paid to be here, who volunteers their time? Transparency is important. Attach a list of members with the assessment report.
- Pg. 8: Clarify the paragraph about ‘private forest and agriculture lands increase where coho reside’. As written, it is not clear what this means.
- Pg. 13: ‘Upland’ instead of ‘Highland’ (this is Oregon, not Scotland!).
- Pg. 8, ‘Actions’: Were these completed? The facilitation team will follow-up with Paul Englemeyer and Jay Nicholas.
- End of notes: The meeting was postponed from January 10-11 to February 24-25.

Review Process Guidelines, Timeline and Participation Issues:

Donna Silverberg, facilitator, welcomed everyone and gave a brief overview of what has happened since the stakeholder team last met in November. She referred to a handout that sets out the planned phases of the project and said that Phase I of the process, the time for tracking and providing input on the state’s assessment, is nearly complete. An email was sent out on 2/8/05, to remind and clarify that the stakeholder team’s role was not to serve as scientific peer review of the assessment (this is the IMST’s role). The state’s objective with holding Stakeholder Team meetings since June was to keep the group informed as it was writing its assessment so that later, during Phase II (the time for processing the information and getting ready to move into conservation/recovery planning), the stakeholder team would be up to speed and prepared to provide input on management actions and other policy implications of the assessment.

Next steps for review:

Louise Solliday, GNRO, reminded the group that March 15 is Oregon’s deadline for receiving public comment on the draft assessment. The state is compiling comments and will review them all before finalizing the document. They did not formally address comments in the first draft due to the short timeframe for completion, but a record of the comments has been maintained. The final assessment will go to NOAA on April 30 in order to inform the federal listing decision and will include an appendix of the stakeholder team meeting minutes and a list of issues raised by the team members—with a clarification that the comments were made by individuals, not the team as a group. At the request of the group, the meeting minutes and issue list will also be linked via the web-site as part of the pre-draft information the state reviewed.

Response to Public Comment:

Comments received by the state will be grouped by subject matter and responses will come from the Core Team and various agency staff who worked on the draft reports. Oregon’s comment process will be linked to NOAA’s notice for public comment so it is clear that the two comment processes exist. As noted above, there will be a web link to

meeting minutes and a summary of stakeholder team issues (through the Nov. 15-16 meeting) compiled by the facilitation team.

Timeline:

Kevin Goodson, ODFW, noted that the Coho Project timeline has been extended to the end of December. He reminded the group that the objectives of the project are to:

1. Assess the Oregon Plan for coastal coho
2. Use the assessment to inform NOAA's listing decision
3. Use the assessment as a basis to seek "legal assurances" for local participants
4. Use as a foundation for developing a 'conservation plan' for Oregon's coastal coho.

There was some discussion about providing legal assurance opportunities to private landowners. Theoretically, if a landowner fulfills certain requirements, they will receive protection from prosecution and other interference if the fish get listed. The state is working with NOAA on this issue.

It was clarified that Oregon is not assuming, nor is it lobbying for, a list or de-list decision from NOAA. Louise Solliday, the Governor's point person on this project, noted that the decision is a federal process. The Governor has been clear that the state will provide needed information to inform the decision, but is not making a recommendation on what the decision should be. The purpose of the assessment was to look carefully at Oregon's efforts to date with coho conservation, coho viability and the likelihood of implementation and effectiveness of the Oregon Plan in the future. As noted in previous meetings, the state had set up the stakeholder team to help with objectives #1 and 4 from the list above.

Stakeholder team member comments:

- The assessment does imply that, as it responds to ESA language of 'viability', the status of the fish does not warrant a list.
- There is a new USDA conservation funding program for in-stream efforts – the state and stakeholder team should look into this as we move forward. There will be a presentation on this program at a future meeting.

Movement Towards Conservation/Recovery Planning:

Kevin Goodson listed the components of a state conservation plan, noting that they match up well with those of a federal recovery plan. The details of the components will be discussed at a future meeting:

- Identify the species management unit (SMU)
- Describe "desired" status
- Describe current status
- Identify the gap between the two and what to do to close the gap
- Develop short- and long-term management strategies
- Describe needed research, monitoring and evaluation
- Develop a process for modifying strategies
- Include measurable criteria

- Compare to other species

Given these pieces of a conservation plan, Kevin offered next steps for the coho project:

- Begin by defining “desired status”
- Use the assessment and TRT limiting factors analysis to determine bottlenecks
- Develop management strategies to clear up bottleneck areas
- Perform an economic analysis
- Identify research, monitoring and evaluation needs

Stakeholder Team member comments:

- If NOAA lists the fish, won't the state have to re-do their conservation plan? Regardless of NOAA's actions, the state will build off the foundation of the assessment to develop a conservation plan, as required by state law.
- How will we keep momentum going if the fish are de-listed? There is concern that if the fish are not listed, federal funds will be lost that would otherwise be given to the watershed councils, etc. The state and NOAA believe that momentum will continue if a strong conservation plan is developed. That plan would identify recovery actions that would have high priority for funding and, especially if consistent with a federal recovery plan, will likely receive support—while at the same time potentially streamlining the ESA Section 7 consultation process, if the fish are listed. Other team members noted that Measure 66 and Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Funds (PCSRF) get distributed by OWEB, not the federal government. Since federal funds are year-to-year budget issues with Congress, a case for funding will need to be made regardless of a listing or not. And, if the fish ARE de-listed, those who have invested in the efforts to date will not walk away from those investments as the fish could just as easily be re-listed.
 - Suggestion – in Part 3A of the report, more clearly acknowledge the state's commitment to move forward and address how the conservation effort will move forward regardless of the federal listing determination.
- Who will determine the desired status? The stakeholder team will be the voice of the 'societal' determination, and discussion will be vetted in other areas in accordance with the public review process in the Native Fish Conservation Policy. There are other conservation planning groups working in a similar capacity to this group, e.g. Spring Chinook on the Rogue and the Interior Columbia Red-Band. All are learning how to do this part of the process.

Recovery Planning:

Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, provided a handout of NOAA's federal registered notice for public comment on the state's draft assessment. The NOAA Regional office and Science Center are reviewing the assessment and will provide comments by March 15. Anyone who wishes to make comments for NOAA to review prior to their comments being sent to the state may do so by March 11th and send to OR-Coho-Report.nwr@noaa.gov. It was noted that there was an OMB directive that all federal agencies must undergo an independent science review of all listing decisions.

ACTION: Rosemary will report back to the group via email what NOAA’s response to this directive is.

Stakeholder Team member comments:

- An ISRP review should be part of the process. Is that possible? Rosemary has asked and was told that the ISRP focuses on broader issues, not specific assessments such as this. (She agreed to inquire with the ISRP again on this issue.)
- A concern was raised that Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) is not more involved with the stakeholder team process. It was noted that they were invited to participate as a member. However, they chose to be on the email contact list to receive and track all information that circulates amongst the group. The state, as a member of the PFMC, is working to ensure the current harvest matrix becomes rule for the PFMC.
- The TRT viability document and IMST review document are not available to the stakeholder team yet – it is difficult to offer comprehensive comments without these as they are the scientists the state is relying on for peer review. Will there be an opportunity for a next round of comments? Likely no, but the IMST comments will be included in the final assessment report.
 - **ACTION:** Rosemary will find out if preliminary information from the TRT document can be shared with this group, and if so, when. She will also find out if there will be a comment period open between April 30 (Oregon’s submittal to NOAA) and June 2005, when the listing decision will be made. A strong concern was expressed that the stakeholder team is being asked to comment without all the facts on the table.

The group welcomed Brad Wurfel, ODFW’s new Coho project outreach coordinator.

Synthesis of Viability Analysis and Evaluation of Conservation Efforts

Bruce McIntosh, ODFW, gave an overview of the assessment process. Four reports are included in the document: Part 1 Synthesis document, Part 2 Viability assessment (presented in December to the group), Part 3 PECE analysis (Part A and B), and Appendices (technical reports). All can be found on the Coho Project website at <http://www.oregon-plan.org/cohoproject/index.html>.

- Jay Nicholas, OWEB, provided a presentation of the Synthesis document, which summarizes and highlights the viability assessment document, conservation efforts and state technical reports.

The state’s conclusions regarding of coastal coho’s viability were:

- The ESU is viable.
- Factors for decline that existed have been and will be effectively addressed.
- Moderate risk remains from ocean conditions and stream complexity.
- Current management should preclude serious deterioration of fish or their habitat.
- Monitoring exists that will promptly detect any serious deterioration, providing opportunities for state and federal management actions and protection.

Stakeholder Team Member comments/questions:

- “Low to stable” language is softer than on the ground reality – do not agree at this point with the premise for viability based on the model used by the state.
- Stated problems that stakeholder team members had with the assessment do not appear to be addressed in the document. Where is the meaningful participation? For example, the four fish/mile criteria, relative to distribution only – the methodology on this is not clear.
 - Response: the state used a conservative approach in modeling. Many, many perspectives on different criteria went into the assessment, so it is not a simple read when looking at, for example, ‘fish per mile’ language. Also, the state found that abundance was not relative with this species – research showed that the fish were above replacement at low densities and below replacement at high densities.
- Population structure was challenged as it is depicted in the assessment. A preliminary study of genetics of coho shows inconsistency with the assumptions in the assessment and suggests that a smaller scale should be used for this criterion. Given this, it was suggested that the state add new preliminary genetic studies that challenge population structure assumptions to the assessment. Ed reminded the group that the state does NOT plan to make changes to the population structure based on preliminary findings from new research until the TRT and state scientists conclude this is warranted..

ACTION: The state will include a paragraph that notes that new genetic analysis currently underway may shift how population structure is treated. While preliminary, if the new analysis is accepted by the broader scientific community, the state will change its approach to conservation planning and note this in the assessment.
- Is there a way of ‘correcting the course’? Yes, as supported in the Native Fish Conservation Policy –through adaptive management practices and by strengthening other criteria (e.g. productivity) in a well thought-through conservation plan.
- How did the state get to the button sizes for each factor? This is not explicitly discussed in the assessment and needs to be clarified.
- ‘Predators’ should stand alone as a factor, not placed under ‘other’ or mixed in with ‘hatcheries’. As written in the assessment, it looks as though the state sees hatcheries (and their large releases of ‘food’) as the primary cause of predation. A number of members felt that predators are an important and potentially high priority for restoration.
 - Jay noted that there is a full report on predators, and that they were analyzed as a stand-alone factor. A suggestion was made to reflect in the document where the ESA and the Marine Mammal Act come in to conflict. From an analytical standpoint, the state will not likely place predators as a medium-sized ‘button’ at the ESU/population scale. But, the state does agree that for site-specific areas, predators may be a bigger limiting factor.
 - **ACTION:** The state will separate predators out from ‘other’, and will note that it is an area for further research, as data is unknown. (NOTE: Some stakeholder team members felt that predators should remain under ‘other’.)

- Passage: Because all of the barriers to passage are not fully known, and are potentially a long term problem, ‘passage’ should not be a small button – why was it labeled as such? The state recognizes that the debate on this issue is ripe and sees that passage may have a significant impact in population growth for the future. There is an opportunity for input from the stakeholder team to fill in the unknowns via the conservation planning phase – it will remain a small button at this point until habitat above barriers can be prioritized in terms of high and low quality for restoration. The issue can be addressed most effectively in the conservation/recovery planning process at a smaller (e.g. population) scale.
- For passage and predators – add ‘potential at local level for being larger threat’ to leave a placeholder that supports local restoration work in these areas.
- Stream flow: Shouldn’t stream flow be bigger than a low risk, especially considering growth of populations in coastal communities? If looking at the chart, you do not see any acknowledgement of how concerned local community members are about this risk.
- Water quantity: Did the state consider drought projections? No, the assessment was based on improving viability of the species and looking at drought projections would not be, on an ESU scale, a top priority for reaching that goal.
- The graphics need to be presented more clearly to reflect what is written in the report.
- Look at the Conservation Security Act for water quantity. Deep pools would be a better solution than shading relative to water quality (temperature).
- Water quantity could affect/cause problems by delaying the coho life cycle.
- Link in a side by side table ‘risks to viability’ and ‘restoration’ for easy comparison and to show that priorities are made based on viability determinations.
- Re: Climate change – Shouldn’t there be a bigger mention of this factor? The state addressed this mostly under marine survival because no trends are known at this point. Likely, this issue will be discussed in more detail in the assessment based on IMST comments.
- Add ‘ESU’ to the ‘conclusions’ slide to be clear about scale.
- Add a bullet on the ‘conclusions’ slide that “other risk factors exist that may be important in local areas”.
- Add ‘and continued restoration efforts’ to bullet #4 under ‘current management’ on slides.
- To better help the reader, include a glossary of all acronyms used in the assessment.
- P. 19 Figure 3: Tighten up the graph on how the graph was made – cumulative or not? Figure captions should be reviewed and cleaned up.
- As a tool for making a change in the future, this is a very good document!
- At the beginning of the document, identify what law brought the Oregon Plan into existence.
- Remove ‘revisions to forest practices’ and just say ‘Forest Practices Act’.

Next Steps: Ed Bowles and ODFW staff will host a small group session to go over the viability assessment for those who want more details and/or to make oral comments, on **Friday March 11 at 2 pm at ODFW Headquarters in Salem.**

Public and Other Comments:

- Link up the 5-20 year viability horizon with the court's time frame regarding ESA Threatened listing. Ed Bowles responded that only the persistence modeling had a time horizon. The persistence modeling assessed the probability of extinction over the next 100 years. The rest of the viability criteria were based on retrospective analyses of the data.
- Pinnipeds – species fitness may be a significant issue, and if you get rid of too many predators, this may detract from the fitness of salmon. Predators serve a real function in genetic diversity/ecosystem health. It was noted that jetty construction has increased the ability of predators to easily catch fish, so the scales have been typically in favor of predators – not species fitness.
- Re: predators –Because of the Marine Mammal Act, we do nothing to manage predators and so population control happens through starvation. This is a cruel management practice and should be addressed.

Day One Wrap-Up

What is the Stakeholder Team's protocol for talking to the press? The protocols only state that this is an open process and,

“Members and Resource participants agree to maintain the respectful tone of the meetings outside the meetings, including all e-mail correspondence. Any reporting to constituents, speaking to the press or other discussion of the meetings will focus on issues not on individuals”.

Given some press coverage that occurred in the interim since November, the following suggestions were made for future interactions:

- Differentiate between the group and personal comments to the press – only speak for yourself/agency/organization, not the stakeholder team.
- Notify team members if the press is developing a story so all have an opportunity to comment if they choose.
- Nobody should speak for the team unless the stakeholder team drafts a press release statement together.
- If you do speak to the press, be mindful of how the press might spin what you say.
- Keep in mind that this is an on-going process and you might pigeon-hole yourself and your organization/constituents if too much is said in the press.
- Provide only written statements to the press.

UPDATE: Charlie Corrarino, ODFW noted that the Hatchery Release Center is looking for an advisory group to aid the new Director. There will be a public Q&A session with the four candidates on Friday, March 11 from 1-2 pm at ODFW Headquarters in Salem. Following, there will be opportunity for a small group meeting to discuss the viability document with ODFW and others that worked on the Oregon Plan assessment.

DAY TWO

PECE Part 3A: Certainty of Implementation

Louise Solliday, Governor's Natural Resources Office, gave a power point presentation (and provided handouts) on Part 3A of the assessment: the certainty that conservation

efforts will be implemented by the state and others. The analysis involved identifying federal and state agency programs that comprised the Oregon Plan, which included: forest management, water quality, agriculture management, water use management, fisheries harvest management, hatchery management, waste removal, urban growth management, and watershed restoration programs. The assessment tracks nine criteria from NOAA Fisheries. The following bullets summarize the conclusions for each criterion and followed by comments from stakeholder team members:

- *Conservation effort, parties, staff, funds and resources need to implement is identified.* This was completed and ORS's were attached to elements of the Oregon Plan so that even the legal links are clear. Louise also noted that funding sources have grown since the beginning of the Oregon Plan conservation effort.
- *Legal authority and commitment are described.* The state has done this through ORS's, legislative directives, Governor directives, commitments from needed boards and commissions, and a 7-year track record. Note: There is some uncertainty of the effect Measure 37 might have on coho efforts as it is unknown yet. While there are exceptions in Measure 37 for federal regulations and pollution, it is unclear how those exceptions will play out over time.
 - *Question:* What is the level of enforcement actions taken as a result of the legal challenges? *A:* This was identified in individual agency reports to show a 'track record' of violations and compliances. Terry Thompson, Oregon Counties, clarified that it appears the level of compliance is high, and that local agencies are engaged in enforcement as well as the state.
 - *Comment:* It would be useful to show how much compliance there is as opposed to (or in addition to) enforcement action required.
 - *Comment:* Don't you need to evaluate Measure 37 as though federal regulations do not exist if the fish do not get listed? *A:* While the ESA might not apply, the Clean Water Act still would.
- *Legal procedural requirements are described and fulfillment of the requirements will not preclude commitment to the effort.* Through statute, the Forest Practices Act, TMDL's as delegated by EPA, an MOA between ODA/EPA, DSL permits, hatchery management requirements, and water rights, the state believes the procedural requirements are not so onerous as to effect the effort.
 - *Comment:* Concern was raised about the sufficiency analysis of the Forest Practices Act (at a landscape scale OK, but smaller scale may be an issue). Work is being done by the agency to address this.
- *Authorizations are identified and a high level of certainty exists that those who need to will get authority to implement the plan.* Most state agencies have already acquired the necessary authorizations. Where private authorization is needed, protocols are in place to get them. This will remain an ongoing effort. Watershed restoration projects have met some authorization impediments, but most have been overcome.
 - *Comment/Suggestion:* There is no way to calculate the number of projects that never get started due to multiple permit requirements. Suggest designing a system that allows a private landowner or watershed council the ability to obtain only the most difficult permit, with sign-off from the remaining agencies as a given.

- *Suggestion:* The report should also capture the authorization not granted, e.g. funds to support pesticide reporting, and projects that have gone through without authorization, e.g. water quantity uses in urban areas.
- *Comment:* There is concern about the slow response in getting to water quality levels required by the Clean Water Act and DEQ not making cities/counties speed up their process to compliance (e.g. Portland, Reedsport). Discharge and water rights remain a concern.
- *Suggestion:* Quantify the number of enforcement cases that have been brought, and where we are now – how quick did agencies respond to violation reports in the past, and how many are still unresolved?
- *Comment re: Hatchery Genetic Management Plans:* A spreadsheet in the report shows how many plans have been submitted, for which species. All coho have been submitted. Should Hatchery Program Management Plans (HPMP) be captured as well?
- *Suggestion:* Team members would like to see the assessment give recognition that most people in the areas where fish reside have worked hard and are complying with the requirements.
- *Voluntary participation is identified and a high level of certainty is provided that these efforts will help the plan move forward.* This has been and is a major component of the Oregon effort. The Oregon Watershed Restoration Inventory tracks volunteer efforts; \$107 million in funding was granted for local projects from 1997-2003 in the ESU; a number of incentives programs are in place to support voluntary efforts and there is a track record that shows how much volunteer participation exists.
 - *Suggestion:* STEP projects should be highlighted in the presentation – put in table to show their efforts, which is very strong and could show the strength of voluntary efforts. (While STEP does not report to OWEB, STEP projects are put into the OWEB database, and should go here too).
 - *Comment:* Re: riparian projects and fences. There were 500 miles put in that got flooded and knocked out and had to be put in again. Which volunteer efforts remain, which get washed out?
 - *Comment:* Relative to other areas, much has been accomplished for a relatively small funding investment.
 - *Comment:* Many efforts do not get reported; acknowledge this as it tells an even BIGGER voluntary participation story. The state recognizes this and would like to include all voluntary projects in the OWEB data base, which only tracks information from grant fund recipients-or those who send data on their own. The stakeholder team could help by providing the local information for inclusion in the database.
 - Many county employees do restoration work in the course of their everyday work that benefits salmon, e.g. culvert cleaning.
 - Agriculture industries are also doing work under SB 1010 that does not get reported, but are good conservation efforts.
 - *Comment/suggestion:* Both of the above examples, like so many others, points out that there has been a culture shift with voluntary efforts since the Oregon Plan was developed. Somehow this should be noted even

- though it is not easy to quantify. Important social capital has been built to support this effort and should not be overlooked or undervalued.
- *Suggest:* Add legal assurances to the list of possible incentives and ‘people want to do the right thing’ as an incentive to balance ‘enforcement mode’.
 - *Comment:* Technical assistance in some areas is lacking and could be improved.
 - *Regulatory mechanisms necessary to implement are in place.* Yes – ODFW, ODF, BLM, ODA, WRD, DEQ, DSL, and DLCDC all have enforcement mechanisms they can employ if needed.
 - *Issues that still need to be addressed:*
 - Current water rights are second to rights issued previously to in-stream regulation.
 - Cannot regulate removal of large wood.
 - Measure 37 creates uncertainty. Applications in Measure 37 have come in since this report was drafted, and will need to be captured. The final assessment will include the numbers and types of claims made to cities, counties and the state in the coastal area.
 - *Comment/suggestion:* Another perspective on Measure 37 is that, because there now is more certainty for landowners in the land-use process, there is less need to ‘beat’ regulation by changing the landscape/use or selling. Do not put a negative spin on the effects of Measure 37 in the assessment.
 - *Suggestion:* Capture the federal regulatory mechanisms that also have an impact on restoration.
 - *High level of certainty that funding exists to support the plan.* Measure 66 (7.5% of lottery funds dedicated until 2014), Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Funds (PCSRF), Salmon license plate income, and ’05-07 Governor’s budget all provide the certain, stable funding needed to make the conservation effort successful.
 - *Suggestion:* Break out actual PCSRF funding that was directed specifically at this ESU.
 - *Suggestion:* Show how funding has been spent on the coast, not just statewide. Also it would be useful to summarize this financial information (amount and spent on what) in a table by agency.
 - *Comment.* There is concern with the backfill of funds, and if de-listed, funds may be diverted to other areas. The resolve and resources are not certain. Response: The Governor is attempting to deal with this backfill through his proposed budget. Also, if the fish are not listed now, there is always the threat that the fish will be re-listed. Legislators and others know that we cannot back away from efforts too quickly in any case.
 - *An implementation schedule is provided.* The schedule has been in place for a while and many target dates have already been met, including 1010 plans and watershed assessments. On-going efforts include TMDL’s, voluntary commitments, implementation plans for state forest lands, and draft rules re: small/medium streams from ODF.
 - *Comment:* Caution against specifically saying there is a commitment when discussions may be ongoing. For example, there is discussion and current development of *draft* rules for small/medium streams, but nothing has

been finalized. (If there is an issue being considered and will continue to be addressed, the state included it in the assessment as an ongoing implementation piece.)

- *Comment:* The Fall Creek Research hatchery should be mentioned in the assessment.
- *The plan or effort is approved by all necessary parties.* Yes –The Legislature, Governor, necessary Boards and Commissions, have all approved the plan which was developed through a great deal of interagency coordination of the core agencies.

Louise summarized the outcomes of the assessment of ‘certainty of implementation’:

- There is a high level of certainty of implementation in the ESU.
- Agencies have adequate funding, staffing, resources and legal/regulatory authorities to carry out conservation efforts.
- Legal procedural requirements can be met.
- Implementation schedules are in place where needed.
- Voluntary participation is strong and expected to continue.

Additional Stakeholder Team Member Comments:

- Forest management – erosion of the numbers of staff in Lincoln County may impact effectiveness and is a concern.
- Forest management – concern that not all on-the-ground water quality data is being processed in the data bases – might this be due to under-staffing?
- Forest management – the Forest Practices Act only has jurisdiction over all forest lands, but only commercial harvest. There is need for jurisdiction over non-commercial harvest, e.g. Siletz, Salmon River, Alsea River where trees are cut for firewood or views on private lands.
- Water quality – The Pesticide Use Reporting System needs to be funded in order to clarify water quality needs (Note: it is in the Governor’s proposed budget).
- Water quantity – when violations on dredging/filling are reported to DSL, there appears to be inadequate or slow response – is this due to under-staffing, inadequate regulations, or....?
- There are concerns that Measure 66 funds are being diverted to other uses and that ‘capital’ has been re-defined to equal ‘percentage of work’ and, therefore, this is decreasing voluntary participation.
- No mention of ODOT restoration work – highlight this. (ODOT restoration work is included in the OWEB database.)

PECE Part 3B: Certainty of Effectiveness

Bruce McIntosh began his presentation noting the four principles underlying the actions that the assessment was based on – Change historic management practices, conserve existing conditions, create future conditions, and monitor. The following section summarizes the results of the six key elements (questions) of Part 3B of the assessment.

1. Describe Nature and Extent of Threats, and How the Conservation Effort Reduces Threats:

For this question, the assessment team focused on programs that influence stream complexity, water quality and water quantity.

- Forest management – Current forestland protection is sufficient. On federal lands, where standards are implemented, recovery is the goal. On state lands, the ‘desired future condition’ supports the habitat requirements of native fish. Private lands are likely to restore habitat in the long-term (through attaining a mature forest condition and woody debris recruitment). OR Department of Forestry (ODF) provides alternative management of riparian areas, incentives, technical assistance and guidance. Relative to overall effectiveness, based on existing regulatory programs, we are unlikely to see a decline and likely to see improvements in forest practices. Overall, the state concluded that forest practices are not a significant threat to coho viability.
 - *Comment* – Concern with the comment that ‘large diameter trees are increasing in upland and riparian areas’.
 - *Comment* – ‘Ample technical guidance’ language is a concern – New land owners with “new” management practices are blooming in the state without the staff to provide these non-industrial private landowners the technical guidance and education needed to get appropriate management of forested areas—this is also true in agricultural areas.
 - *Comment* – Degradation in stream complexity is still being observed. Increasing capacity to do in-stream work where not already being done is important, even if degradation is not a result of forest management practices. If degradation continues to occur, there may be a threat to viability, and some of this is occurring on a site specific basis. Bruce offered that much of the restoration work is recent (since the 1980’s) so improvements may not yet be fully actualized. Ted Lorenson, ODF, suggested that real opportunities exist to improve conservation efforts that are not yet known. We should continue to look for those opportunities given the uncertainties. Be clear in the report about the uncertainty.
 - *Clarification* – The IMST concluded that forest practices are not sufficient to meet recovery goals Delete - IMST said nothing about viability, that wasn’t a question at the time. DEQ and ODF have websites with sufficiency analyses to meet water quality standards and recommendations for changing forest practices to improve habitat, through regulatory or voluntary efforts. Ed Bowles stressed the need to de-couple notions of desired status (which will be addressed in the state’s conservation plan) and viability threats (which is what the assessment focused on).
 - *Comment* – Be mindful of the historical perspective on forest management; do not focus entirely on active management, as some work may be unnecessary (e.g. shade areas).
 - *Comment* – Shade, large woody debris, and instream food supply are interrelated. All three cannot be maximized at the same time; there are trade-offs. All are important, but we don’t know how any of them connect directly to increased fish productivity. We need to balance these factors instead of trying to maximize one or the other of them.

- *Question* – Where is the data to support 70-99% riparian area? Figures on riparian area effectiveness can be found in the Forestry report on riparian issues. Also, there are more details on public safety issues and effects on aquatic habitat.
- *Comment* – There is concern with the statement about basal area increase for small and medium streams on page 16 of the agency report. The assessment team is still working on this.
- *Comment* – Re: management of riparian areas and allowable harvest: since regulations in the Forest Practices Act went into effect, opportunities for harvest have increased since new trees have grown. The ODF report shows that this harvest effect is not a problem yet. Again, this plays into the incentive noted earlier, that ‘people want to do the right thing’.
- *Comment* – There was a conscious effort to keep landowners economically involved in their riparian zones in the development of current forestry regulations for stream protection. Landowners are more likely to invest and actively manage riparian forests, provide what fish need, conduct restoration projects, and reforest after disturbance events if they continue to have an economic interest in their riparian forests. Economics is not the only motivation for landowners, but it is an important one.
- Water quality – Most water quality regulation is managed through DEQ/TMDL’s. Currently, there are four TMDL’s completed in the ESU; the remainder will be completed by 2008. Stream temperature, bacteria, and sediment areas were addressed. Additionally, the Dept. of Agriculture is responsible for Water Quality Management Plans and rules prohibiting discharge of waste. The assessment found that:
 - While many coho streams did not meet water quality standards, no trend was seen for the last decade.
 - Current programs are designed to meet water quality standards.
 - Implementation is in the early stages on agricultural lands.
 - If implementation is effective at meeting water quality standards, this translates into benefits to native fish.
 - Continued monitoring, review and adaptive management are critical to long-term effectiveness.
- *Comment* – What about mercury? Mercury is addressed in the Willamette TMDL, and the information will be used to inform and begin work monitoring mercury in other areas. There is a general movement toward monitoring and addressing mercury and other toxics in all TMDL’s, including those on the coast.
- *Comment* – Liked the specificity of water quality data. It is not as clear for others at the population level in the watersheds. This raises a concern with the entire assessment if data, such as large woody debris, is not clear enough. (For each monitoring area, consistent trends among monitoring areas were observed, giving the assessment team insight into what was happening at the populations level

- *Comment* – Lead is another water quality issue. EPA is conducting studies in the Siuslaw and has put this on the horizon as an issue that is becoming more significant. DEQ is beginning to monitor lead.
- *Comment* – Organic pollutants (human and animal) also are becoming an issue. They are not addressed in TMDL's yet, but water quality researchers are beginning to look at this on the coast, especially effects on endocrine systems.
- Water Quantity – The Oregon Department of Water Resources assessed the likelihood of meeting summer low flow needs. They determined that the regulatory process maintains a minimum instream flow, and the primary risk factor is on the North Umpqua. They found also that consumptive use has not substantially increased since 1999.
 - *Suggestion* – Establish an 'urban water conservation ethic', and divert any additional water that comes from this to in-stream.
 - *Suggestion* (also shared in November) – Augment the analysis with current water rights granted but not exercised or current requests for additional rights to show the potential for an increase in consumptive use. (The analysis was done for August and WRD does not anticipate giving any new rights. The report does recognize that there may be future pressures.)
 - *Comment* – Look at storage as a potential solution. Water is a critical survival issue and there needs to be a balance between available water in the winter with lower levels of available water in the summer. Human and fish needs are often at odds with one another. There are risks and benefits to storage; consider in- and off-stream storage options.
- Habitat Restoration – Looked at activities that address limiting factors and promote long term restoration, through: partnerships; regulation; funding; and monitoring of restoration effectiveness.
 - *Suggestion* – Recognize specifically STEP, Tillamook Estuary Partnership, and LCREP on the partnership slide.

2-4. *Questions 2-4, re: conservation objectives, steps to implementation and parameters/standards for achievement and progress, were addressed in the individual agency reports.*

5. *Monitor and Report on the Conservation Effort:*

Implementation, monitoring and reporting components are important and well underway in state programs. Descriptions of monitoring and reporting are detailed in the technical reports. Oregon Plan monitoring programs have gained broad acceptance. Investments in the last decade provide a strong baseline.

6. *Incorporate Principles of Adaptive Management:*

Adaptive management is the central premise of the Oregon Plan. This assessment is an example of adaptive management in action, and monitoring of standards and adaptation has been key to success thus far. Oregon partners will now use the findings of the assessment to improve decision making and target investments.

Summary:

- Current regulatory programs are adequate to maintain current habitat conditions.
- Non-regulatory programs focus on risk factors.
- Monitoring is crucial.
- There is a commitment to develop a conservation plan which will move the state from addressing minimum viability standards to recovery planning.

Stakeholder Team Member Comments:

- *Question:* Why is there such a commitment to improving roads? *A:* It serves multiple functions: it is a quick restoration action for passage and refined sediment, has less permit requirements, and gets commitment from landowners.
- High intrinsic potential habitat is not just on state forest lands– stream complexity, private agricultural lands, and private forest lands are also major areas for HIP. This is acknowledged in the report.
- Look at particular areas (stream by stream based on local capabilities and needs) to prioritize restoration projects, rather than the whole ESU.
- It would be helpful to hear NOAA’s perspective on ways to improve the assessment. *A:* NOAA will have comments in to the state by March 15. All comments, positive and negative, will be helpful for both NOAA and the state and should be submitted.
- *Re:* Adaptive management – now that stream complexity is a high priority, will it be prioritized for funding, more so than roads?

Wrap Up/Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be held on **Friday, April 8, in or near Cannon Beach** (details to follow). The Stakeholder Team will discuss:

- Conservation planning
 - Process and approach for the group
 - Review elements of a conservation plan
 - Discuss a process for decision making
- “Desired Status”
 - What are the guiding principles?

ACTION: NOAA, the state, and the facilitation team will meet to develop ideas for an approach to the conservation planning process and circulate ideas to the Stakeholder Team in advance of the next meeting.

Meeting Evaluation – The Stakeholder Team commented on today’s meeting and suggested ways in which future meetings and the overall process could be improved. Stakeholder Team members found it very helpful to have hard copies of power point presentations, receive information in advance of the meeting, and to have stayed on

schedule. Momentum, at times, got lost during today's meeting, but was recovered. Improvement could be made on providing context and continuity between comments. It was noted that there will be strength in a consensus from this group as we move forward. Because of this, the team needs to further discuss issues of consensus and develop a protocol to address consensus. Effort could be made to improve a sense of ownership and acknowledgement that Stakeholder Team members are being heard by the state. The state and NOAA need to clearly lay out their expectations as we move forward.

ACTION: Kevin Goodson, ODFW, and Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, will develop a visual that shows, side by side, conservation plan elements and recovery plan elements, and where they overlap.

An agenda and logistics for the April meeting will be forthcoming.

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

**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 (Alesia 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 th 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, 3rd bullet “Comments”: Change from non-commercial ‘harvest’, to ‘land’
- Page 12, 4th bullet “Comments”: Change sentence to “The Pesticide Use Reporting System needs to be funded to write information about water quality needs”.
- Page 14, 2nd 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, 1st bullet re: forest management: Delete “NOAA’s assessment was adopted by the state”—that is not an action the state can make.
- Page 16, 1st 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.

**OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT
Stakeholder Team--Ninth Meeting
The Adobe Resort, Yachats
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 (Alsea 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?

OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT
Stakeholder Team--Ninth Meeting
Port of Umpqua Building, Reedsport
Facilitator's Meeting Summary
June 17, 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 Council), Les Helgeson (alternate for Bill Bakke; Native Fish Society), Cindy Heller (STEP), Wayne Hoffman (Mid-coast Watershed Council.), Bob Jacobson (Oregon Salmon Commission), Tom Kartrude (Port of Siuslaw), Richard Oba (Oregon Coast Sport Fishing), Dennis Richey (Oregon Anglers-NW Steelheaders), Blake Rowe (Longview Fibre Company), Johnny Sundstrom (Oregon Soil and Water Conservation Districts), Terry Thompson (Assoc. of Oregon Counties)

Resource Advisors:

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

Alternates and Technical Resources: Todd Buchholz (USFS), Bob Buckman (ODFW), Jeff Dose (USFS), Harold Ettelt (STEP), Brandon Ford (ODFW), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Mike Gray (ODFW), Dave Harris (STEP), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Dave Loomis (ODFW), Jo Morgan (ODF), George Westfall (ODFW)

Other Interested Parties: Walt Morgan (public)

Facilitation Team: Donna Silverberg and Robin Harkless

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Work to get city official added to team	Louise Solliday	July coho meeting
Change guidance document to ‘Stakeholder Principles for Coastal Coho Conservation’	Facilitation Team	ASAP
Send Federal Registered Notice of listing decisions to stakeholder team	Rosemary Furfey	June 30
Email power point Conservation Tasks to stakeholder team	Kevin Goodson	DONE: June 22
Develop bibliography of science on limiting factors and threats	State and NOAA	July coho meeting
Send questions to Kevin Goodson re: high quality habitat, etc to be answered at the July coho meeting	Englemeyer, other stakeholder team members	July 22

Introductions/Housekeeping/Comments on 5/9 Meeting Summary

Membership – Louise Solliday, Oregon Governor’s Office, is working to add a city official to the Coastal Coho Stakeholder Team membership. There will likely be someone in place for the July meeting.

Guidance Document – A revised DRAFT stakeholder team guidance handout was provided to the team after a member of the public noted that the document did not include specific guidance language from the Native Fish Conservation Policy (NFCP), which is ODFW’s guidance document for conservation planning. The revision included a new title to better reflect the intent of the document: *Stakeholder Guiding Principles for Coastal Coho Conservation*. Stakeholder team members commented on the draft handout:

- We do not need guidance to help plan, but rather need guidance to set priorities for making decisions and allocating resources, etc. Let’s move on to the conservation plan, which will be just as meaningful as addressing principles.
- The document is an overview of the value of fish, not to help define how we are going to get there, how we are going to fund this effort, etc.
- Suggestion: take out the word ‘guiding’. They are principles. We could add ‘operating’ principles, taking into account experience thus far and other models, etc.
- A suggestion was made for how to proceed with the process: Develop a list of actions we can manage, cannot manage, and those we can respond to. Work from that to choose what actions are appropriate to do, appropriate to respond to, and then determine how to do that. (It was noted that this will be part of the process at some point.)
- We have protocols, these are our principles.
- **ACTION**: The document will be changed to “*Stakeholder Principles for Coastal Coho Conservation*”. The rest of the document will remain as is.

Contact List – A member/technical advisor/resource advisor contact list was distributed to the team prior to the meeting. The team agreed that the list could be made available to the public as a way for them to access the work of this group. However, team member information will only include mailing addresses, while phone numbers and email addresses for state and federal advisors will be provided.

Updates – Rosemary Furfey

Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, reported that there has been a federal status review for the listing decision for proposed threatened or endangered species, which was announced on 6/16 in the news. Listing decisions for ten steelhead ESU’s and coastal coho were extended six months and two separate Federal Register notices were published regarding these ESUs. NOAA took a 6-month extension for coho which will include a 30 day public comment period on the state’s final coast coho assessment, which was not available in time for the listing determination. (Rosemary noted that Bob Lohn, Regional Administrator, has an interest in making the determination in less than 6 months, maybe in July or August.) The extension resulted from substantial disagreement in scientific findings and the analysis used to make the decision. The state’s final assessment is on the web, with comments on how the draft was changed per stakeholder team and other public input.

ACTION: Rosemary will forward the federal register to the stakeholder team when it is published next week.

Stakeholder Team member question: How does the addition of hatchery coho into the listing affect the determination? The final hatchery listing policy will be out this week. A decision will be based on that policy. Hatchery coho are not considered a large part of the coastal coho ESU.

Rosemary also reported that the TRT are fine tuning their draft viability criteria and assessing viability of the ESU. A draft will be available in early August for an internal review, then co-manager review in mid-September. At the TRT meeting on 6/16, Rosemary urged the TRT to complete the criteria as soon as possible. Pete Lawson will provide an update on the status of the TRT product at the July Stakeholder Team meeting. Rosemary will continue to press the TRT on this, and will provide the co-manager draft product to the stakeholder team when it is available (not likely before the July meeting).

Stakeholder Team questions/comments:

- Could NOAA recommend changes in the hatchery program within the parameters of the lawsuit? If a species is listed, hatchery programs are reviewed by NOAA, public comment is requested, and the program undergoes a NEPA analysis. Yes, in a recovery plan, NOAA could recommend changes.
- Note the TRT draft product, which was scheduled to be shared in mid-July, has changed to mid-September.

Federal/state caucus meeting update – A joint state/federal caucus meeting was held on June 2. Paul Englemeyer and Wayne Hoffman attended the meeting along with Rosemary Furfey, Jeff Lockwood, Louise Solliday, and Kevin Goodson. Rosemary reported that the goal of the meeting was to brief federal land managers and state agencies on the recovery process, and to engage them. The technical team will be asked to be on a technical team to help craft and review recovery scenarios. Attendees included BLM, Forest Service, EPA and others. Rosemary will work with Kevin to keep the agencies involved; at this point, they are on track for getting dedicated staff to the process. It was noted that work is needed to get USFWS, FEMA and the COE involved on the federal end.

What is the TRT's role in this process? The TRT will be developing recommended viability criteria in coordination with state, federal and tribal co-managers, with public and stakeholder team input. ODFW scientists are members of the TRT. (NOAA staff clarified after the stakeholder meeting that the final decision on viability criteria resides with the Regional Administrator of NOAA Fisheries). When Rosemary shared with the TRT (at their 6/16 meeting) the intended involvement and connectedness of the TRT with this process, they were initially supportive, and will check with their Seattle supervisors to make sure this meshes with their plans. A TRT member will attend future stakeholder team meetings.

Stakeholder Team member comments/questions:

- Related to USFWS involvement in recovery planning, there are interests in using New Carissa law suit settlement funding for purchasing/selling land in river areas, with easements for the USFWS who manage refuges in the ESU.

Desired Status/Condition of the Coastal Coho

Kevin Goodson, ODFW, presented a power point on conservation planning tasks to get to a final plan. He asked that the stakeholder team keep in mind, as they begin to develop strategies, the decisions will only be tentative until the conservation package is complete. The process will be iterative throughout, with feedback amongst federal and state scientists and the stakeholder team.

ACTION: Kevin will email the powerpoint to the stakeholder team. (NOTE: The slides were emailed to the group on June 22.)

Stakeholder Team member comments:

- Will the conservation plan spell out what ODFW has authority over or what the Oregon Plan controls? The state ESA limits actions to hatchery, harvest and habitat on state lands. The NFCP embraces all factors with the intent to guide the Oregon Plan. The conservation plan will be broader than ODFW authorities, addressing all limiting factors that effect desired status of the fish. So, the plan will address both. It will be a ‘legal’ document for the Fish and Wildlife Commission, and serve as recommendations for inclusion in Oregon Plan actions.
- What do state documents say about forestry? Hatchery management? Etc? The stakeholder team will need to understand this scientific information, which can be found in the assessment report. Input from the TRT on limiting factors is needed to move forward. One suggestion was to structure a half-day meeting on limiting factors and threats that are important from Oregon and NOAA’s perspective. A concern was raised that the data may not be reliable, and/or could be one-sided. Finally, a comment was made that the Oregon Plan assessment has already completed this type of review, and there will never be consensus on the science.
 - **ACTION:** The State and NOAA will develop a bibliography of information on limiting factors and threats that is available, with links to the information. There may also be a workshop scheduled for those interested.

Kevin walked the group through steps/tasks he laid out for getting to a final conservation plan. Highlights from the presentation are bulleted below:

- Defining desired status and developing management scenarios were included as one task (#1), as they will overlap.
- Conservation level (task #3) was described as a trigger that strategies may not be working and that the management scenario needs to be re-examined. This step comes before adaptive management, as an extra safeguard.
- RM&E needs – to help with the adaptive management plan, and to get at what would be the best management strategy in areas where information is needed. Some of these needs will filter out of other tasks, e.g. management strategies.

- Cost and time estimate – required in recovery planning process and NFCP. How the stakeholder team will be involved with this step is to be determined. NOAA is working on methodology which they will share with the team when available.
- The facilitator report will identify areas of agreement and disagreement, and alternative ideas that came out of the stakeholder team process.
- *Question from stakeholder team member* – If coho are de-listed, will NOAA stay involved? Yes, NOAA will continue to support the state in developing a conservation plan.
- Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission adoption of conservation plan – this step will come after NOAA review to avoid having two plans.
- *Comment* – add a final step for other agencies taking formal action with the plan.
- *Public comment on RM&E*: Make sure what you are doing really works, and that the public is truly informed. Without public support, this will not work.
- It was noted that NOAA will stay engaged along the way to ensure that NOAA's needs are being met as the conservation plan is developed, reiterating that this will be a joint state/federal plan.

Additional stakeholder team member comments:

- As the effort moves us forward, less weight will be put on recovery (urgency, funding, and staff resources will go down). Is it possible to codify this concept or put it into rule/law? This will likely happen anyway – as coho start to return, funding will go to more critical areas. Also, multiple ESU's can benefit from shared action and the plan should leave room for this. Also, a sunset could be put into administrative rule.
- Add another step between 1 and 2: identify/agree on limiting factors and threats. Or, put this step between desired status and management strategies.
- There are RM&E needs regardless of the recovery level. We need to have a baseline of research in place to assure maintenance of the species. This could be addressed in the adaptive management plan.

Kevin then presented a review of the assessment numbers for abundance, productivity, persistence, distribution and diversity. How each population passes or fails each criterion will be a part of the desired status developed. Two possible scenarios were shown: all populations passing all criteria, and all but two populations passing all of the criteria. Graphs were also shown that displayed the results of the recruitment model used in the assessment for three scenarios: similar ocean survival conditions as was seen from 1961 to 2003; a similar ocean pattern, but coho survival being 25% better than the first scenario; and the same ocean pattern with a 50% increase in coho survival from the first scenario. These examples were intended to show the variability of adult abundances due to ocean and other environmental factors, and the potential numbers of adults that could be allocated to harvest or spawners. Mark Chilcote, ODFW, will explain in more detail how the graphs could change, and what would be needed to make changes, at the July coho meeting.

Stakeholder team member questions/comments:

- Where does the notion of potential come in? There could be a discrepancy between this and other areas. (There is another tool that can help address overall desired

condition of the ESU.)

- How does this tie into the ‘button’ maps presented by Jay Nicholas earlier in the process? The ‘button maps’ were built from the table presented today. They will re-emerge when looking at limiting factors.
- RE: harvest estimates: ODFW does not require harvest cards to be turned in, as other states do, which would correct errors in harvest counts, particularly steelhead and in rivers with no docks. ODFW does not use the tag to do counts, but does use them as a check on estimated counts. This creates management pros and cons.

Kevin provided a handout on Amendment 13, to serve as a reality check for fishery management, asking the group to keep this federal process in mind when developing scenarios. The amendment includes language that an allocation for a commercial fishery will open when abundance reaches a certain level. A clarification on the impact rate numbers on page 1 was made, for the Marine survival index: low = 15%, high = 35%. (Note: Kevin was informed after the meeting that the version of the Amendment 13 table he copied from the PFMC website and shared was not the current table being used by the PFMC. The current impact rate table is provided in the ODFW agency report on harvest that was included in the Coho Assessment Report and can be found on the Coastal Coho Project website. The current table has impact rates from 0 to 45 % in a matrix that includes four coho abundance levels and four smolt survival levels.)

Stakeholder Team member comments/questions:

- What is full seeding of high quality habitat? This relates to abundance estimates. ODFW will bring Lawson and Nicholson, who are working closely on the habitat model, to describe/explain what it means.
 - **ACTION:** Paul Englemeyer and others will develop and send a list of questions to Kevin before presentations, so they can be addressed at the upcoming meeting. (Ed Bowles gave an explanation for part of the above question about changes in the amount of high quality habitat. He acknowledged that this is confusing to the public and said that ODFW will work to correct the language to clarify that it refers to the ‘amount under poor ocean conditions’.)
- Re: Amendment 13, on the last page. The Southern Oregon Northern California Coast Coho (SONCC) ESU might raise issues for this ESU eventually, if coho in the SONCC ESU remain listed.

A persistence graph of life cycle potential was presented. ODFW developed three scenarios based on information from this graph (current potential) and then looked at different levels of increasing potential (25% higher life cycle survival, 50%, and 75%). They overlaid a threshold level for harvest, as an example to show what it would take to stay above that level given the different potentials.

Stakeholder team questions/comments:

- Coho production drops during times of El Nino, so potential drops are followed by a period of increased potential; the graph does not appear to show this. More details/information will be provided by Mark Chilcote at the July meeting.

- Clarification: the purpose of the model is to take historical information and show whether we can use that information to closely and accurately project the future.
- Caution that this is only a model and need to consider this as we continue developing scenarios. Build in a margin of error.
- Cannot support ideas based on a model; models are tragically flawed. (Agreed, and we need to model to provide a tool for what might happen. Models are a simplification of the actual system, and this keeps us aware of our assumptions, bias, etc.).
- Global warming could/should be part of this discussion and included in the model.

Kevin then showed how the Nickelson/Lawson model is used to estimate total smolts for high quality habitat and total smolts for all habitat. The purpose of this exercise was to show the effects of good and poor ocean conditions – that there is a need for high quality habitat during poor ocean conditions and a good response in all habitat during good conditions. A map of the coho ESU was displayed that showed where current high quality habitat and high intrinsic potential habitat are thought to occur.

Stakeholder Team member comments/questions

- Look at the ratio of high intrinsic potential miles and current high quality miles to work. (In other words, find opportunities to turn potential high quality miles into actual high quality miles).
- What is the definition of high quality? That habitat during 3% (poor, but not worst) ocean conditions which is fully seeded at 3 fish per meter during the winter.
- Suggestion to ground truth the models through on the ground observations via a project/field trips. It was noted that it will take multiple years to determine whether the model is accurate.
- Are there enough spawning grounds available? In most cases, this does not appear to be a problem. Fine sediment was listed as a potential, but not major, factor. One area was noted that does have a problem with sediment but not with over-wintering.

Ed Bowles, ODFW Fish Chief, reiterated to the group that, at the next meeting, ODFW will bring additional fleshed out tools for each of the populations and will have several scenarios. For example, they will use the existing assessment's built-in cushion so there will be a "pass plus" across the ESU. Rather than just tweaking 25% up, they will look at specific population changes to help be more specific and take risk off some of the smaller, wild populations. Questions: What is the current gap between here and where we want to be? What could be done to improve the gap? ODFW will not be able to say that if you do this action, it will result in this improvement. This is only true for harvest rates and there is not much room for more improvement in that area at this point.

Stakeholder Team member questions/comments

- Can you model hatchery increases? ODFW had not planned to because of noted impacts on the failing populations from hatchery causes. Some changes have been made to make improvements and they need to be better tracked. But risk factors included competition predation and other aspects that we cannot control. ODFW will emphasize getting hatcheries up to current best practices and then will use the

Hatchery Research Center to make improvements through research and study.

- Since there are 5 hatchery populations included in NOAA’s considerations, how will ODFW treat this? There is a need to figure out how to embrace this in the analysis.
- Will ODFW take recommendations for how to deal with pinnipeds and other predators? Yes, ODFW might not be able to deal with them, but will take recommendations. ODFW hopes that part of the conservation plan will include more information gathering on this issue.
 - Is there any information on predator control based on reduced hatchery releases? Yes, but the real differences are noted in El Nino and non-El Nino years.
- Re: Map of high quality and high intrinsic potential habitat —many looked at it at the break and believe it is fiction. (Yes, science fiction!) Many can not relate it to anything on the ground that makes sense to those actually working in the landscape. The scale may be too crude to get the pockets of both good and bad habitat. Ed acknowledged that the map needs to be refined between now and the next meeting.
- What can local partnerships do to improve the data in terms of monitoring ground truthing, etc? Will need a calculated coordinated effort in the near future based on defined habitat characteristics.
- Fish may create their own spawning grounds, if there are enough fish in an area. ODFW responded that yes, rearing, especially overwintering where fish are vulnerable and need protection, is a problem. Actual spawning bottleneck areas are only in lake system areas.
- How does this relate to critical habitat designations? Critical habitat designations do not necessarily have any impact on development of the plan. Critical habitat is more of a regulatory issue and is based on fish needs, specifically the conservation value of watersheds based on an interagency expert panel.
- Conservation Security Act – could work well for farmer and fish. Look into this further.

What Effect Will NOAA’s Decision Have on Work of Stakeholder Team?

Louise Solliday, Oregon Governor’s Office, suggested that listing or not, there is a high likelihood the decision will be litigated, and that some stakeholder team members may be litigating. Louise requested that members commit to continue with this process regardless of the decision and what happens outside of this process. Team members were asked to consider this request in the next few months.

Responses

- There would need to be assurance that we are working on the state’s conservation plan, with different goals and bars than the federal process.
- This is the basis for our work regardless of ESA.
- We need to reaffirm our commitment to this process through our principles document.
- Some said they are committed to the process. Others cannot give commitment that they will continue regardless of litigation (based on previous experiences).
- Consensus is an interest from the anglers/sport fishers’ perspective, and they plan to continue for the long term.

What Have We Learned from and about the Oregon Plan?

Jay Nicholas, OWEB, and Louise Solliday discussed and came up with a list of lessons learned from the beginning of the Oregon Plan through today. Louise noted that up to this point, many resources and time have been spent “doing”, not “analyzing”. The assessment was the first time to analyze data from 1997 and before. The revised assessment includes, as part of the adaptive management piece, revisiting every 5 years to do an analysis of the Oregon Plan. Shifts will be made relative to staff time and other resources. Lessons learned from the assessment included:

- More monitoring is needed at the population scale.
- We are honing in on specifics so we can be more strategic.
- How data is collected, analyzed and used needs to be more accessible to agencies and the public.
 - A data warehouse has been built – it needs to be improved and made useful to the public and decision-makers.
- Inter-agency coordination at first was very structured and there was a high level of energy and activity. When the Oregon Plan was completed, not as much inter-agency interaction occurred while implementing the plan. The coho assessment has raised that level of energy and participation, and we need to keep it up as we continue with recovery planning over the next two years.
- Limiting factors were dealt with in isolation from other agencies. The plan showed that we need to look at limiting factors as a collection and manage them as a system.
- Investments made in the Oregon Plan are significant since 1997. Restoration funding was directed at substantial watershed function issues in all areas; now we are more strategic in prioritizing what is most beneficial and useful. Need to continue to improve this strategic planning.
- Monitoring: as data rich as this area is compared to others, it is still limited. Need to improve monitoring effectiveness through a statewide strategy. Develop a monitoring plan that includes how to invest monitoring funds.
- All quality habitat during low ocean conditions is very important and now much better understood, not just ‘high’ intrinsic potential habitat. We need a strategy for keeping high quality habitat in place to support the fish during poor ocean conditions so they can survive and persist. This is likely to be important for other species as yet unknown.

Stakeholder Team member questions/comments

- The Oregon Plan has not been good at putting recommendations of IMST on the ground. There is very little reference to IMST in the report. A presentation from the IMST on their recommendations on the agency reports (e.g., highlands, uplands, and habitat) would be helpful.
- Priorities will be different for viability vs. broad sense recovery goals. Caution against tying too close to the viability analysis when doing broad sense recovery.
- Basin plans have built in a basis for strategic work/prioritizations. Do not minimize this fact.
- What have you heard from other agency directors in terms of revitalizing interagency interaction? The Governor’s office and ODFW are working to get engagement on

various inter-agency technical teams; state resources are available to help with this. The agencies understand recovery is important and needs to be done. The state should be the lead in the process, and the commitment is there.

- Oregon Soil and Water Conservation Districts: Assessment, evaluation and effectiveness monitoring of the Oregon Plan is important. There has been much contribution from different agencies over the years. The delivery system and cost may create a problem for effectiveness, based on competition for funding for ‘cooperative’ efforts. The delivery system needs to be further refined. We need to evaluate the Oregon Plan in terms of leveraging funds from other sources and continuity of staff so the learning curve can continue. How do you measure partnership? Without it the watershed suffers, but it is difficult to show concrete benefits to partnering.
- Competition is a problem in some areas, and not in others. Look at partnership and volunteer projects/programs that are working well, e.g. Lewis River.
- Appreciation was expressed for having Louise back on board to help continue this process.
- Need to think about watershed councils when no more funding exists and they are forced to support themselves.
- OWEB and OACD have pledged commitment to come up with an analysis that shows partnership between soil and water conservation districts and watershed councils, in hopes of minimizing the perception that the two cannot work well together.
- The link between the IMST and OWEB and the problems with OWEB/GWEB need to be resolved so we can move on.
- 80 councils are receiving some funding, many areas of the state do not have OWEB-funded councils. Watershed councils and districts have in the past been the most cost-effective mechanism for getting projects going on the ground. Overhead costs are low (15-18%) compared to what goes to the actual project. The commitment to cost-effectiveness made it a worthwhile investment in the context of Measure 66.
- At OWEB budget hearings, there was a good show of successful watershed council work. Accountability is being taken seriously by OWEB. Last month OWEB voted to fund 57 coordinators.

Review of Oregon’s Final Assessment sent to NOAA

Ed Bowles highlighted changes made from the draft to final coho assessment, summarized in bullets below:

- Viability analysis – May final report:
 - Population structure shifted based on further TRT analysis; Umpqua strata went from 2 to 4 populations.
- 2 populations in southern strata did not have sophisticated data, re-analyzed in Floras and Sixes watersheds.
- To address minimum criteria vs. broad sense recovery viability confusion, a continuum was added in the final assessment to better explain this.
- Density dependent approach; did not change but embraced a different density independent model to address sensitivity around this – the results were basically the same. Staying with original model.
- Other models looked at persistence, from multiple perspectives. TRT is looking at 5 different models, ODFW still awaiting co-manager draft to share with stakeholder

team. Re: Nicholson/Lawson model found glitch between predictive and actual; recalibrated and now useful again.

- Corrections to fundamental data were made, e.g. numbers of hatchery fish.
- Criteria did not previously include abundance. Developed simplistic abundance criteria for final assessment. Noted that TRT still has concerns.
- Shifted productivity criteria to be more consistent with TRT.
- End result had 7, not 5, failed populations.
- Moved away from yellow ‘near misses’ to avoid confusion. Showed instead through metrics those that were on the verge of failing.
- Looked more carefully at future changes; more rigorous sensitivity analysis of future risks.
- Stronger section on risk of catastrophic events.
- A few members felt the tone was too optimistic. ODFW understands there is a lot of uncertainty and sensitivity was built in to deal with this.

The final assessment is available on the Oregon Plan website and includes changes to this section, and PECE A and B. <http://www.oregon-plan.org/>

Next Meeting, July 29: Location TBD

The Alsea Hatchery Research Center will not be open or available for the stakeholder team to meet on July 29. We are working to find a location and will share when we have it. An agenda will be developed for the July 29 meeting. Stay tuned!

**OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT
Stakeholder Team--Eleventh Meeting
Forest Sciences Lab, Corvallis
Facilitator’s Meeting Summary
July 29, 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), Cindy Heller (STEP), Wayne Hoffman (Mid-coast Watershed Council.), Tom Kartrude (Port of Siuslaw), Kaitlin Lovell (Trout Unlimited), Jason Miner (Oregon Trout), Bill Moshofsky (Save the Salmon Coalition), Lisa Phipps (Mayor Rockaway Beach) Shawn Reiersgaard (Tillamook Creamery), Dennis Richey (Oregon Anglers-NW Steelheaders), Blake Rowe (Longview Fibre Company), Terry Thompson (Assoc. of Oregon Counties), Bill Yocum (Freeman Rock, Inc.)

Resource Advisors:

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

Alternates and Technical Resources: Kara Anlauf (ODFW), Bob Buckman (ODFW), Brandon Ford (ODFW), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Mike Gray (ODFW), Les Helgeson

(Native Fish Society, alt. for Bill Bakke), Kim Jones (ODFW), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Bridgette Lohrman (NOAA), Dave Loomis (ODFW), Heather Ludeman (NOAA), Tom Nicholson (ODFW), Jay Nicholas (ODFW), Jeff Rodgers (ODFW)

Other Interested Parties: Walt Morgan (public), Thomas Way (public)

Facilitation Team: Donna Silverberg and Robin Harkless

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Technical science meeting to present further information on desired status scenarios	Bakke, Englemeyer, Forgatsch, Giesy, Helgeson, Heller, Hoffman, Lovell, Richey, ODFW staff, others	August 8, 1-5:00 pm at ODFW, Salem
Revise/clarify definitions of threats and limiting factors	NOAA, Oregon	September coho meeting
Offline discussion about actual vs. reported water use	Forgatsch, Solliday	September coho meeting
Check on constraints from DEQ re: fish carcasses	ODFW	September coho meeting
Send CD of presentation, maps to interested stakeholder team members	Jeff Rodgers	September coho meeting

Introductions/Housekeeping

Welcome New Stakeholder Team Members

The stakeholder team welcomed Lisa Phipps, Mayor of Rockaway Beach (representing coastal city governments), and Bill Yocum, Freeman Rock, Inc. (representing aggregate interests) to the team. The two said they were pleased to be part of this effort and offered thoughts on their interests relative to coho salmon — good healthy native fish populations; balanced recovery of wild runs; offering perspectives on landowner interests; balancing ecology with economy; and minimizing impacts to Oregon’s economy and social structure. Their presence on the team will help the group in balancing these important points.

Comments to June 17, 2005 Summary Notes

- Page 3: Clarify the comment about the TRT product schedule change.
- Page 3: Next comment: ‘They will be asked to help craft...’ is ‘Federal land managers and state agencies’.
- Page 6: Note that Paul Englemeyer did send a set of questions to ODFW related to models used in developing a desired status, which had not yet been received at the time of today’s meeting.
- Page 9: Middle bullet “high quality habitat during low-ocean conditions...”. Clarify

that this refers to all high quality habitat, not just high intrinsic potential habitat.

- Page 9: Stakeholder comments: ‘Not good at putting IMST recommendations on the ground’ ... add that it was also recommended that a presentation from IMST on uplands, lowlands and habitat reports is needed.
- Page 10: Clarify comment that the final assessment includes a continuum to address minimum criteria vs. broad sense recovery viability.
- Page 10: Correction: Ed Bowles highlighted changes to the assessment, not Louise Solliday.
- Last page, last bullet: Not all the stakeholders felt the tone of the assessment was too optimistic. Clarify this.

Announcements

Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, provided handouts of a request for proposals (RFP) for a community-based restoration program and marine debris removal program that stakeholder team members might be interested in. She also mentioned that the facilitation team forwarded via email the Federal Register notice on NOAA’s extension on a listing decision for coho, NOAA’s intent to produce draft recovery plans by Dec. ’05 and final plans in ’06, and the hatchery listing policy to Stakeholder Team members. All of these were emailed before today’s meeting. Rosemary offered to send a PDF file of the full hatchery listing policy to interested stakeholders.

Desired Status Scenario

Ed Bowles and Kevin Goodson, ODFW, provided a first draft of a ‘desired status scenario’ for coastal coho. Ed offered that the intent with the scenario is to 1) provide a greater conservation ‘cushion’ for populations and the ESU, and 2) provide adequate societal benefits as articulated by the stakeholder team.

Ed described the greater conservation “cushion” relative to desired status:

- All populations except the Salmon and Sixes will be at ‘Pass+’ viability levels.
- Pass+’ is defined as double the viability criteria (for 3 of 5 of the populations).
- Abundance = 7 year average of 10 spawners per mile during a ‘90’s type’/poor ocean condition;
- Productivity = 2.1 r/s when density is less than 10 fish per mile;
- Viability = less than 1% chance of extinction in 100 years; and
- Diversity = the 100-year harmonic mean of spawner abundance greater than 1,200.
- ODFW is uncertain how to forecast distribution and is still giving thought to how to approach the issue.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions and Comments:

- Why use 5th field HUC instead of 4th field, as done with Water Management Plans and Watershed Plans? The 5th field was the smallest unit that could be used that had adequate numbers from the samples. The 4th field had too much over-lap with other populations and therefore would give unreliable guidance.
- RE: diversity – what is the interim standard? ODFW is working to develop a real-time status based on the other criteria. They are currently gathering information

through a retrospective look at diversity. (This raised concerns that an outcome will be dominated by historical or projected information and insensitive to nearer-term, real-time management.)

- Concern was raised about the low abundance status of 10 fish per mile. ODFW responded that they are looking at the gap between where we are now and where we need to go. Abundance can help us do this.
- Is ODFW suggesting that we look at the full stream mileage or just high intrinsic potential (HIP) habitat? ODFW suggests looking specifically at coho spawning habitat (not HIP vs. all habitat).
- Does ODFW define spawning habitat for coho only where redds have been seen? No, they look at where there is enough gravel to allow for spawning – this is continually surveyed. How do you factor in significant changes in water levels?
- RE: viability -- how is this considered a high bar when you are looking at conditions under which the fish were listed? It seems as though the bar has not been raised.

Explanation re: viability modeling results:

ODFW adjusted the relative survival rate for populations in the model based on the criteria to move from pass to pass+. Kevin provided a handout of the modeling results for each population, and noted that Mark Chilcote, ODFW, will be available to answer questions about the model during development of management scenarios. (Also see below re: technical science meeting on August 8.) Ed reminded the Stakeholder Team that the details of the scientific results of the model do not necessarily need to be fully understood by this group. The Stakeholder Team is meant to help the agencies sort through the policy and management issues, not the scientific issues.

- Question re: ocean conditions: Is there a way to quantify fish that get lost on their way to sea that have been affected by something other than ‘poor ocean conditions’? Is there a way to do site-specific management for these areas to improve survival before they get to the ocean? Yes, this will be included in the limiting factors analysis and management actions discussions. Available data for the estuary and seining surveys in the ocean within 25 miles of the coast can provide some insight on this.

Providing Societal Benefits

The “Societal benefits” to which ODFW is referring includes those described by the stakeholder team in May:

- Fish for fisheries (ocean/inland, recreation/commercial)
- Carcasses for nutrient enhancement
- Abundant coho for cultural needs
- Hatchery brood stock as a genetic pool for mitigation

From ODFW’s perspective, in order to provide these societal benefits, we will need to keep abundance at a ‘high’ spawner status level (from the Amendment 13 matrix) regardless of ocean survival conditions. Kevin Goodson provided a handout of the harvest management matrix in the Amendment 13 Marine Survival Index to show current

allowable fishery impacts; he noted that this was different from the document he distributed at the 6/17 meeting.

The overall message, Ed offered, is that even if Oregon is able to reach the desired status goals as suggested by the draft scenario, the opportunity for added fisheries will be only during good ocean conditions and ‘fleeting’ (if any) during poor ocean conditions.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions and Comments

- Has Amendment 13 been adopted by the Fish and Wildlife Commission? Though not a requirement, ODFW is working toward getting it adopted.
- Why do the numbers not match up in the viability modeling results vs. Amendment 13 results? It was clarified that the two concepts are not the same; the viability numbers are the initial biological ‘cushion’ while Amendment 13 looks to give direction to when fishing can occur. ODFW hopes to have a clearer answer to ‘what will it take?’ by the next meeting.
- Aren’t we discussing recovery--which means expanding the range? As such, shouldn’t we be looking at recovery instead of focusing on sub-sets in the marine survival index? Each index group incorporates a ‘buffer’ or sliding scale. A comment was made that this may not provide enough of a real-time check-in on whether we are seeing the numbers expected with varying ocean conditions. More discussion is needed.
- If you create additional habitat, the 75% abundance variable becomes a moving target. (It was noted that the Pacific Salmon Commission does not share this view). ODFW will focus on quality of habitat first, then quantity, and says that both are related. This analysis is not a fine-tuned scale, but rather a broad vision of where we want to be.

After the break, Ed provided clarification on what the desired status scenario means to ODFW. It means reaching an equilibrium point for survival which is 75% or better so that, even under poor ocean conditions, the fish will reach stability. He reminded the group that ODFW developed the quantitative desired status based on qualitative discussions with the Stakeholder Team at previous meetings (see June 17, 2005 ‘Stakeholder Principles for Coastal Coho Conservation’ document). To meet those principles, most populations will need to at least double their survival by this model’s standards. Some will need more, others will need less. Ed informed the group that ODFW does not intend to impose conservation plans via regulatory means, so it is not necessary to fine-tune the model; rather the plan will be the result of a group effort to decide where we collectively want to be—and will serve as the guide to get there.

ACTION: For those that want to discuss the technical aspects of the model, there will be a separate meeting at **ODFW in Salem on Monday, August 8, from 1-5:00pm.**

Stakeholder Team Member Comments and Questions:

- What happens to all of this if NOAA lists the coho? This would require the state to meet regulatory obligations under federal law to get to a de-listing. However, ODFW believes the bar will be much higher with the conservation plan than any federal

regulatory requirement because society is asking for more than just recovery.

- What is meant by ‘double’ in terms of improvements? How is what we have done and invested in since the 90’s accounted for in the desired status? Improvements to all limiting factors will need to be made to get there: not just harvest or predators, but a combination of changes to hatchery management, habitat improvement over time, etc. Some results will take a lot of time, others will not.
 - Concern was raised that the requirements to get us there (e.g. fisheries) will be too difficult to achieve, and could potentially end fisheries. Ed responded that the group will look at specific areas and collectively decide whether the management scenarios to get us there are feasible and acceptable.
- There needs to be basin-specific triggers and criteria for river fisheries. ODFW agrees. The stakeholder team should discuss what the criteria should be when we discuss management actions.
- There have been big changes in returning numbers since we began our efforts. What is the value we have received for the funds already spent? ODFW believes this information is captured in the assessment.
- Are there any identified problems with the Clean Water Act (CWA) and/or any guidance from EPA? Water temperature standards will need to be considered, but the assessment found that water quality is not a primary limiting factor. There is an underlying concern that if we put too many carcasses in the river, it may become a CWA issue. **ACTION:** An EPA/DEQ representative will be involved in management strategy discussions.
- With the models, can ODFW come up with management actions that individually affect just one of the criteria? All the criteria are connected, but some will experience a change more quickly than others. Productivity will be the driver. There may be a way to target productivity specifically, but there is more work to be done on this.
- We need to begin exploring the economic consequences of this effort. Agreed—and this will happen when we get to the management strategies and actions discussion.
- Public comment: The group is urged to consider the return on investment -- even though it is difficult to evaluate, it is important to be able to answer questions from the outside.

Review Limiting Factors and Threats: Application to Planning

Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, provided a handout of definitions and a bibliography of limiting factors and threats. She noted that a chapter on this is required in both the state conservation and federal recovery plans. She noted that NOAA has been sued for lack of a thorough discussion on this in prior plans and would like to see this group avoid that.

Definitions (see handout):

Comment: Limiting factors could be linked to the ability to achieve broader sense recovery goals, not just viability.

Question: How do you make a comparison of ‘conditions under which the population evolved’ with such a wide range of factors to consider? The definition refers to pre-settlement conditions based on the best available information. Are we going to get a

clearer definition of those conditions? During discussions about limiting factors relative to timber/forest areas, it will be important to involve experts (e.g. Tom Spees) who have studied historic conditions.

Comment: A more general definition of limiting factors could be used: ‘That which is most important in impeding population growth’.

Rosemary also included a bibliography of limiting factors and threats analyses examples, and provided a handout of the habitat chapter from the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board’s plan. NOAA hopes to bring a draft chapter of ‘limiting factors and threats’ for coastal coho to the stakeholder team later in the fall.

NOAA also offered that while a good deal is known about mortality causes at different life stages on Columbia stocks, this information is virtually unknown for coho. As a result, best professional judgment will be relied upon for the coastal coho plan. The 2006 TRT product on limiting factors will influence the final NOAA chapter on this issue.

Public comment: ODFW already identified that the key limiting factor is stream complexity. The production bottleneck, generally, is over-wintering habitat. Why are we going over all the others again? For the state plan this is true, but not for a recovery plan. NOAA is building on the state’s effort to put together the limiting factors/threats chapter.

Question: Under the ‘threats’ definition, what are the ‘key’ limiting factors? There was no specific intent with the language except to keep the list narrow; it was suggested to strike ‘key’ from the definition as it is confusing (and provokes concern from stakeholders).

ACTION: The state and NOAA will revise and clarify the handouts relating to definitions of threats and limiting factors.

Review of Limiting Factors

Kevin Goodson presented a power point review of the limiting factors/factors for decline that the state identified through its assessment. He pulled slides from previous meetings, including:

- Harvest was found to no longer be a major factor for decline.
- Predation was found not to be a major factor for decline, but some potential individual problems were identified.
- Disease was found not to be a major factor.
- Introduced fishes was found not to be a major factor for decline.
- Instream habitat - higher channel entrenchment and less large wood than reference sites.
- Riparian conditions – fewer large conifers and lower shade levels than reference sites.
- Water quality – 58% of large river sites have fair to poor water quality, random sites have similar water quality to reference sites.

- Water quantity - consumptive use of water not a widespread issue. A number of comments were made about the discrepancy between actual water use vs. ‘water rights’ permits.
 - **ACTION**: Tom Forgatsch and Louise Solliday will have an offline discussion about which areas are using water beyond their rights and report back.
- Estuaries and wetlands – significant loss historically, but minimal loss recently.
- Fish passage: A small percentage of areas are inaccessible, but status of 1/3 of culverts unknown – the stakeholders can look at this on a finer scale.
- Hatcheries – no longer a major factor for decline. A few places where there may be impacts.

An expert panel was used to determine the key bottlenecks for each population. A clarification was made about ‘bottlenecks’ that were identified for most populations: the state used this language to distinguish from ESA limiting factors and threats language.

Overall, stream complexity was the primary limiting factor for most populations.

Management Strategies: Current and Potential Tools

Jeff Rodgers, ODFW, presented a power point with information including a definition of high quality winter habitat, a description of winter high intrinsic potential (WHIP) habitat, and a description of the maps that were up on the walls around the room.

Jeff described “habitat quality” as habitat with quality sufficient to support a winter rearing density of greater than .3 juveniles per square meter when marine survival is 3%. This was what was estimated for the population to replace itself. This was determined using the “Habitat Limiting Factors Model” (HLFM) and “Habrata” models.

“High intrinsic potential habitat” was described through a handout from the Pacific Northwest Research Station. Intrinsic potential describes the potential to provide high quality winter habitat (Jeff made the distinction that high intrinsic potential refers to winter habitat), with attributes that are static over long time frames. This is calculated as a geometric mean of attributes such as valley constraint, gradient, and flow. It can be used as a tool for developing restoration plans.

Jeff also provided a number of Frequently Asked Questions about high intrinsic potential (see the handout for more details).

Stakeholder Team member questions: Is determining where WHIP lies in terms of conifers vs. deciduous trees part of the analysis? Jeff responded that trees serve more as a cover, and that complexity is the main objective, not comparing one type over the other. It was noted that more alders fall in to rivers faster than conifers. This issue will be revisited during management strategy discussions.

Comment – The model needs to be fine-tuned to consider substrate to get a better picture of what is going on. ODFW agrees, and noted this is just one tool of many.

The purpose of the maps is to show where there is good information and where additional data is needed. A suggestion was made to add to the maps a measure of uncertainty and to incorporate watershed council data and other information into the GIS work.

Recommendation: Conduct winter habitat surveys to fill in the gaps, using the implementation plan as one tool for prioritizing restoration efforts.

Next steps: ODFW needs to determine who is the GIS resource for this group and what resources are available to move these tools forward.

Comment: Overall the most important factor is winter habitat – improvements there would give us the most return. Agree that for most of the sub-populations this is true, but for the other 25-40%, a different factor is more important. Look at the sub-population scale so we are only developing winter habitat where it is beneficial. Re-visit in 10 years to make sure we are on the right path. Do not stop doing other restoration activities where appropriate. Finally, look to locals for guidance on this.

Comment: This is good data collection. Where commitment is there, habitat improvements are achievable (and happening already in some areas).

ACTION: Jeff Rodger's maps and power point will be included on a CD; Jeff will forward them on to those interested. Let the facilitation team know if you would like this information forwarded to you.

TRT Status Review: Progress and Products

Pete Lawson reported that the ocean is experiencing El Niño-like conditions without being in an El Niño year. Researchers do not understand why it is so warm, why adults are returning in such low numbers, and why the normal upwelling of nutrients has yet to occur. Signs are not encouraging for this and next year, with water temperatures at or near record highs from south of San Francisco up to Alaska. While temperatures are starting to cool, there may be sterile ocean conditions for both juveniles and adults. Researchers are putting together a proposal to study this more closely and try to determine what is happening in the ocean.

TRT Coho Work Group Viability Presentation

Pete presented the work group's preliminary work on coho viability. As part of the viability analysis, the work group developed a decision support system model which expresses degrees of certainty, based on a 'truth value' with a degree of membership in a set, ranging from -1 to +1 (i.e., complete membership to complete exclusion). Pete described this as 'an extension of traditional logic' (hence, the name of the model, "Fuzzy Logic").

Issues – This model requires a different approach to designing criteria and is hard to quantify; results are sensitive to network structure; using an iterative development to

achieve ‘reasonable’ results; and weighted to low truth values, with an assumed conservation goal. (See handout for more detail.)

At this point, the model was presented with no results for the Stakeholder Team to review; this will come after the data undergoes review by the TRT. Pete expects that the results will be available for the Stakeholder Team to review in mid-November.

A recommendation was made for the TRT to go through this exercise in the Southern Oregon Northern California (SONC) coho process too. (The TRT plans to do this).

Public comment/request: Since there was not much time to comment on the assessment for viability, ODFW should give time to review the different reports (e.g. DEQ, hatcheries and habitat) based on this new criteria, and provide written comments. ODFW responded that yes, the reports should be revisited in the context of how management strategies could be utilized to improve populations.

Stakeholder Team member comment: Has there been discussion with DEQ on carcasses in the streams? Yes, and DEQ will participate during management scenario discussions.

ACTION: ODFW will check on whether there are any carcass constraints with DEQ and, if so, what would be needed to remove the constraint before the next meeting.

Stakeholder Team Meeting Schedule: The following dates and locations were set for upcoming meetings:

- September 23 --Newport;
- October 27 -- Bandon Dunes; and
- November 14 -- Tillamook or Rockaway Beach

Next Steps

The facilitation team will be making calls to team members prior to the upcoming meeting(s). These calls will be to check in on stakeholder team member’s priorities as we move forward and to allow the team to help shape future agendas. The group was asked to consider what information they still need to move forward with the development of the conservation plan.

OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT
Stakeholder Team Meeting
Shilo Inn, Newport
Facilitator’s Meeting Summary
September 23, 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), Cindy Heller (STEP),

Wayne Hoffman (Mid-coast Watershed Council.), Tom Kartrude (Port of Siuslaw), Kaitlin Lovell (Trout Unlimited), Bill Moshofsky (Save the Salmon Coalition), Lisa Phipps (Mayor Rockaway Beach) Shawn Reiersgaard (Tillamook Creamery), Dennis Richey (Oregon Anglers-NW Steelheaders), Blake Rowe (Longview Fibre Company), Johnny Sundstrom (Siuslaw Soil and Water Conservation Council), Terry Thompson (Assoc. of Oregon Counties), Stan Van de Wetering (Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians), Bill Yocum (Freeman Rock, Inc.)

Resource Advisors:

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

Alternates and Technical Resources: Jerome Arnold (EDWC/CSWCD), Greg Apke (ODOT), Carol Bickford (Nestucca/Neskowin WC) Brandon Ford (ODFW), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Mike Gray (ODFW), Dave Jarrett (WRD), Pete Lawson (NOAA-TRT), Jeff Light (Plum Creek Timber Co.), John Lilly (DSL), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Justin Mills (Contractor with Mid-Coast Watershed Council), Jo Morgan (ODF), Eric Nigg (ODEQ), Maggie Peyton (Nehalem WC), Jeff Rodgers (ODFW), John Spangler (ODFW), Tom Shafer (OWEB), Tim Stevenson (ODA), Heather Stout (NOAA-TRT), Karen Tarnow (ODEQ)

Other Interested Parties: Joel Gallob (Newport Times), Elaine Hallmark (Oregon Consensus Program)

Facilitation Team: Donna Silverberg, Robin Harkless, Erin Halton

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
“Parking lot issues” for further discussion	Stakeholder Team	October/Nov meetings
Track RM&E needs/issues from presentations	Heller, Lovell, Rodgers, Ritchey	Ongoing
First cut basin by basin apportions, per Hoffman proposal	ODFW	October 27

Housekeeping/Introductions

Meeting Goal: Based on feedback from stakeholder team members and ODFW staff, the facilitation team developed today’s agenda to invite direct local input on limiting factors and management actions. To assist with this, the Mid-Coast Watershed Council prepared a presentation, which was followed by small group discussion. Also, a resource user perspective, led by Blake Rowe for the forest industry, was shared. This presentation was also followed by small and large group discussion. Finally, the group was asked to

examine if and how the information might fit into the state's conservation plan. This meeting structure was proposed for the meetings in October, focusing on south coast populations, and November, focusing on north coast populations.

Ed Bowles, Fish Chief for ODFW, reported that stakeholder team member Richard Oba was involved in a boating accident. A card was sent around, to let him know that the group's thoughts and prayers are with him and the others involved in the accident.

Comments on July 29, 2005 Summary Notes

- Page 3: There needs to be clarification about why the Salmon and Sixes are not at pass+. The statement at the last meeting was in the context of desired status, not the current status. This will be clarified in the notes to reflect the time aspect.
- Page 3, Societal Benefits: The bullets, as written, could mislead those who have not followed the conversation. To clarify, add hatchery brood stock as a genetic pool for mitigation.
- Page 4, Stakeholder Team member comment on 'recovery = expanding the range'. Do we really mean this? This raises concerns, and should be discussed further.
 - **PARKING LOT ISSUE**: Does recovery really mean expanding the range?
- Page 4, Amendment 13: Note that questions remain and that the state, facilitation team, and Paul Englemeyer are coordinating to get a response.

Solicit volunteers for RM&E focus – A request was made for stakeholder team members to volunteer to track RM&E issues/needs as we move through the upcoming presentations so that later, in December or January, there can be discussions on what this smaller group has been hearing.

ACTION: Jeff Rodgers, Kaitlin Lovell, Dennis Richey, and Cindy Heller volunteered to track potential Research, Monitoring and Evaluation needs that should be included in the Plan.

Follow up: Fish carcass information: Karen Tarnow, ODEQ, and Eric Nigg, ODEQ's TMDL expert, responded to questions that came up at the last meeting about restrictions the agency might put on fish carcass placement in streams. ODEQ sees no problem with more fish coming into Oregon streams. While ODEQ does require ODFW to have a permit for human placement of carcasses in-stream (which is intended to provide guidelines that will help prevent problems such as depletion of oxygen), the agency does not enforce policy against natural influences in the environment. This includes fish returning to streams and bringing nutrients from offshore. In fact, the agency does not have nutrient standards and does not see that a problem would exist if large numbers of fish were to return. A potential management challenge might come from distinguishing between fish bringing the nutrients naturally vs. other occurrences, such as land use. For example, if large fish numbers were to begin returning, than human sources may need to be reduced at the point source level.

'Possible Action': Fish carcasses in streams: changes to ODFW manual? Possibilities might exist for local coordination of carcass placement in streams.

Follow-up: Water Rights/Use: Louise Solliday, Oregon Governor’s Office, reported that she followed up with the Water Resources Department (WRD) on water rights/use for Gold Beach, Bandon, and Portland. Gold Beach and Bandon each have 6 water rights in various streams; each uses less than 1/10 of its right. In Portland, there had been some violations of movement of water in the past, but those issues have since been resolved. Well #1 on the Columbia slough is one problem that is being corrected. Louise noted that water use and rights reporting is available on the WRD website. Water rights in Gold Beach and Bandon are voluntarily reported because they are “older” water rights. A suggestion was made that there should be required monitoring on older water rights, and also on bigger water users. Louise noted that Mitch Lewis, watermaster, is a good contact on water rights questions for Bandon and Gold Beach.

‘PARKING LOT ISSUE’: Water rights: Monitoring requirements for older rights?

Clarification of limiting factors and threats definitions: Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, and Kevin Goodson, ODFW, are working with other recovery teams for each domain in the region to develop draft guidance based on comments from the stakeholder team, and to be consistent throughout the region. The draft guidance should be available by the next meeting. ‘Conditions under which the species evolved’ will be addressed if this language is left in the definitions.

Local Perspectives on Management Actions to Address Limiting Factors and Current and Future Threats

Justin Mills, contractor with the Mid-Coast Watershed Council, presented on a GIS tool, the Basin Browser that has been used by the Mid-Coast in their limiting factors analysis. A handout was provided. Justin noted that this tool brings affordable resource assistance and expertise to rural environments. A simple program to use, it allows you to pull up reports on useful information, and compare it to other watersheds. He also noted that there needs to be more focus on analyzing the data that has been gathered—monitoring and evaluation need to go hand in hand.

Data management issue: It would very useful if there were an interface between Jeff Rodger’s maps (posted around the room during today’s meeting) and the maps in the Basin Browser. Major data sources in the Browser include juvenile snorkel surveys, ODFW/MCWC/SWCD aquatic habitat inventory surveys, and culvert information.

Stakeholder Team Member Comments and Questions:

- Is there built-in historical information as a comparative to current information? No, the data goes as far back as 2001 and would require additional resources (funding and personnel) and time to pull together that information.
- How much would it cost to build in an updating system? Updates cost about \$2000. ODFW has identified that data access and management is a need and they are working with OWEB and others to provide funding for a more coordinated, consolidated, and updated information system. This would include layering in watershed council information. Funding should be made available soon, and the next step will be

coordinating all the data sources.

- What are the analysis capabilities of the program? The program is not designed for analysis; once the data is run, it requires a person or a more sophisticated system to analyze the data.

Wayne Hoffman presented the Mid-Coast Watershed Council approach to geographic prioritization and limiting factors analysis. A handout was provided. Wayne noted that geographic prioritization is done using snorkel surveys, aquatic habitat inventories and GIS analyses. Results of the prioritization included: 60 of 218 6th-field subbasins ranked as high; larger subbasins are more likely to be a high priority; and high priority 6th fields are clustered. The Council also looked at ownership to determine which areas were most appropriate for the watershed council's work. More details on the prioritization process might be added to the Mid-Coast Watershed Council's website (which was down at the time of this meeting).

A limiting factors analysis was done on 20 high priority areas, in groups of 5. A coho-centric stage by stage analysis was done to determine which life history stage(s) experienced bottlenecks. From that, a prioritized list of potential restoration projects was developed. The watershed council sought grants to undertake the highest prioritized actions on the list. The watershed council received about \$7,500 for each 6th field from OWEB.

Question: How do you assure that restoration work is not affecting other species? E.g. a wooded riparian area developed in an area for coho that comes into direct conflict with elk. Wayne offered that they consider other salmonids and species when doing restoration projects, and that in practice there are very few conflicts.

Wayne explained that one of the main goals is to develop an ecosystem that can support itself and provide protection from anything that might degrade productivity. All work is voluntary so the watershed council works with landowners who want to preserve or improve conditions on their land. Restoration work includes: Stabilizing slopes, voluntary easements, large wood placement, managing landslide areas to benefit habitat in streams (e.g. so that large wood will be delivered to the stream during a slide), replenishing stream bed gravel, and removing human barriers.

Areas for addressing limiting factors include: Core habitat, anchor sites, secondary branch sites, critical contributing areas, barriers (the Watershed Council does not currently act on removing natural barriers) and lowlands (wintering and rearing habitats, which may be downstream from the 6th field area).

Wayne provided examples of an analysis done on the North Fork Yachats River, in partnership with the Siuslaw National Forest, Lincoln SWCD, ODF and the Siuslaw SWCD.

In-stream work is typically done from July to September to least disturb instream migrants, while helicopter projects are implemented from mid-September to mid-

October, to least impact nesting birds. Data is inventoried for the whole basin. Additional measures are taken at particular areas to get a more complete picture, and the watershed council works to fill in the gaps.

Wayne also discussed work on gravel reaches and large wood placement, and partnership work done designing thinning areas with a goal of maximizing large wood inputs from landslides. It was noted that the thinning concept implemented to maximize wood inputs could be quite different from thinning for other objectives, such as getting re-growth of as many trees as possible.

Analyses were also done at: North Fork Beaver Creek; Ollala Creek; Steer Creek (working with the Siletz Tribe as a major partner); and Rock Creek.

Management Strategy of Choice: The Oregon Plan 3-legged stool model – local grassroots efforts, combined with voluntary efforts by landowners, and salmon-sensitive regulation by agencies. The third leg of the stool, salmon-sensitive regulation by agencies, is wobbly.

Desired Status: Full seeding, ubiquitous distribution, enough fish to support healthy fisheries, and enough fish to serve coho sustainability (e.g. carcasses), escapement in all years, all populations adequate to avoid genetic impoverishments and local extirpations. Use smolt production as the primary currency for setting desired status goals for coho, based on what it takes to get a minimum return during bad ocean years.

From Wayne's perspective (he clarified that his proposal for an iterative process is not necessarily that of the Mid-Coast Watershed Council), smolt production is the most important aspect for recovery. His smolt production goals include reaching smolt numbers that are 4 times the current estimated numbers, with adult escapement at 2 million during good ocean condition years and 200,000 during bad ocean condition years.

Siuslaw Soil and Water Conservation District

Johnny Sundstrom presented information to the group about the Siuslaw Basin Partnership. He noted that the watershed contains over 50% federal land, and that his federal partners were not able to attend the meeting, but are currently out doing restoration work. He handed out a brochure with information on the Partnership. The 200,000 adult escapement target from Wayne's presentation, he offered, was a reality prior to 1880 in the Siuslaw.

Limiting factors addressed by the Siuslaw Partnership: High water/high velocity resulting in smolt flushing; 303(d) listing of several tributaries for sediment and temperature; excess bedrock in the system; lack of nutrients (fish carcasses); fish passage; calcium and lead problems (toxics); and social and cultural perspectives. The group's prioritization process involves ½ biological potential, and ½ social opportunity. The latter is essential in order to get support from local communities, funding resources and bodies to help get the work done.

Management actions have included: sixty thousand trees delivered to private landowners to support riparian habitats; in stream structures (logs on site, hauled in, flown in, small woody debris); riparian planting and protection, including assistance to landowners to maintain riparian areas; fish passage; road maintenance and repair; channel modification and stream reconstruction; monitoring for water quality conditions (toxins and lack of nutrients like calcium through the study of mussels); upland management; and landowner education and training.

Desired status/recovery goals: Include a ‘business plan’ to get state-wide and national buy-in for long-term commitments. Show what it will take to get thriving coastal communities, healthy people, and economic gain. What are we investing? How many fish over how many years? What are we expecting? Johnny noted that the Siuslaw Soil and Water Conservation District’s mission is a ‘sustainable, harvestable and fully functional temperate rainforest ecosystem’; fish are a critical component of this mission of the Siuslaw.

Small Group Discussion

In small affiliate groups, participants were asked to consider the following questions relative to the presentations: *What should be included in the conservation plan? Are there modifications to the State’s assessment and management plans that stand out? What did the proposal spark re: desired status?*

Given that many of the answers were similar, the following is a compiled list of suggestions, comments, and questions from the different small groups:

Liked from Presentations

- Hands-on examples and modeling – a balance of both is needed
- Good examples of local watershed planning
- Reach by reach approach, in context of the larger watershed
- Goal of restoring ecosystem health
- Consistent themes as were in the assessment
 - Good examples to help get local level specifics into the plan

Challenges

- Level of analytical detail was great—this will be hard to duplicate at other watershed councils, as well as in the Plan
- Historic number issue will be affected by land uses based on geographic location
- Funding limitations will necessitate prioritizing restoration efforts:
 - Need a business plan (see below for more detailed suggestions)
- Built in conflict between protecting against degradation and supporting natural processes—sometimes one creates the other (no suggestions for changing this, just needs to be acknowledged)
- Economic consideration of wild fish recovery (corrections to hatchery practices might help)
- There is always a role for hands on management—and that need might be great
- Data/modeling inclusion. How much detail for the state plan needs to be carefully

considered

- Fresh water actions impacting ocean production
- These examples point to the need to be proactive in turning missed opportunities into opportunities
- There is the potential for watershed councils re-inventing the wheel and assessing in ways inconsistent with others—consistency and cooperation would be good
 - Conservation plan could help this?
- Any sacrifices to support recovery will need to be shared across society
- Look at natural barriers individually – some may need fixing, others will not

Suggested Inclusions to Conservation Plan

- Include these examples and acknowledge that such work can be produced at the local level -- allow for updates at that level as well(detail issue)
- Use similar level of detail, ESU-wide
- The plan should answer: What can you do? When? What is the cost? (From local perspective, as a separate section in the plan)
- Include new and cutting edge work being done in the field
- Educating the public: Need to include feel-good, accessible projects for social impact (more than just the biological focus)
- Include methods and reporting for evaluating success and failure—be honest about what we have and have not done
- Include mention of pesticide use, fire retardants, hormone issues, floodplain development, water quantity and quality as ‘future threats’. Address these future threats in both watershed council planning and conservation planning.
- Write a plan that describes the process for setting priorities, data/numbers (where available), and addresses time/cost (based on averages of projects done)
- Explain that the Legislature told watershed councils to put state funding ‘on the ground’
 - Do this to avoid blaming WC’s for lack of monitoring/evaluation—they would have done more of this had funds been allocated for that use.
- Include a ‘business plan’ that answers what can you afford to do?
 - How much funding exists?
 - Where is funding available?
 - Subsidies?
 - Effects on jobs/food?
 - Multiple/tangential benefits of coho work
 - Range of costs (more than one alternative)
- Be careful that the plan does not delve into so many areas that it is too complex, controversial, and (as such) un-workable
- Keep the plan forward looking, not constrained by current conditions

Additional comments

- Re: natural barriers: At the watershed level, agree with the ‘do not disturb’, but on a state wide level, we should not be constrained by an all or nothing approach.
- Heather Stout (NOAA) provided a handout paper on conservation hatcheries. If you

want a copy, contact Heather.

Resource User Group Perspectives: Forestry

Blake Rowe offered that, as a foundation, OFIC is committed to: Maintain a private forest land base; support, maintain and improve the Oregon Forest Practices Program; maintain the productive capacity of our forestland; and protect our forest resources from wildfire, disease and insects. These basic commitments from Forest landowners are critical to the coho conservation plan.

What restoration contributions have private forest landowners made? Major efforts include

- Stream surveys, including data collection and funding. This work actually started before the OPSW was created. The data, collected in cooperation with ODFW, forms the foundation for much of the assessment.
- Fish passage
- Road surfacing and drainage. Several of these voluntary efforts have been so successful that they have been incorporated into the Forest Practice rules with the support of forest landowners.
- Riparian work. Numerous alternative voluntary measures to enhance buffers on fish bearing streams through additional tree retention or active management.
- Placement of large wood/boulders to enhance stream complexity; included into rule incentives for landowners to place key pieces of wood in return for limited harvest of riparian trees. It is clear that this work improves fish habitat, but it is difficult to quantify the benefits in terms of more fish.
- Helped create and fund habitat biologist positions to develop project design and permits –this has proven critical to initiating restoration projects
- Research and monitoring – this continues to be a key focus for private landowners both small and large

From the private landowner perspective, the most effective measures are fish passage work, road improvements, habitat biologists who can facilitate improvement projects, and research and monitoring. Wood placement is not considered the most effective by some landowners because it is difficult to see/quantify results compared to fish passage work.

Blake noted challenges that could be addressed:

- Lack of funding and maintenance of current funding mechanisms (e.g. attempts made by the environmental community to cut funding from landowners to support public education and research through the Oregon Forest Resources Institute and to shift a greater share of fire protection to forest landowners);
- Interference with good ideas, e.g. ‘basal area credit’ not currently available because it wasn’t supported by federal partners;
- Perception that landowner’s work is never good enough – in spite of all that is done, they are still expected to volunteer more. Forest practice regulatory reviews are more rigorous, burdensome and frequent than other land uses.
- The rush to regulate before key scientific research. Examples of research that should be complete before more regulatory changes are made include Hinkle Creek; the

relationship between shade, food supply, and fish productivity; headwater stream temperature work.

The forest industry feels that the approach laid out in the Oregon Plan should continue in the conservation plan. The industry will continue to meet its commitments in the OPSW, e.g. funding research, monitoring, and evaluation, supporting watershed councils, voluntary efforts on roads and stream protection, etc.

Additionally, Blake shared some ideas that could be added to the new Plan: Hard falling trees into streams to increase complexity – work with ODFW staff to identify suitable stream reaches, identify trees and direct fallers on placement. Also, sediment routing: placing debris and sediment behind culverts on the downstream side of the current thereby allowing natural mechanisms to move sediment instead of loading it into dump trucks and trucking it away, out of the stream system.

Question: What is the view of the IMST report on the Forest Industry? Recommendations were sent to the Board of Forestry and addressed through that process.

Jeff Light, fish biologist for Plum Creek Timber, provided examples of specific restoration projects implemented by private landowners in the mid-coast. He noted that landowner participation occurs through watershed councils, research advisory committees, weed boards, road and culvert inventories and fish surveys.

Projects included: habitat improvement, passage barrier removal (Jeff noted that there are some remaining passage barrier removals to be addressed, but the major work is complete), road sediment reductions, estuary enhancement, riparian conifer regeneration, biodiversity maintenance, culvert replacement (expensive but provides an instant benefit), falling trees directly into streams, research on placing buffers only on the south side of the stream, and Newton's research. In response to Blake's comments, Jeff noted that he has indeed found tree placement to be a very effective restoration activity.

Questions relating to on-going research and monitoring needs: How effective are current practices? What influence does forestry have on aquatic ecosystems? What culverts are significant barriers, cost-effective solutions, and can we measure results of barrier removal? How effective are current buffering strategies and alternatives? How does the amount of 'fish food' affect temperature sensitivity? While some of the research does not directly address smolt productivity, the information could be put into context to show the impacts of activity in one area on other areas. The research could help in prioritizing important restoration projects, and further research could be done to add perspective to the impacts on coho.

Blake concluded by saying that we need to allow the science to be fully understood, examine how things are inter-related, and continue to monitor results. These are dynamic questions with dynamic answers, and research needs to continue.

Next Steps

- The next meeting, scheduled for October 27, will begin with small group discussion of the Forestry Industry presentation, and work toward answering what, if anything, from today's presentations is needed to reach agreement on concepts for inclusion in the conservation plan (relative to habitat concerns).
- Paul Englemeyer requested a review of the IMST report on forestry.
- Ed Bowles, ODFW, thanked the presenters for providing their ideas and information and suggested that what he heard reinforced the gratitude owed by all Oregonians to local efforts. These on the ground efforts provide an excellent foundation for future work of the state and others. Recognizing ownership on the ground, ODFW will make certain that the conservation plan captures the local work, so as not to reinvent the wheel. The state will put the effort into the context of a coho-centric recovery plan. Ed also appreciated hearing from the Forest Industry some potential future action ideas, and suggested others consider this aspect (relative to coho) in their presentations. ODFW's district biologists will be taking the lead as authors of the conservation plan and will begin drafting pieces for Stakeholder Team feedback at the next meeting.

ACTIONS:

- ODFW will do a first cut at apportioning the Hoffman goals on a basin-by-basin basis.
- The conservation groups will be providing their ideas regarding desired status
- A request was made for an economic presentation on projections, from OCZMA et al. How much would be required to provide a fishery? Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, noted that her agency is developing an economic approach proposal and will brief the Stakeholder Team in October.

Meeting Schedule/Agendas

October 27, Bandon Dunes: South Coast Populations

- Desired status
- Follow up on Forestry
- Local perspectives on limiting factors and management strategies
- Resource User perspectives: Agriculture presentation: Cranberry and...
- Economic approach

November 14, Rockaway Beach/Tillamook: North Coast Populations

- Follow up on Agriculture – dairy
- Local perspectives on limiting factors and management strategies
- Resource User perspectives: Local government
- TRT status update

Meeting Evaluation: What Worked/Didn't Work?

- Two-day meeting might be better (facilitation team will check with group on-line about their availability for November)
- Liked small group idea generation, possibly get feedback in between meetings?
- Didn't like set up of room because not everyone could see. Suggest setting up so everyone can see and so presenter can use computer without blocking the view.

- Larger space allowed for multiple discussions (and this was good for small group discussions).
- Shorten small group discussion time; include facilitators to keep small groups on task.

OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT
Stakeholder Team Meeting
Bandon Dunes, Bandon
Facilitator's Meeting Summary
October 27, 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), Jennifer Hampel (Coquille Watershed Association), Wayne Hoffman (Mid-coast Watershed Council), Tom Kartrude (Port of Siuslaw), 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), Terry Thompson (Assoc. of Oregon Counties), Stan Van de Wetering (Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians), Bill Yocum (Freeman Rock, Inc.)

Resource Advisors:

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

Alternates and Technical Resources: Bob Buckman (ODFW), Kevin Craig (Coquille Indian Tribe), Greg Kreimeyer (ODF), Brandon Ford (ODFW), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Mike Gray (ODFW), Mark Grenbemer (ODFW), Les Helgeson (alternate for Bill Bakke, Native Fish Society), Harry Hoogestager (South Coast Watershed Council), Dave Jarrett (WRD), Dave Jenkins (ODFW), Terry Leeker (Umpqua Basin Watershed Council), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Bridgette Lohrman (NMFS), Dave Loomis (ODFW), Heather Ludeman (NMFS), Mike Mader (Ten Mile Basin Watershed Council), Cindy Meyers (South Coast Watershed Council), Jo Morgan (ODF), Jim Muck (ODFW), Mike Northrop (USDA Forest Service), Maggie Peyton (Nehalem Watershed Council), Tom Shafer (OWEB), Jon Souder (Coos Watershed Council), Tim Stevenson (ODA), Heather Stout (NOAA-TRT), Karen Tarnow (ODEQ), Ray Wilkeson (OFIC)

Other Interested Parties: Ted Cart, Dan Delaney, Leo Grandmontagne (Wild Fish for Oregon), Representative Wayne Krieger, Tom Kulkotz, Mary Scurlock (Pacific Rivers Council)

Facilitation Team: Donna Silverberg, Robin Harkless

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
--------	-----	---------

Send clarifying language for 9/23 notes to facilitation team	Blake Rowe	November 4
Forward responses on Bilby’s research to stakeholder team	Les Helgeson	November meeting
Forward specific issues/questions on Forest Practices Act, relative to coho conservation plan, to Blake Rowe	Stakeholder Team	November meeting
Forward recommendations for Board of Forestry to stakeholder team	Jo Morgan	<u>Done</u> : November 1
Connect watershed council, etc. presentations with chapters of the conservation plan, and share with stakeholder team	ODFW	November 11
Send NOAA’s guidelines for developing recovery plans, revised format, to stakeholder team	Rosemary Furfey	November 11

Comments on September 23, 2005 Summary Notes

- Page 3: Follow up on water rights/use issue: Tom Forgatsch found that Bandon does use more than its allotted water. From Tom’s perspective, domestic wells are a problem; at 15,000 gallons a day, they hold more than a water right. 193 domestic wells have been drilled. Unrestricted water rights need to be looked at. From the notes, he believes the 1/10 data is off. He suggested having a representative from the Water Resources Department attend a meeting and talk more about this. (Dave Jarrett was in attendance during today’s meeting.)
- Page 5: Under ‘Management Strategy of Choice’, add: ‘The third leg of the stool, salmon sensitive regulation of agencies, is wobbly.’
- Page 5, “Desired Status”, add: ‘Use smolt production as the primary currency for setting desired status goals for coho, based on what it takes to get a minimum return during bad ocean years.’
- Page 9: Under projects from Jeff Light’s presentation: Include ‘falling trees directly in streams, research on buffer only on south side of stream, ways to design to get the least amount of stream, Newton’s research’.
- Page 8, Blake Rowe’s presentation:
 - **ACTION**: Blake will send language from his presentation to clarify the bullets.

Local media outreach: Local station KCBY attended today’s meeting. ODFW does press releases for each of the stakeholder team meetings. It was noted that this will be more important as the process continues, and there will be more push for a media connection. Kevin Goodson reported that town hall meetings will be scheduled when the final draft of the conservation plan is completed and released for public comment. Louise Solliday provided copies of the Newport Times article from the September 23rd meeting in Newport.

Clarification of Limiting Factors and Current and Future Threats: Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, reported that her advisor was making a few changes and she will send the draft

guidance document to the stakeholder team prior to the next meeting.

Follow up on Desired Status

Kevin Goodson provided a handout of ODFW's draft desired status under poor ocean conditions. The number 200,000 in the graph was based on Wayne Hoffman's concept presented at the last meeting.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments:

- Re: In the carrying capacity model, what is the recruit curve? It is based on actual performance of the fish and estimated to full seeding. Gaps between desired and current status are identified, then look at a specific area's potential for meeting carrying capacity.
- Paul Englemeyer still has technical questions about full seeding, and suggested this issue has implications for whether he could endorse the desired status concept presented today. ODFW offered that Amendment 13 may come into play later but is not a focus for now. It was clarified that 'full seeding' used in the graph is not the same as full seeding in Amendment 13, but is based on Mark Chilcote's work. ODFW recognizes that uncertainty around full seeding is an issue that needs to be resolved, and that resolution may not occur before the conservation plan is written. The concept will be included as a proportion of full seeding and likely be resolved later when ground-truthing the plan.
- Several approaches were suggested during Wayne Hoffman's presentation at the last meeting. The graph presented today has produced some anomalies (e.g. 10 mile Lake is not able to carry as much weight as the graph shows, more could be done in the Siuslaw, Yaquina and others have greater potential), and the next step will be to understand what it would take/where opportunities really exist (feasibility). This is a good first step.
- What does 's max' correspond to? About half, or 100,000. Simply put, full seeding during poor ocean conditions would require a doubling of fish numbers. What is the stakeholder team being asked to review – numbers, an approach for allocating back to basins, or both? ODFW responded that they are looking for input on a reasonable desired status number, and identifying where the most work is needed.
- How do you measure poor ocean survival? The Oregon Production Index is used. "1%" is worst, "10%" is best. Historical numbers are used; this might have caused some of the anomalies in the graph.
- "Current status" is a 1993-99 average. This is a lower than low average, as the poorest ocean conditions were seen during this time period. ODFW agreed. Adult returns were so low that smolt production could not get close to filling the habitat. ODFW's goal is to reach a point that smolt production is not so influenced by poor ocean conditions. Variance in spawning density is such that severe localized problems arise/exist. The desired condition is two-fold: increasing productivity and increasing carrying capacity (high quality habitat). The group was reminded that the state's assessment identified over-wintering habitat as the main bottleneck area.
- Is the desired status achievable? We may be setting an unrealistic bar. Fundamentally changing the habitat at a landscape scale will be VERY challenging, even to get to 's max'. Why set the goal higher than 's max'?

- Have habitat conditions not been improving? The habitat has stabilized as far as metrics show; but the data does not show improvements to habitat at the landscape scale. Still, the fact that we do not appear to be deteriorating is an important step. Given this, fish numbers may not matter as much in years to come, as we will put our best efforts forth, and improvements will be made as we progress.
- In some areas, habitat is NOT the primary limiting factor. (E.g., in the Yaquina, predators are a problem.) Look at other options.

Kaitlin Lovell, Trout Unlimited, provided a handout and shared ideas about desired status from the fish conservation perspective. They went back to the statutes for a definition of recovery in the Oregon Plan. While they believe it is a good start, a few issues were identified. Diversity is not explained, and should include life history and genetics; ISAB concluded that you must look at all populations not just those looked at by ODFW; and finally, looking at the state's numbers, societal benefits were at zero. From the fish conservationists' perspective, recovery means that societal benefits need to be seen in almost all years. Generally, their suggested approach is to look at smaller scale areas for potentials to meet desired status/recovery.

Preferring a qualitative description, they offered a broad brush quantitative desired status of 760,000-1.4 million returning adults. At a minimum, nutrient requirements at 1.4-1.5 million. They also went back to the TRT document for smolt abundance – roughly 400 fish/mile. They suggested starting to talk about management actions that would be needed to get to desired status. Overall, everyone must do something. Look at stream by stream needs. Kaitlin had copies of the Oregon Business Council's vision for salmon, a business plan for how salmon recovery can be done and provide a benefit to the Oregon economy. If anyone wants a hard copy, contact Kaitlin.

Donna Silverberg reminded everyone that this is a first step in looking at desired status, and that the group will have the opportunity to refine the concept at future stakeholder team meetings.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments

- Clarification: 400 fish/mile does not need to be all coho. Some Chinook, some chum, etc. Further clarification: The TRT says up to 400 fish/mile.
- **Action:** As a follow-up item from a previous stakeholder team meeting, Les Helgeson reported that he received responses on Bilby's research and offered to send the information to the stakeholder team.
- What about seals and birds? Yes, this issue needs to be addressed but was not included in the handouts; it should be added to harvest/predation. Through a stream by stream analysis, these limiting factors will reveal themselves, at which time something would be done to address them.
- Look also at ocean management of other stocks.

Additional feedback from the group on the desired status concept is welcome. ODFW shared their perspective that we need to understand the basis of desired status and current condition numbers to understand what would need to be changed to get to these numbers.

While there is some disagreement over the numbers, the fish conservationists think it is a good range. Ed Bowles offered that to keep the concepts ‘apples to apples, the desired status concept from the fish conservationists should equate to ocean conditions, as in ODFW’s analysis.

Additional questions:

- In what way does the current standard not get at recovery as defined in the statute? The assessment meets VSP attributes but does NOT ensure societal and ecological benefits. That is what we are looking to address in developing a desired status.
- Just because there may not be a fishery provided in every year, it does not mean you have failed in providing societal benefits. This is just one interpretation of societal benefits. This concept needs to be further negotiated by the stakeholder team.
- Suggestion: The stakeholder team should review the business plan provided and have discussion later about it.
- As history shows, there may not be societal benefits every year, no matter what we do.
- The desired status concepts presented today provide great options. The next step will be to do a side by side comparison to better understand how the options line up.
- Suggestion – send the Lackey paper to the stakeholder team – it may only be available in hard copy.

Follow up discussion on Forestry Issues and Next Steps

Following a small group discussion, the stakeholder team identified outstanding questions from Blake Rowe’s presentation at the September 23rd meeting, and suggestions for future management strategies for coho conservation relative to forestry.

Questions the group may want to discuss included:

- Status of riparian protection as compared to other “salmon states”? Federal, state, counties, etc. management. How do fisheries compare? What are economic implications of different states’ Forest Practices Acts? How do economies vary?
 - Jo Morgan, ODF, noted that many of these questions are answered in the ODF booklet – copies were available at the meeting.
- Monoculturing and diversity issues – how do they play into coho issues?
- What benefit does one size set back have for coho and the forest industry?
- What changes to the Forest Practices Act (FPA) should be contemplated for coho? Is this fair?
- What are constraints on the forest industry of a “leave it to beaver” strategy to assist channel complexity? (See below for further discussion.)
- How can we use natural events to assist in channel complexity through management actions (e.g. road issues, trees and landslide events)?
- How are IMST recommendations being addressed? (See below for further discussion.)
- Does the Oregon FPA meet Clean Water Act standards? If not, by how much?
- What is the relationship of channel migration zones to forest practices?
- What is the review of research on light on streams telling us?
- How do we identify incentive strategies to help wood delivery to needed places at the right time? What are other states doing on this?

- How does difference of length of rotation effect the adequacy of the FPA in fostering restoration of in-stream and riparian conditions?
- Are there more opportunities to get large wood where needed?
- Are there opportunities for trade offs between high and low intrinsic potential areas?

Suggested strategies for the conservation plan included and will need further explanation:

- Continue culvert replacement program
- Riparian thinning for large wood
- Research and Monitoring
- Through incentives, encourage private timber industry to increase the probability of availability for wood in streams– See below
- Business plan for balancing economics with actions
- Leave it to Beaver – See below
- Wood debris from flows and landslides
- Falling trees into streams
- Riparian management areas above fish barriers
- Increase basal area target for medium and small Type F streams

As time permitted, Blake Rowe responded to a few of the questions and suggested strategies that were offered by the group:

‘Leave it to Beaver’: Forestry has seen less beaver control on some private lands than in the past. On low gradient streams many have buffers already so beavers are impacting the existing buffers. In some areas, where roads are an issue (blocking culverts, e.g.), there is very little if any beaver control, so the ‘leave it to beaver’ concept is not far from what is already happening. Given this, ODFW may initiate, through experimental management, curtailing harvest of beavers in a specific zone, and measure the response. (Blake agreed that this is possible, but there may need to be some allowances for problems with water temperature and nutrients).

- Question: What about BLM land? It is not covered under the Forest Practices Act, but is covered under federal regulation, e.g. the Northwest Forest Plan, etc.
- **ACTION**: Stakeholder team members will forward any specific issues and questions from the Forest Practices Act to the facilitation team to pass on to Blake, including suggestions about what is being/needs to be done to change the Act.
- Question: Consider relocating ‘bad actor’ beavers?

The IMST report on forestry was reviewed by the Forest Practices Advisory Council (FPAC). From the report, a set of recommendations from DOF went to the Board of Forestry, and many of those recommendations have been addressed. At the 11/22 Board of Forestry meeting, the Board will decide whether to go forward with formal rulemaking for the following rule concepts: Riparian management areas above fish barriers (to ensure riparian vegetation is maintained on stream reaches that have the potential to become accessible by fish once an artificial barrier is removed but are currently classified as non-fish streams); wood from debris flows and landslides (a minor adjustment to an existing

rule standard is being recommended because there is increasing scientific evidence that small non-fish-bearing streams prone to debris flows provide an important source of large wood for downstream fish habitat); and increase basal area target for medium and small Type F streams (increase the standard and active management basal area retention requirements within RMAs along small and medium fish bearing streams in western Oregon).

ACTION: Jo Morgan, ODF, forwarded the proposed rule changes for the 11/22 Board of Forestry meeting to the stakeholder team.

- Question: Do we have adequate monitoring of woody debris? Can we monitor instream habitat conditions? These questions should be directed more to ODFW. From the forest industries perspective, many good projects are happening, and there could be more.

Jo Morgan added that the adequacy of the Forest Practices Act is being addressed by the Board of Forestry. Discussions have been on-going for a long time and will continue to be discussed; the discussion will not end on November 22nd. ODF is putting together a report on the Hinkle Creek research, which will fold into the discussions. The stakeholder team can provide ideas about how we can meet needs of over-wintering habitat, but we do not have time to debate the Forest Practices Act through this stakeholder process.

Management Actions to Address Limiting Factors and Current and Future Threats: Local Populations and Perspectives

Coquille Watershed Association

Jennifer Hampel presented background information on the Coquille Watershed Association and discussed limiting factors and management actions specific to the area. See the coho website, www.oregon-plan.org for slides from Jennifer's power point. Formed in 1993, the Association originally was very focused on coho fisheries. It then expanded to other groups, including timber, business, etc. Jennifer noted that every watershed council is different, and that the Coquille focuses on restoration projects. The 'old' way of getting projects going everywhere with less time spent prioritizing helped the Association make contacts with locals so now folks are aware of what the Association does; however, very little monitoring was done in the beginning.

To meet the goals of the Board (getting restoration on the ground), and to evolve to a more strategically functioning group, the Association is currently prioritizing actions and has increased and improved its monitoring. Next steps include finalizing basin assessments and updating the management action plan.

Limiting factors identified:

- Stream complexity (more specifically, lowland habitats of which wetlands are virtually nonexistent now – reduced by 90%.) To address wetlands has been politically difficult but the Association is implementing pilot projects for usable wetland habitat, restoring the wetland (juvenile habitat) while allowing landowners to continue to use the land.

- Lack of spawning habitat was deemed NOT a limiting factor by the Association.
- Instream structure is a limiting factor as an over-wintering habitat.
- Temperature is still being debated – riparian shade assessments being used to look at this area. And, it may not be realistic to get temperatures down.

Management actions:

- Primary focus on wetlands.
- Targeted “cluster area” riparian restoration projects.
- Instream projects focusing on juvenile habitat.
- Monitoring data is now posted on the website and very accessible.

Jennifer reiterated that expectations will depend on the specific watershed council, since every council has its unique focus. Management actions should be site specific.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments:

- Kudos, you have done everything the watershed councils were originally designed to do. Now monitoring will be important as results of restoration projects may not be known for 20 years.
- Has the Coquille STEP hatchery program been successful? Yes, the Coquille program has been successful in public outreach and educating and motivating volunteers. Brood stock collection and monitoring is needed for this as well as everything else.
- Look at current and future threats – and at those that used to be threats that could re-emerge and should be monitored.

Coos Watershed Council

Jon Souder offered that the Coos Watershed Council (WC) has taken three main approaches to management: a function approach similar to OWEB project investment priorities; the Reeves et. al coho limiting factors technique; and an approach being developed as part of a Sea Grant project – see the coho website for Jon’s slides.

The Coos watershed holds the largest urban area and largest estuary on the coast. So, the WC is looking at aquaculture in water quality in addition to fish, e.g. crab and larva species. The primary limiting factor is water quality. Concerns include: high summer water temperatures; high sediment loads (dredging to address this); and high bacteria levels and sources affecting oyster cultivation. This and other information can be found on the WC’s web site. www.cooswatershed.org.

The WC looked at limiting factors on a sub-region scale. The upper watershed area contains corporate timber land, and these corporations (Weyerhaeuser and Menasha) work well with the WC to do restoration projects. The sub-region holds high intrinsic potential for coho—stream complexity (cleaned out or splash-dammed) is the primary limiting factor: too much sediment is put into streams, mainly from legacy forest roads. The WC is working with its partners to address sediment issues.

The heads of tide region is forested in the uplands, agricultural in the lowlands. It does not hold as much coho as in the upper watershed area but does provide crucial refugia.

The primary limiting factor here is bank stability and shade: for cooling streams.

The slough system region is forested uplands, urban/rural residential lowlands. It does not hold high potential for spawning, but does contain critical rearing areas. The primary limiting factor is connectivity (between sloughs and adjacent land); secondary is hatchery releases (hard to quantify but many hatchery fish are released and are likely impacting coho).

The direct bay tributaries region contains industrial forest in its uplands, private land managed for forestry in the valley; and agricultural and rural residential in the lowlands. This sub-region is potentially highly productive for coho. Tide gates at the mouths do not seem to be reducing fish numbers. The primary limiting factor is floodplain connectivity; the secondary is stream water temperatures.

The Coos Watershed Council management actions include working with landowners to match up with what landowners want to do with their property. Actions fall into four restoration categories: Restore watershed connectivity (passage at culverts and tide gates, stream/floodplain connectivity, natural stream flow restoration); restore watershed processes (control sediment inputs, riparian planting, rip-rap removal); restore watershed inputs (irrigation improvements); and restore symptoms of disturbance (large wood placement, create natural channels, install water/sediment control basins).

Summer/winter habitat and channel complexity as identified key limiting factors are both likely due to poor connectivity. To address this, the WC is using a decision support system to look at reaches of the river and how fish respond to various habitat types and restoration actions. Next step include monitoring.

Next step goals are to: Gather good restoration data if not already available; participate in group restoration projects; get active involvement of landowners; look at and address limiting factors (different than being only opportunistic); and monitor.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments

- What about hatchery fish? There are very few strays in the area.
- What type of monitoring are you doing? There are four stream gauging stations, temperature monitors, spawning reach monitoring, life cycle monitoring, and an extensive riparian monitoring program; overall there is a real commitment to monitoring.
- When and where are fish using the streams? The WC's understanding is poor on this.
- Have you seen different outcomes with the three approaches to limiting factors? It is too soon to tell, and also they have different spatial perspectives.
- What is the dredging affect on oyster aquaculture? Not much because dredging is happening in a different area from oyster aquaculture. However, there is a potential for bacteria increase due to movement and sediment.
- For lowland agriculture, is CREP a good resource? CREP is our best tool to work with landowners in lowland areas. There is a potential problem with the amount of technical paperwork. There is a need for an alternative for those areas that do not want

to use CREP, as well as a need to build trust between agricultural landowners and CREP.

Sixes, Floras and New River: South Coast Watershed Council

Harry Hoogestager introduced the South Coast WC's limiting factors matrix. Using OWEB guidance and local experts, an assessment, action plans and limiting factors matrix were produced Harry noted that the work is about halfway done.

Cindy Myers also noted that the matrix is in draft form and should be available in the next couple months. The WC will use the matrix to help prioritize actions. She highlighted limiting factors for each of the rivers of focus for the South Coast WC. Her presentation can be found on the Coho Project website.

Sixes – Consists of a low gradient, unconfined flood plain (which provides over-wintering habitat); tributaries (clear water), clay soil (affecting turbidity and runoff); a complex estuary; and high nutrient levels. The data from the Sixes is new and not yet published. Off channel habitats include swamp, flood overflow channels, beavers, runoff pollutants, an impaired macro invertebrate community, and varying habitat quality. Recently, a conservation easement was secured for 50 years on the dry river.

Floras – Consists of clay soil, high runoff/low summer flows, low gradient habitat, more water yield, and better shade and supply of hard wood in the upper area. Downstream is sensitive to erosion, has a history of bank stabilization and aversion to beavers. Off channel habitats connect with the New River, but are disconnected from the floodplain. An important tributary feeds into the Floras. Confined by rip rap, sediment cannot be trapped. The lower mainstem was straightened.

New River – Off channel habitats include: high value coastal lakes and complex lakes, channels, and ditches. Tributaries that drain uplands, straightened/incised/depositional, ditches were dug to drain wetlands but caused problems, water quality concerns, complex issues around artificially breaching (which has been done).

- Public comment—Degradation of the New River occurred as a result of building the highway/bridge, and straightening the river. Breaching caused problems.

South Coast WC management actions include: livestock exclusion, riparian improvements and planting, fish passage, large wood placement, upland sediment treatments, gorse management, constructed wetlands from cranberries, Conservation Reserves (we need to find a way to streamline and make this program easier for landowners).

Channel complexity and water quality were identified as the key limiting factors for the South Coast WC.

Umpqua Basin Watershed Council

Terry Leeker presented information on the Umpqua Basin WC. Projects include:

education, fish passage, flow modification, GIS data collection, large wood/boulder placement, research and monitoring, riparian restoration, watershed assessments, and channel reconstruction. Through planned and, mostly, opportunistic means, projects are implemented after receiving feedback from the Technical Advisory Committee.

Management strategies include: Working with habitat biologists at ODFW, tying old projects into new (structure placement; mixing landowner with timber industry to move up river, etc.); project monitoring; and using the SWCD's culvert ratings to prioritize for maintenance and replacement.

Terry concluded with a question for the group to consider, and welcomed feedback: How do watershed councils plan for monitoring and restoration management when most are surviving hand to mouth?

Comment: Dan Delaney, who is working with the Coquille Tribe, noted that they are putting together a review team to look at the Coquille River Basin Management Plan. Anyone interested in hearing more or getting involved should contact him at (541) 659-8515, or wildriver@charter.net. The deadline for completing the plan is June 2006.

Public comments:

- What about introduced fish? This is an issue in some areas, and more information can be found on the WC's website. What about starting a population? How do you do that? Through desired status, the state will look at fish-based abundance and productivity criteria along with objectives for getting there, with a focus on habitat. The current status of coho is available in the assessment.
- CREP contracts cover 280 acres in Coos County, 430 in Curry County, 483 in Umpqua County, 243 in Lane County, and in other areas. Success of the program depends on the willingness of landowners. Most recently, Klamath has gotten involved.
- Priority actions have been acknowledged by the forest industry, and there is a need to see evidence that actions are being taken, e.g. watershed enhancement projects. (This is not always apparent in dollars and number of miles, so show more specifically how the work ties into habitat and other coho needs.) Finally, this group should focus on controversial areas in the Forest Practices Act that relate to what goes into the coho conservation plan. This group could and should influence other decision-making bodies, e.g. the Board of Forestry.

Small group discussions:

The group listed additional limiting factors they heard from the presentations today, that may not yet be part of the state's list. They include:

- Sediment in the Coos,
- Political and legal infrastructures (e.g. funding rules),
- Wetland restoration,
- Invasive species (plant bird, fish, etc),
- Floodplain connectivity,
- Bank stability,
- Water quality (e.g. mercury, temperature, quantity, seasonal changes in hydrograph-

- peak flow alterations),
- Hatchery releases

Current and future threats the group identified included:

- Developmental pressures,
- Predators (exotic/invasive species, striped bass),
- Diking and channelization,
- Complex paperwork programs for incentives,
- Phosphorous overloading,
- Spills of noxious materials,
- Uncertainty of funding for local projects/efforts,
- Changes in stream flow patterns and bank stabilization projects,
- Recruitment of wood debris (more needed),
- Road building (legacy and new),
- Invasive species,
- Size of hatchery releases

Finally, the group listed management strategies they heard from the presentations, which included:

- Monitoring,
- Streamlining the application process,
- Need for more responsive incentives programs/relationship building with agriculture industry.
- Create “natural” channels for fish

A suggestion was made to link the listed limiting factors with current and future threats and with management actions.

ACTION: ODFW will link information from the watershed council presentations/suggestions to chapters of the conservation plan.

Resource User Group Perspectives: Focus Local Agriculture

Tom Forgatsch presented information on agriculture, specifically cranberry farming. Cranberry growers consider themselves stewards of the land – many cranberry growers have been around for two or three generations. The marine environment makes the south coast area prime for growing cranberries, and the beds provide excellent wildlife habitat.. For every acre of bed, four acres of ‘support’ are needed. Water management is very important: cranberry growers dig sumps for storage and use, and usually have more water than needed for growing, which creates additional habitat.

Management actions include more eco-conscious pest management approaches, and re-use management of water.

Question: Is water quantity an issue? There are ways to access water in this area, water close to the ocean that gets out via cracks (not rivers). It is just a matter of finding the water.

Windhurst Reservoir is a water district contributed by cranberry growers, who use and sell the water, and the water serves as wildlife habitat. The cranberry growers are currently proposing the Johnson Creek project, another reservoir for water storage, at a cost of \$3 million (including studies).

Question re: grower guidelines/Best Management Practices: Does this include water quality monitoring? Yes, the cranberry farming community is sensitive about water quality. The Food Protection Act looks closely at the content of cranberries for contamination. Cranberry farmers conform to SB 1010, CZMA, CWA, ESA and FQPA. Copies were made available the cranberry grower's best management practices.

Question: How will the reservoir project be impacted by the predicted population growth on the south coast? The reservoir would not be able to support the expected growth – water storage is key.

Question re: SB 1010: How does cranberry agriculture compare to other agriculture in this area? There are many other types of agriculture in the area. Dairy here is moving toward organic.

Question: If phosphorous was a problem, what would you do to alleviate it? One solution would be to run water into certain storages to break it down. There is an Extension study on phosphorous, specifically looking at artificial wetland treatment; anyone that is interested should talk with Tom Forgatsch. The study found that background and outflow water were not that much different, and never exceeded EPA's standards.

ACTION: Per request, Tim Stevenson, ODA, will provide a short presentation on SB 1010 rules at the next stakeholder team meeting.

Meeting Schedule/Agendas

November 14 (12:30-6:30)-15 (9-3:00) Rockaway Beach: North Coast Populations

- User perspective: Agriculture – dairy and SB 1010 presentation from ODA
- Local Perspectives on limiting factors and management strategies: North Coast Populations
- Resource User Perspectives: municipalities/tribal focus
- Desired Status
- Feedback on ODFW staff draft chapter on mid-coast populations

Les Helgeson offered to do a field trip on the morning of 11/14 before the start of the meeting.

An additional meeting was scheduled for December 8 in Roseburg. An agenda will be sent out prior to the meeting.

Comments on ODFW's Work Plan

ODFW provided a draft work plan for developing a conservation plan. The stakeholder

team provided initial comments:

- The NOAA chapters corresponding to the chapters in the work plan are NOAA's guidelines for developing recovery plans.
 - **ACTION**: A revised document from NOAA (changed only in format) will be forwarded from Rosemary Furfey to the group.
- How is the iterative process built in? If we are to comment, we need more than a week to review the draft conservation plan. ODFW responded that it will be a 'drafty' draft. The agency will be looking for feedback on whether they are heading in the right direction. And, there will be opportunity for additional feedback later.

OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT
Stakeholder Team Meeting
Civic Center, Rockaway Beach
Facilitator's Meeting Summary
November 14-15, 2005

Attendees for all or part of the meeting:

Stakeholder Team Members: Paul Englemeyer (Audubon-Public at Large), Tom Forgatsch (Farm Industry), Wayne Geisy (Alsea Valley Alliance), Paul Heikkila (OSU Extension Sea Grant), Cindy Heller (STEP-Public at Large), Wayne Hoffman (Mid-coast Watershed Council), Kaitlin Lovell (Trout Unlimited), Mark McCollister (Oregon Trout), Les Helgeson (alternate for Bill Bakke, Native Fish Society), Bill Moshofsky (Save the Salmon Coalition), Lisa Phipps (Mayor Rockaway Beach-Cities), Shawn Reiersgaard (Tillamook Creamery Association-Diary/Ag), Dennis Richey (Oregon Anglers-NW Steelheaders), Blake Rowe (Longview Fibre Company-Forest Industry), Stan Van de Wetering (Confederated Tribe of the Siletz Indians), Bill Yocum (Freeman Rock, Inc.)

Resource Advisors:

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

Alternates and Technical Resources: Greg Apke (ODOT), Bruce Apple (ODEQ), Wayne Auble (ODFW), Carol Bickford (Nestucca Watershed Council), Keith Braun (ODFW), Bob Buckman (ODFW), Mark Chilcote (ODFW), Brandon Ford (ODFW), Dave Godsey (Lower Nehalem Watershed Council), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Mike Gray (ODFW), Mark Grembemer (OWEB), Dan Knoll (ODFW), Bill Langmaid (Upper Nehalem Watershed Council), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Dave Loomis (ODFW), Michele Long (ODFW), Denise Lofman (Tillamook Bay Watershed Council), Mark McLaughlin (Lower Nehalem Watershed Council), Jo Morgan (ODF), Jim Muck (ODFW), Mike Northrop (USDA Forest Service), Maggie Peyton (Upper Nehalem Watershed Council), Andy Schaedel (ODEQ), Tom Shafer (OWEB), Tim Stevenson (ODA), Mark Trenholm (Tillamook Estuary Partnership), Ray Wilkeson (OFIC), Brad Wurfel (ODFW),
Other Interested Parties: Walt Morgan (public)

Facilitation Team: Donna Silverberg, Robin Harkless, Erin Halton

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Link Biennial Report of the Oregon Plan, Volume II, to NOAA’s website.	Solliday, Furfey	December meeting
Share copies of the North Coast power point presentation with stakeholder team	Mark Trenholm	December meeting
“Parking Lot Issue”: Discuss role of development in riparian areas	Stakeholder Team	Future meeting
Discuss report on peer reviewed/verifiable data for historic numbers in desired status table	Furfey with NFS	ASAP
Share tribe’s report on data re: coho and tide gates when it is available	Stan Van de Wetering	When available
Review agreements on desired status with constituent group, followed by more discussion/decision on desired status at the next meeting	Stakeholder Team	December meeting
RM&E “Parking Lot Issue”: Nutrient-carcass placement benefits to coho	Stakeholder Team discussion	Future Meeting
Write draft Progress Report on Coho recovery planning to post on NOAA’s webpage	Furfey	December meeting

Monday, November 14

Welcome and Introductions

Lisa Phipps, Mayor of Rockaway Beach, welcomed everyone to Rockaway Beach’s new Civic Center. A round of introductions was conducted.

Comments on October 27, 2005 Summary Notes

- Page 5: “Next Steps: Questions that need to be answered prior to the plan”. Recommend striking ‘prior to the plan’ or ‘questions included’ instead as the plan may not require that the entire list be answered. The steering committee will refine the questions with those that need to be answered for this work.
- Page 6: Include wood from debris flows and landslides (as per the Forestry rules)
- Page 6: ‘Suggested strategies’. Add the recommendations from Forestry and flesh out some of the bullets:
 - ‘Continue culvert replacement’; ‘Riparian thinning’; ‘Through incentives, encourage private timber industry to increase probability of availability for wood in streams’; ‘Business plan for balancing economics with actions’.
- Page 6: ‘Leave it to beaver’: Add ‘Forestry has seen less beaver control on SOME private lands’ to better represent what is really happening out there.
- Page 6: ‘Blocking’ culverts, not ‘tampering with’.
- ODFW pursuing an experimental approach to ‘leave it to beaver’ is ok. There may need to be some allowance for temperature and nutrients.

- Section on IMST report: Clearly describe the three rule change proposals that are going before the Board of Forestry on 11/22. In the last sentence – DOF, not FPAC, is putting together the recommendation for the Board. FPAC no longer exists.
- At end of Forestry discussion, move ‘falling trees into streams’ above as a suggested ‘strategy’ in bulleted list.
- Add that Hinkle Creek research needs to be considered under ongoing Forestry discussions. ODF is putting together a report on this.
- Page 6 typo, change to ‘Menasha’.
- Page 7 stakeholder comment re: STEP program success. Add Coquille STEP program to clarify that it was not referring to all STEP programs.
- Middle of page 7: splash -dammed, not slash-dammed.

Follow-up from 10/27 meeting: Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, forwarded NOAA’s revised Template for Salmon Recovery Planning, and a memo of Draft Guidelines for Limiting Factors and Threats Assessments to the group prior to today’s meeting. She said the content in the Template has not changed, but the format was revised to simplify the document. The Draft Guidelines document was developed through work with regional TRT chairs and internal NOAA staff. Its purpose is to clarify how to carry out a limiting factors and threats assessment and is intended to be used as a reference for conservation plan development. Rosemary also offered that this is a working document that likely will evolve as it is used. It is being used in other recovery domains throughout the northwest.

NOTE: Rosemary noted that the definition of limiting factors in the Recovery Plan Template should not be used– instead, use the definition as written in the Limiting Factors Draft Guidelines.

Question to the group: Rosemary reminded the group of NOAA’s goal for December 2005 to post a progress report of various recovery plans on its website. What will the product for the coast coho plan look like? “Progress report”, “Drafty Template”, Oregon Plan-Volume II, or...?

Comments from group:

- Will a no-list/list decision affect this report? No, NOAA is committed to reporting on the status of recovery planning in this ESU regardless of that decision.
Action: Louise Solliday, Oregon Governor’s office, provided a biennial report of the Oregon Plan, Volume II. This document will also be linked to NOAA’s website.

Management Actions to Address Limiting Factors: North Coast Populations

(NOTE: this presentation is available electronically) Mark Trenholm, Tillamook Estuaries Partnership (Partnership), began the north coast presentation suggesting that there are a range of watershed councils and groups and each have varying capacities (technical, funding resources, fish). This must be considered when contemplating how the north coast groups take on issues together. The area covers 2,000 square miles, most of which is forest land. Seven different groups are at work in the area.

Limiting factors: The Partnership has identified limiting factors that impact coho in

addition to the state's assessment. As such, they agree with the state's conclusion to use local input to address other factors. A few concerns remain with the state's analysis: its use of a single species approach (instead of watershed health), use of the intrinsic potential model (watershed groups have a range of capacities so the model does not always apply), and not enough emphasis placed on the importance of site specific issues (e.g. water quantity in the Necanicum).

Mark noted that the Partnership is much like a watershed council, in that it is locally driven using local resources/knowledge, and focuses on locally-recognized issues. It is an EPA-administered organization. At the outset, habitat, water quality, flooding and sedimentation were deemed priority concerns for the area. So the Partnership wrote a management plan which looks at coho, chinook, steelhead, cutthroat trout, and other species. The plan set a 10-year target including habitat restoration objectives. It was adopted in 1999.

Stakeholder Team member question: How far along are we with the Plan? The Partnership has acquired property and is now about halfway to its target of 750 acres of wetland. It has addressed 25-30 miles of its 100 upland stream habitat objective. Little upgrading of tide gates has occurred at this point, and a fraction (~150 miles) of the 500 miles of riparian habitat has been addressed.

Question: Do you agree with the Oregon Plan report that water quality is not a primary limiting factor for coho production in this area? The Partnership does believe water quality limits production. Other habitats are deemed important that may not necessarily hold potential for coho production.

Question: If stream complexity remains the primary bottleneck from the state's perspective, and water quality is the Partnership's primary issue, how will you resolve this in terms of prioritizing projects? Mark clarified that while water quality was the original driver for putting the Partnership together, no priority has been set forth for species, habitat component, etc. It is not entirely clear at this point how local groups might be impacted by the state's conservation plan. To the extent that the Partnership's agency partners adopt the plan, then the Partnership will be impacted.

The Partnership developed a woody debris recruitment potential map (which has been used by ODFW – most of the area is state forestland). It overlapped wetlands and tide gate prioritization (the county acquired 375 acres of land, and is currently looking to implement a restoration project).

Mark identified current data needs: Population and distribution data (OWEB is funding a rapid bio-assessment to get at baseline data, measure effectiveness of projects, and prioritize projects); prioritized fish passage barriers (the Partnership is currently prioritizing culverts for replacement); and dissolved oxygen as a limiting factor (data suggests this is so and more research is needed. To address this, the Partnership co-hired, with ODEQ, staff to design a monitoring program).

Examples of Management Actions Being Taken to Address Limiting Factors

Upper Nehalem – Bill Langley offered that the Upper Nehalem was recognized as having the most potential for restoration. The WC did an assessment, and developed an action and work plan. Implementation of the plan is opportunistic in nature.

- *Boxler Creek* – Residents found coho trying to enter the Creek and told the Upper Nehalem WC about it. Partnering with others, including Longview Fibre, a bridge was built to replace culverts, which allowed the brood stock to be recovered and now they spawn in Boxler Creek. Characterization by ODFW as a ‘medium to low intrinsic potential’ area poses a problem: if looking on a 100-year timeframe, this could be considered low potential, and the Nehalem will require long term work. But for the short term, Boxler Creek is a high potential and has become excellent spawning ground for coho.

Questions from Stakeholder Team Members:

- How deep are the pools? They are relatively shallow.
- Does the lake act as winter habitat? Yes.
- Were sediment tests done? What did the creek beds look like before? There are indications that the pool is natural, not a cut out stream.
- Intrinsic potential issues, where do they come from? Conditions below the lake make for a high intrinsic potential, except that the water temperature is too high. The coho use it to spawn and migrate to the ocean. It should be considered for doing management actions. This issue is found elsewhere: temperature impairs the potential of a reach.

Necanicum – David Godsey, Lower Nehalem Watershed Council (reporting for the Necanicum Watershed Council) suggested disagreement with the state’s assessment of the Necanicum. Water quantity is a limiting factor due to water withdrawals by Seaside. However, stream complexity, habitat disconnects, and water quality (from tributaries flowing into the area) are also considered limiting factors.

Mark Trenholm explained that implementation of north coast projects for coho depend on cost-effectiveness, partnerships, fish passage, wetland acquisition, and riparian enhancement. One such project was the acquisition of the Wilson-Trask wetlands, through multi-stakeholder group participation in developing a management plan and a COE feasibility study. Additional funding is now needed for the project. The objective of this project is to improve rearing capacity for coho and provide refugia for outmigrating fish. Potentially, this area could become high quality habitat.

Questions/Comments from Stakeholder Team Members:

- What is the salinity expectation? It depends on flows coming down the system.
- As you move forward with funding requests, suggest recommending net work, similar to what is being done in the Siletz, to study whether fish are staying in the estuary. This would be good information to have.
- What about chum? The Cole Creek project involves removing a dam to address chum. The WC would like to acquire and restore this creek, but it is a long process.

Other Examples: The panel provided information on a number of other areas such as: East Humbug Creek Project - Problems were discovered with five fish passage barriers, so a basin-scale project plan was put together to improve: fish passage, stream complexity, riparian condition, stream nutrient and water quality. The WC partnered with others on a number of actions, including fixing the passage barriers with 3 bridges and two large culverts (Longview Fibre), placing large wood (Longview Fibre), planting native trees (BLM), placing carcasses into the creek (ODFW), and reducing fine sediment.

- Question: What about RM&E? This was also part of the plan – the work has just been completed so now monitoring will occur.
- *God's Valley* – In this key habitat area, the project shows that partnering is crucial in the north coast: With ODFW and other landowners, a number of important habitat projects in the valley have been identified. They include large wood riparian restoration and culvert work. Fish passage barriers are still being discovered as the work continues.
- *Vaughn Creek* – Denise Loughman, Tillamook Bay Watershed Council, shared aspects of this project. A diversion dam blow-out occurred at a golf resort on the creek. The WC was asked for help. They replaced barriers, then moved on to another reach of the Creek, partnering with 14 other groups to replace a tide gate, improve instream channel complexity, increase sinuosity, replace culverts, add a livestock crossing and improve riparian habitat. Four landowners are involved in this work. It is a highly visible project and has allowed the Tillamook Bay WC to grow in capacity.

In summary, Mark Trenholm identified key challenges facing the North Coast watershed and partnership groups: Rural communities and limited capacity, rural communities and ideology (mistrust of the government), limited watershed council support, and future risk (e.g. invasive species, land use). State support is needed for engineering assistance, funding help and more volunteers. The state can also help to build trust with locals, invest in community groups and institutionalize support to give full time work to councils. Finally, there is a need to demonstrate the economic value of salmonids (small rural communities do not quantify impacts of development and benefits of salmon as a resource), support controls on land use and resource extraction, and make conservation/recovery a priority.

ACTION: Mark will share copies of the power point presentation.

Questions/Comments from Stakeholder Team Members:

- What is needed in terms of population growth control? Riparian ordinance is a good example; harvest activities in uplands – e.g. ONC lands. Comment: Nowhere else is there addressed the consequences of development, so why bring it up as a concern here? (Note: this issue will be addressed through the local government presentations on Dec. 8)
- What is your budget for projects: It depends on types of projects we are running – \$800,000 to \$1.2 million for the Tillamook Estuary Partnership; Watershed Councils

range from \$90,000-400,000, plus matched funds.

- There is a need to address long term issues, e.g. riparian protection and changing land uses from extraction industry to private development. This issue will need to be addressed.
- As in other coastal areas, water storage could help address the water quantity issue.

Small Group Discussions: The Stakeholder Team was asked to consider the limiting factors reported for the North Coast populations and how they match up with the Oregon Plan assessment, what future threats need to be addressed in the conservation plan, and which management strategies need to be included in the Coho conservation plan to address the limiting factors and threats listed.

Limiting factors that could be mentioned in the plan: Lack of money to support work of local watershed councils; lack of monitoring/data gaps; human capacity to get the work accomplished; fish passage/stream crossings; water quantity; invasive plants, animals and people; temperature (for Upper Nehalem) as a limiting factor; flooding & floodplain connectivity--lack of habitat in estuaries; Nehalem hatchery strays.

Future threats: Development pressures; land use practices in riparian/floodplain areas/wetlands; global warming/climate change; timber harvest level rates e.g. once same-age timber is ready to harvest, will it all go at once?; increasing demand for water; new invasive species (e.g. New Zealand mud snail); increased runoff from urbanization; ocean conditions; decaying infrastructure (e.g. sewage systems); bacteria in Tillamook.

Suggested Management strategies:

- Consider alternative development strategies in sensitive areas
- Use site-specific development strategies rather than saying no to development entirely – this includes not just people strategies, but also placement of large woody material
- Land acquisition if can demonstrate a positive impact for coho
- Overall improvement of sewage treatment that might affect coho streams
- Consider alternate water supply/pricing structure and storage options for Seaside, Portland, et al. Consider the possibility of a hotel conservation program
- Implement Goal 5 site-specifically
- Engage ODF in recovery planning as landowners– especially Tillamook, Elliott and Clatsop State Foresters
- Change Administrative Rules around fish carcass placement (to allow for placement)
- Get storm water management plans in place in smaller communities
- Look for opportunities to connect floodplains
- Restore tidal influence
- Monitoring (e.g. fish carcasses) to make sure good comes from projects
- Create and support partnerships that share information and education
- Align coho recovery with economic considerations for coastal communities – and communicate this to communities
- Look for increased opportunities through Forest Practices Act and state Forest Management Plans to provide stream complexity

- Employ a business plan approach to management strategies
- Look for ways to increase flexibility in rules relating to wood placement, site-by-site

“Parking Lot Issue” for future discussion: Role of development in floodplain areas.

Public comment:

- It is important to realize that watershed councils and other groups cannot engage in direct political activities.
- Re: state forest – management plans are a staggered process, but Swiss Needle Cast logging is an issue that could contribute to warming of streams.
- Need to anticipate pulses of large wood falling into streams otherwise wood will be taken out for safety reasons. Build structures to be able to support that.
- How are bacteria in Tillamook a limiting factor for coho? Bacteria is a good indicator of other water quality issues. Be more specific with what limiting factors impact coho. Bacteria issues in shell fish lead to the Tillamook Estuary Partnership, not coho.
- Single-species approach was considered a limiting factor, why was it not mentioned in the small groups? Concern about single-species management was raised as it relates to watershed council work plans and the conservation plan. The approach has a potential for future biases in watershed council work, but is not a “limiting factor” for coho.

Comment from the watershed councils to the group: Make sure we have flexibility to do site-by-site management strategies. It was noted that while it is possible to get permits, they are very difficult to obtain. So essentially, site-by-site permits are nonexistent. (See management strategy above).

Resource User Perspective – Focus: Agriculture

Shawn Reiersgaard, Tillamook Creamery, said there has been a consolidation in the number of dairies along the north coast, but in the recent years both the number of dairies and the number of cows in the area has remained constant. Tillamook County produces one third of the milk in Oregon and is recognized as producing the best quality milk in the nation. There are 14,000 acres of agricultural land in Tillamook County. Currently, 12,900 acres are required for manure application. This finite agricultural land base limits the number of cows on the north coast.

The Tillamook County Creamery Association’s (TCCA) involvement in the coho recovery effort stems from a long standing commitment to environmental stewardship and a commitment made to the Governor regarding Measure 38 to manage streamside fencing.

TCCA’s environmental goals were set before coho became an issue, and include:

- 1) Keeping cows out of the state’s waters (by funding materials for streamside fencing, and by promoting management practices that minimize cattle ‘loitering’ in the state’s waters);
- 2) Restoring riparian areas;
- 3) Keeping manure out of the state’s waters (sponsoring manure management seminars, working with OSU extension and NRCS, funding a buffer width study,

- requiring CAFO permits and nutrient management plans from member dairies);
- 4) Maintaining a functional agricultural land base (through a consistent policy of no net loss of farmland and opposing any legislation to change land use from agricultural land); and
- 5) Improving fish passage (through a grant from DEQ the Association conducted a culvert survey on the agricultural portion of the Tillamook Bay watershed; also funding culvert replacement projects).

Shawn noted that agricultural land is very valuable in Tillamook County and thus it is difficult to get landowners to participate in conservation easements. However, landowners are often more willing to participate in a voluntary restoration project if their loss of useable agricultural land is offset by the installation of fence that benefits their operation.

Impacts to Coho: Although TCCA's environmental actions predate the coho crisis, those actions that implement TCCA's environmental goals are the same actions that have been identified as necessary to address limiting factors for coho. Shawn highlighted an example of an action taken by TCCA at the cheese production facility: TCCA instigated and implemented a project that cools the water from their onsite wastewater treatment plant by using a cooling tower and discharging the water to a wetland. The wetland further tempers the water so that when it finally reaches the Wilson River the water is cool and has no impact on the coho's use of the river.

In summary, the dairy industry has changed the landscape along the north coast. The dairy industry plays a significant role in the local and state economy. Dairy farmers are committed to environmental stewardship and that stewardship has an effect on coho.

Questions/Comments from Stakeholder Team Members:

- What levels of financial contributions come from TCAA? Roughly \$30,000-55,000 per year is contributed for fence building. Most farms in the area are now fenced.
- Has TCAA also done riparian planting, along with fences? Over time, will they provide large wood complexity? Riparian planting is part of each project, but typically is done by others. Most all of the riparian planting is on agricultural lowlands and does not generate large wood.
- Do you use the CREP program? Due to the high value of agricultural land, working dairies do not use this program. The same is true for the wetland reserve program.
- Future question: What will the impacts be on quality, land price, etc. with the new factory in Boardman? Although the diet of Tillamook and Boardman dairy cows will differ, the quality expectation for the milk is the same.
- Are you seeing a loss of agricultural land? Impacts of Measure 37? Loss of agricultural land is not yet happening but if/when it does, the sustainability of a local dairy industry is jeopardized. Because the Creamery provides living wage jobs, 70% of the houses in Tillamook are owned year round by homeowners; Shawn emphasized that if the dairy industry were not viable in this community he would expect a shift to 70% of the homes in Tillamook becoming second homes. At this point measure 37 has not impacted the Creamery or the Association, but it remains a concern.

Tim Stevenson, Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA), reported on ODA's programs addressing coastal coho issues. While state agricultural land is small along the coast, it is significant. As an industry, ODA wants to make sure it is responsive to the needs of the state. ODA contributes in the following ways:

- The CAFO (Confined Animal Feeding Operations) program has been expanded, and provides educational outreach and coordination with other partners.
- Pesticides – review and enhancement of labels when necessary; regulation of commercial pesticide applicants.
- Weeds and Invasive Species Program – this is a priority for fish enhancement, watershed health and wildlife.
- SB 1010 agricultural Water Quality Management Area Plans – are meant to prevent pollution from agricultural activities and meet standards. The program is not prescriptive, but rather watershed and outcome-based; it is both voluntary and regulatory. Currently, all coastal areas have 1010 Plan's associated with them.
- Relationships with the SWCD and agricultural services partnership (provide education and outreach particularly for 'horses and mud', receive advice regarding program implementation, assist landowners with management plans, provide technical assistance on conservation practices and management systems).

Current SB 1010 implementation activities include: Plan reviews, compliance investigations, program evaluations, outreach to landowners, and technical assistance. Basin plans can be found on the ODA website, <http://egov.oregon.gov/ODA/>.

Question: How do TMDL's fit in to SB 1010? When there is a SB 1010 review, it gets appended to TMDL's to show what the industry is doing to meet water quality standards. A specific riparian area requirement was added to the TMDL process.

Tim provided examples of agricultural land that has undergone 1010 projects, particularly in the riparian area. He noted that 2,100 acres are enrolled in the CREP program on the coast (in Coos, Curry, Umpqua, Lane, Lincoln, and Columbia Counties).

- Question: What about land being too valuable to enroll in CREP? How do we modify that situation? Usually landowners enroll when agricultural practices are not working for them. Louise Solliday offered that OWEB has negotiated a higher CREP rate with Farm Services Agency to alleviate some of this, so there is flexibility with the CREP program. The message about the benefits to enrolling in the CREP program needs to be shared with landowners in some areas, e.g. Lincoln County.
- Question: At the end of a CREP lease, what happens? The landowner regains control. Potentially, land could revert back to pasture, but the landowner might change his/her ideas about landownership and may not want to go back. Providing this flexibility has made for a more attractive CREP agreement, and more positive actions.
- Question: What percentage of land is enrolled in the CREP program? Do not know but do know that many landowners are stewards without being involved in state or federal incentives programs. A cultural shift is taking place. Tim emphasized that changes have been affected on the ground not through civil penalties, but other means.

Small Group Discussions: Stakeholder Team members were asked to consider what agriculture practices are supporting or adding to the limited factors and threats for this region, and what management strategies should be included in the Coho conservation plan.

Limiting factors and threats – Riparian management; agricultural lands effect on connectivity of wetland/floodplain/estuary for over-wintering; tide control & diking; increase in nutrients and organic matter can be a limiting factor (e.g. dissolved oxygen); channelization; summer irrigation and effects on water quantity; invasive species via agricultural practices and feed; and herbicides/pesticides

Agricultural management strategies:

- Provide adequate funding and support to make CREP more attractive
- Improve incentive programs
- Go beyond ‘prohibited conditions’ to increase effective practices and monitor effectiveness of SB 1010
- Enforce CAFO
- Protect/restrict farmland from residential conversion
- Look for opportunities to impact coho wetlands via dairy practices beyond fencing – incentives?
- Create incentive programs for hobby farms to increase ecological practices

Comments from Stakeholder Team Members:

- It is impressive how many marshes and wetlands remain in the area, as a result of good planning.
- An observation was made that there is no requirement for a provision of stream buffers/large wood rules and regulations for the agricultural industry. (Tim offered that riparian rules are included in every SB 1010 management plan. He forwarded those rules to the team after today’s meeting.) Still, requirements for agriculture are different than for forestry.

Tuesday, November 15

User Perspectives: Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians

Stan Van de Wetering, Siletz Tribe, provided a tribal perspective on what actions have been taken to address limiting factors and threats facing Coastal coho. He noted that many of the Tribe’s projects are not completed today, and many do not focus on coho. A brief history of the Siletz Tribe: By 1930 Siletz land had been eliminated. The Tribe was re-recognized by Congress in the 1980’s. A treaty was signed between the state and the Tribe that included a ‘Consent Decree’ which said the Tribe would not raise issues of hunting and fishing. Because of this, the Tribe does not have treaty tribe co-management status. This has allowed the Tribe to focus its own work without formal consultation with the Federal and State governments. Enduring a long history of mistrust, the Tribe and the state have been working to rebuild their relationship, and have in recent times engaged with one another more frequently and positively.

The Tribe has chosen not to be actively involved in assessing coho populations or limiting factors specific to coho, but they do believe the fish will continue to be in danger and need to be addressed. They track the state's policies and make decisions based on how the policies may affect the Tribe. The Siletz' interests are in clean water and air; appropriate limits on fisheries harvests; support of ocean and freshwater conditions; and support of Tribal families.

Stan highlighted a number of RM&E projects that the Siletz Tribe is involved with:

- Nutrient cycling
- Algal communities and the food chain
- Herbicide research and monitoring related to the TMDL process (the Tribe is currently preparing for a TMDL process in the Mid-Coast)
- Suspended sediment research and monitoring
- Stream temperature research and monitoring
 - Using Forward Looking Infrared (FLIR) photography, the Tribe studied differences in temperatures on various reaches, and used the model for predicting how changes to the landscape (e.g. growth of or cutting of trees) might influence temperatures.
 - The Tribe is also looking at stress levels of fish with shifting stream temperatures.
- Stream flow research and monitoring (studying decay of streams, etc. the Tribe focused mostly on municipal water withdrawals and how to best plan for growth.)
- Patterns of juvenile salmonid use in the mainstem Siletz and its tributaries – how different species use the mainstem and how they move to/from tributaries.
- Estuarine research and monitoring (funded through NOAA and in partnership with USFWS, the US Forest Service, and the Mid-Coast WC, looking at how well restoration projects are working, specifically how fish are using large wood in the estuaries).

Questions and Comments from Stakeholder Team Members:

- How many tribal members make up the Siletz? 4,002. Does the Tribe have a catch and release policy opinion? No, this has not been discussed. Generally if an action keeps populations from dropping, the Tribe will support it. And, there are a wide range of opinions within the Tribe.
- What about pinnipeds? Stan does not know of data that shows the historical relationship between the Siletz and pinnipeds.
- Is there data that supports that the fish use tide gates? Recent data, yes. The data shows, generally, that fish reside behind tide gates, there is limited daily migration, and they tend to grow well – 90% increase in size of smolts that are associated with the same watershed that went out that spring. It seems to offer a beaver dam type of habitat.
ACTION: Stan will share a report on this tide gate research when it is available.
- How many smolts are seen in the Siletz area? We are finding an average of 100 times more juveniles per cubic meter in large wood habitats opposed to all other habitats.
- What happens to coho in the mainstem? The fish appear to do well through the summer period, move out in late summer/early fall, and then it is unknown what happens to

them. There is a site in the Drift Creek portion of the estuary where there is a beaver dam where the fish over-winter and migrate out the following year.

- Are other coastal tribes directing their efforts at coho? Stan clarified that he is not answering for other tribes. He does know that the Coos, Lower Umpqua, Coquilles, Cow Creek, Grand Ronde, and Siletz each have one wildlife biologist, and one fish biologist. With relatively little funding, not much can be done. The Coquille Tribe has put forth a concerted effort to do an assessment and restoration plan for coho and want to be involved with this conservation planning process. Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, noted she is working with the Tribe to link up with this project.

Stan also discussed the Rock Creek watershed project. The Tribe bought the land around a state hatchery that was no longer used and dug up raceways to make ponds. In 1998 the Creek began seeing fish but survival was known to be limited. So it was used as an acclimation site where fish were also incubated for awhile. The Tribe built a spawning channel to rear the fish in the ponds to full term. The Tribe is currently working with ODFW to improve spawning habitat upstream to get the fish into the ponds and allow them to rear until the following year. In recent years, up to 7,000 fish have been produced. The goals are 10,000 fish, a produced fish that has the least impact on wild fish, and increased contributions to traditional tribal fishing harvests in Rock Creek.

Large group discussions: Stakeholder team members commented on areas for additional/continued RM&E, and suggested strategies for moving forward:

RM&E

- Support the expansion of innovative monitoring and research, e.g. underwater cameras
- Develop better stress analyses that can be done
- Tide gate studies – request that the tribe share this information ASAP
- Continue and do more of the dike analysis currently underway
- Need to better understand: Are salt/freshwater areas equally important for coho rearing habitat or is one more important and needing extra support?

As a strategy

- Need a mechanism to share and coordinate the breadth of data/work being done
 - Get to wider audiences (Use the state-wide data base being developed and compiled. It does not include research projects, just monitoring. Find a way to link this in.)
- Use forward looking infrared (FLIR) techniques for studies; this method gives a lot of information, quickly.
 - When data is collected, someone will need to analyze it—keep this in mind as more data is being contemplated for collection.
- Follow-up on the tribe's Little Rock Creek work (wood chips) to help make future decisions for hatchery efforts.
- Need more (strategic) effectiveness monitoring to support adaptive management
- Use a life-cycle monitoring stream to experiment with habitat changes to study effects more specifically on the population and eliminate 'noise' in other monitoring settings.
 - Ed Bowles responded that this would require a shift in management, away

from broader-scale applications. And agreed it is a good approach to consider.

- Look for ways to increase lowland backwater. Study more on tide gates.
- Need to design ways to communicate the overall effectiveness of all coho efforts to the public if there is a desire to continue coho/salmon conservation efforts beyond 2014.

Question to ODFW: Where are we in completing research to understand how well watershed councils are performing to support juvenile fish?

Answer: Effectiveness monitoring is an issue, and intra-state, not just on the coast. Monitoring will occur at the population scale first, then there will be a closer look at site-specific areas. The state will make educated guesses for now and then wait and see how the fish respond. ODFW is doing sensitivity analyses of effectiveness of habitat parameters at this point. It was noted that OWEB has approved funding for implementation of broad-based effectiveness monitoring, an example of which is on Green River. Effectiveness monitoring of large wood placement has shown a doubling of capacity of that stream to rear fish. *See strategy above.*

Question to the State: If, after 10 years of monitoring, we find coho have/have not come back, will funding continue? What is the parameter?

Answer: Measure 66 funds are the cornerstone for implementing the Oregon Plan. Voters will have an up or down vote on whether funding should continue in 2014. So, it will be important to express the value of watershed stewardship so society can support it even at a level that it competes with other needs, e.g. education. Across stakeholder lines, there needs to be demonstration that the Oregon Plan has value, e.g. in moving away from an ESA listing, providing healthy populations and more fisheries, etc. There is also a need to demonstrate that monitoring is important. We need a good story in 2011 so we can continue in 2014, when the measure is put back on the ballot. (It was also suggested that we focus on the fish, making the most of what we have now.) *See strategy above.*

Desired Status for Coastal Coho: What is the desired status the group would like to see represented in the state's conservation plan for coastal Coho?

Kevin Goodson, ODFW, suggested that the goals for developing desired status were based on the agreed-on stakeholder principles for coastal coho conservation planning. He provided a handout of his power point presentation that included a list of the principles.

The goals with desired status are to:

- Identify a level of abundance and productivity for coho that provides economic, cultural and ecological benefits.
- Explore what has been proposed and what has been seen or estimated.
- Decide with your constituents what is reasonable.
- Decide with your fellow stakeholders what is reasonable.
- Adaptive management allows for reconsideration of desired status goal.

A comparison of the three options (ODFW, Hoffman, and Lovell) with current and TRT historic numbers was shared. Stakeholder Team members provided comments and asked questions (summarized in bullets below):

- Why is ODFW proposing a desired status that puts some rivers below the current

status? The analysis is based on an average full-seeding for the population, and also represents a desired status during the worst of ocean conditions.

- What are the TRT historic numbers based on? Intrinsic potential habitat in each population and assumptions about how productive areas would be without land management constraints. Also they looked at historic records, cannery records, and ‘straying’ in relation to other fish. Generally, the numbers are pre-settlement.
- Uncertainty exists in regards to assumptions made in the models. The models are based on best information and our best educated guess. Still, concerns remain for some stakeholders with the concept of intrinsic potential. ODFW responded that the numbers shared today are a first cut to see if the options were in the same range. ODFW recognizes that their numbers are indeed an educated guess. Historic numbers too are a best guess. A suggestion was made that ODFW be transparent about what they do not know. There is not necessarily enough information to make an educated guess. ODFW also noted that intrinsic potential is NOT part of ODFW’s desired status equation (but IS part of the historic scenario).

ACTION: Rosemary Furfey/NOAA will talk more with Native Fish Society and others interested about the TRT’s historical population report.

- Showing desired status scenarios side by side with historic numbers might diminish the important realistic ambitions of what we are trying to accomplish. On the other hand, it shows a trajectory of movement toward that goal, and shows that we are moving in the right direction. Concerns were raised about how we convey our message to the public so they understand and can support the desired status. One suggestion was for the group to address how to craft a message to the public after we have decided on a desired status.
- Will there be discussions about allocations to the various populations? Yes, so management strategies can be focused in each area.
- Habitat has changed over time, so comparing historic, current, and future status does not work. There is support for showing trends of movement in the process, and historic numbers as a reference point.
 - ODFW comment: Historic numbers were included strictly for reference, not as a desired status option.

ACTION: Clarify this on the web and elsewhere if the numbers are more widely distributed. Separate out current and historic numbers from the three desired status options to distinguish them from each other.

- We risk losing legitimacy by showing that we are far from historic and have not been doing the right thing for the fish. It was also noted that some stakeholder team members believe it may be possible to reach historic levels.
- Red flag is raised about ‘historic TRT estimates’: The Native Fish Conservation Policy work group agreed in their process not to try to get back to those estimates. Natural production at historic levels is still not enough to support the various fisheries. This suggests we may need to bring hatchery fish into our targeted levels if we intend to support fisheries and Oregon’s economy.
- What is the timeframe for getting to desired status?
- Where do the counts come from? Smolts out of the gravel, not released from the

hatchery – i.e. ‘naturally produced fish’.

- Show the public where and how their efforts have made a difference. Choosing the number ultimately will give us a chance to show success, but will not change what we are doing. So, when we reach ODFW’s goal, we celebrate. Then, we move on to the next level and when we reach the next goal, we celebrate. And so on. We need to look at what it would take to meet each of these goals, and also look at trade-offs.
- The ODFW targets support the concept of adaptive management: If on the ground work results in movement toward the targets, it will signify to us to keep going. If not, we will reassess and change our focus. If we reach our target, we can then reassess and decide if we want to do more. ODFW responded that there will be reviews and updates of the plan.
- Look at the desired status options as various benchmarks, the two ends being current and historic. Don’t focus on numbers; instead, look at what they represent – ecosystem health, nutrient cycling, etc. The Lovell option is a 100-year plan. ODFW’s might be the 20-year plan. Build in steps along the way to capture progress. Use numbers as a way to gauge how we are doing, but don’t make them the target.
- Is there a different scientific way to allocate among populations without conveying ‘winners’ and ‘losers’? Meaning, in some places there is a lot to do and others, not as much.
- Based the goals on a marine survival number.
- Each of the models exhibits flaws with certain populations. Adjustments will need to be made for each of them, so don’t weigh the options against one another.

Kevin Goodson suggested that if the disagreement about the numbers is due to how much ODFW relies on habitat in their proposal, the group might agree on desired status as ‘managing populations at 80% of full seeding under worst ocean conditions’.

Questions/Comments from Stakeholder Team Members:

- How did ODFW come up with ‘80% of full seeding’? The agency recognizes that Amendment 13 is based largely on a seeding level, which is not fully understood. However, in Amendment 13 there is a matrix, of which the top row shows the sub-aggregate, at the highest level, at 75% of full seeding to get the highest levels of harvest. ODFW tweaked the number up to 80% for the desired status to get to an even number, roughly 100,000 fish. Also, the intent is to make full use of the habitat in all watersheds, even during the poorest of ocean conditions.
- There is apprehension, from a legal perspective, with not fully defining full seeding. Is ODFW leaving this open to interpretation? No, ODFW will need to define full seeding, and, acknowledges that at this point they do not know, that understanding needs to be further refined. Is full seeding based on current availability, or on what we think we want for full seeding? Should/does it also tie in a productivity component? The seeding level could change, because capacity might change. It will depend on habitat improvement.
- Does ODFW intend to try to improve the situation for coho, even if we meet our goal? Yes. Regardless of what we do, there will be ups and downs. As long as ODFW

maintains a goal to improve, we will be moving in the right direction. It is ok not to have a specific number to define success; but if a bar is set, it should be realistic.

- If the recruitment model approach is used, categorize watersheds into ‘like’ systems, e.g. the lakes systems, basins with a lot of potential for more lowlands and marsh development, etc. Set different targets for each type. Restrict use of the model to those basins that the model is best designed for, and use different, more appropriate, models in other areas.
- Change the objective: let ODFW take its assessment out to local watershed councils and ask them what they think they can accomplish over the next ‘x’ number of years. Then build the number of where we want to be, driven by watershed council input into how limiting factors will be addressed. Build recommendations on limiting factor types, and then go to watershed councils to talk about what can be done. (This has been an on-going discussion amongst watershed councils.) Implement action plans first. These ideas are in line with OWEB’s approach to a bottom-up approach, by allowing the watershed councils to do their work based on site-specific needs. Encourage action plans to be built that are realistic, and opportunistic.

NOTE: ODFW responded that the state cannot punt the conservation plan to the watershed councils. Part of the maturation of the Oregon Plan is looking to address, on an ESU-wide scale, what is ailing the fish. The suggested process would not help prioritize limited funding and where it needs to go to be most effective. We now need to make difficult decisions about where to put our resources to do what is best for coho. Treating everything equally would be a disservice. Another perspective was shared from watershed council members: There is a need for ESU-wide guidance, and we also need to look system-by-system at potentials and how well potentials can be realized without requiring extraordinary events or breaking the budget, and then prioritize actions. Ed Bowles responded that we need a process and scientific basis for making those decisions.

- Can we use the lakes systems as a model for a goal or desired status, (biological and social parameters) and work backward to look at what it takes to get there? And what will be required of other systems? This would meet both a top down and bottom up approach.
- Is there a guidance document to look at what is meant by recovery? What are our goal posts, on a watershed by watershed basis? Ask what, realistically, each watershed area is capable of doing that will meet the overall conservation/recovery effort?
ACTION: The stakeholder team members asked the facilitator to put in writing the agreements reached on desired status, to take back and discuss with their constituents. (*See italics below.*)
- Next step suggestion: Break into regional watershed groups and ask: Can we set goals? What do we know? What do we need to know to be able to set goals to distill what is available on a local basis to put into decision-making? Another suggestion –allow watershed councils to receive guidance from the state on how watershed councils can best do their work. Ed Bowles responded that the process does not necessarily need to follow one or the other line of thinking. The intent is to provide guidance to the conservation/recovery process. The recovery plan will set ESU-wide sideboards, and watershed councils (and many other partners) will implement the plan. The ODFW

desired status is a population-based number. The other options are ESU-wide. ODFW's expressed hope is that as a group we can agree on what we want out of a worst-ocean year. Do we want smolts to remain relatively constant (as many as possible)? Or, smolts plus additional fisheries, or... other ideas?

- Caution against referring to this as NOAA's ESA recovery process. Maintain that this is a state conservation plan. Response: NOAA and the state intend to work in coordination with each other so that the plan meets both the goals of the state and ESA requirements, and so that the plan is community-based and locally driven.
- Suggestion: Put the statutory definition up for all to see so we do not spend time discussing/debating required key components of the plan (e.g. gauge on bad ocean conditions, include abundance, diversity, 'naturally produced', etc).
- Suggestion: 100,000 fish is probably realistic for now as a minimum/baseline. Use this number to set limiting factors, then determine which watershed councils need to address what. And finally, support them in their work
- There appears to be agreement about the need for overall ESU-wide guidance, with input from local watersheds. Cautiously support 80% of full seeding as a starting point, but do not support the other numbers included in ODFW's proposed desired status.
- How are watershed councils coordinating with ODFW? What authority does ODFW have with respect to watershed councils? Who decides what the limiting factors are? ODFW has a seat on the Mid-Coast WC, habitat fish biologists design and implement restoration projects in cooperation with the WC (funded through the WC), a WC liaison does project development, etc. So ODFW and the Mid-Coast are closely linked. WC's also partner with timber companies, US Forest Service, BLM and others. This is much the same in the north coast and south coast. Most watershed councils on the coast work very well with the agencies.
- What series of management actions can/will it take to double the number of current smolts? It is possible to attain –the numbers in 'current' status are artificially lower than what is really going on, as there was unused spawning habitat. How long will it take? In terms of watershed councils setting goals (determining desired status): as was mentioned before, capacity varies greatly from group to group. We are on a continuum of top down-bottom up in the Oregon plan process. The conservation plan is another step along the continuum, to inform local groups and help local efforts be even more strategic.
- None of the stakeholder team members fully understand the numbers. If not clarified somehow, this could pose a problem for everyone when the plan goes out to the public.

For today, the group agreed: *There is a need for a state-wide, ESU level perspective to provide guidance to local implementers (e.g. watershed councils and others). Guidance should come in the form of reference numbers, current status of the fish and goals. Continued assessment of limiting factors and implementation measures must continue at the local level with coordination with the state.*

Questions remaining: What is/are the timeframe(s)? How should the timeframe be articulated? What are the goals?

Stakeholder comments:

- I need to understand the model enough to say it is reasonable and one that will support adaptive management to allow new information to be added when available.
- Need definition of full capacity. Want to make sure we are not moving backwards, so desired status should include ‘no net loss’ of full capacity as defined in the 1990’s. In other words, don’t go below actual numbers observed and don’t reduce ‘capacity’ to below what it is now. Avoid ratcheting down of habitat. There is a lack of trust with ODFW that the target number will not continue declining. Is there a way to ensure that this target will not go down? Put language in that says there is a commitment to *avoid backsliding from assessment*. (See below.)
- This plan is not the place for social commentary on land use decisions. We need to put a plan in place that we can balance with other social decisions and still reach our goals.
- Do not change the goal if you don’t meet it. Rather, say you didn’t meet the goal – be honest.
- “Full capacity” is based on current spawning capacity of the system. Full capacity is not being fully realized right now. (This needs to be further clarified, by the December meeting.)

Next steps: Stakeholder Team members agreed on the following components of desired status, which the state will take back and refine for further discussion/decision at the December meeting.

- The group is looking for 80% full capacity under bad ocean with no backsliding from the status achieved in the state’s assessment
- ODFW will continue to refine the model and numbers at the population level
 - They will treat the lake systems differently than currently modeled because they are different than other stream settings
- Full capacity will be defined (current spawning capacity – 2005)
- A timeframe for the effort will also be defined

Additionally, the group agreed that:

- Uncertainty exists with regards to assumptions made in models
 - The models were based on best information and best educated opinion
- Historic levels have been used as a reference point, not as a target.
 - Caution: Pre-settlement numbers may be viewed as highly unrealistic: if used in desired status, will need care in description.
- To clarify, ODFW will separate TRT, current and desired status levels (graphically)

ODFW requested specific help on borderline independent/dependent populations, and how to deal with dependent populations. The revised desired status will be further discussed at the meeting on December 8 in Roseburg.

Draft Chapter for Conservation Plan: Mid-Coast

Bob Buckman, ODFW, presented a rough draft of the Mid-Coast chapter of the conservation plan. Setting the context, he noted that the priorities for coho are:

1) independent populations to achieve and maintain pass+ (a level of health beyond

viability);and 2) to achieve desired status, smaller basins with consistent late spawners and corresponding juveniles are of equal importance for habitat improvement and protection. Also, consider co-occurring fish while managing for coho: fall Chinook, winter steelhead, cutthroat trout, other salmonids, lamprey, and other non-game fish.

Limiting factors in the Mid-Coast were due to: High harvest in the 1970-80's, low smolt survival in the 1990's, and freshwater habitat constraints today.

Habitat

Based on watershed council and user group presentations at the Stakeholder Team meetings, ODFW included the following habitat limiting factors in the chapter: channel complexity or winter habitat; summer rearing; connectivity/passage for juveniles and adults; limiting life stage can vary (floods and droughts, e.g.); multiple life stages; other areas remain uncertain, e.g. lakes.

Habitat strategies include: protecting existing habitat, advising and coordinating with local groups, and pursuing additional voluntary measures. Restoration projects are opportunistic and should utilize the Mid-Coast WC 6th filed watershed assessment approach when possible.

Question: The Mid-coast is almost half federal forest land. Is there any study on big flood effects on these streams? Likely yes, but Bob was not aware of that data. There are also state and private forest lands in the Mid-Coast. Beyond what is being done, ODFW suggests focusing on full flood plain areas and managing for coho and using incentives and voluntary actions to support a cost-effective approach. Also, artificially add large wood.

Agricultural areas are limited in the Mid-Coast. To address limiting factors, ODFW recommends looking for high intrinsic potential areas and, where farmers are willing, re-establish floodplain connectivity.

To address land use in low water areas, minimize any new buildings so the focus can be on coho habitat.

To address water quantity issues, find alternatives to direct stream withdrawals, e.g. Rocky Creek Reservoir.

Beavers supply good coho habitat, so coordinate with landowners and trappers to leave them in these areas. Also additional research on management of beavers is recommended.

Nutrients-carcass placement is beneficial but benefits may be limited relative to other habitat factors.

Connectivity and good juvenile passage is most beneficial for fish.

ACTION: Add this 'Parking Lot Issue' to the RM&E list for further discussion.

Harvest

Harvest has been reduced, although some harvest is allowed through Amendment 13. Additional ocean harvest constraints exist due to other listed species. From ODFW's perspective, the potential exists to open more harvest opportunities in the Siletz, Yaquina, Alsea and Siuslaw. There is a need for more habitat, not more spawners in the Mid-coast. This speaks to the potential for increased harvest opportunities in the future.

Hatcheries are no longer a broad risk factor. In the Salmon River, hatchery coho are the key limiting factor. ODFW recommends either doing something different with the hatchery program, or ending it. ODFW recommends against hatchery coho smolt releases elsewhere unless for research.

Question: What is the potential for restoring habitat? There is some potential. Research ideas include studying the life history, habitat use and adult contribution of juveniles that migrate out of the tributaries; determine juvenile coho distribution and habitat use in coastal lakes; better inventory and understanding of high intrinsic potential habitats; better understanding of predator impacts.

Finally, ODFW is seeing a positive response to local work; generally we are on the right course for habitat, etc. Bob noted that this area needs some refinements in management to improve already good work.

Next steps: ODFW requested feedback from the stakeholder team on the Mid-Coast chapter before the next meeting. Bob requested that any major concerns in the chapter, be sent to him by Friday, 11/18 (or as soon as possible) so he can flesh out other parts of the plan that do not cause concern and discuss concern areas at the next meeting.

Next Meeting, December 8, Roseburg

The Stakeholder Team will discuss any concerns with the Mid-Coast chapter, continue desired status discussions, begin reviewing the South Coast draft chapter and hear from municipalities (including ports). NOAA will share a draft progress report for the recovery plan with group before the next meeting.

Other Items

- Dan Knoll was introduced as the new ODFW outreach coordination for Oregon Plan activities, including the work of the coast coho stakeholder team process. Most recently, Dan did public information work with ODOT. He said he is looking forward to learning from this group.

Suggestion: A hard copy of the presentations at future meetings would be helpful.

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 ‘**in 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 protection? 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.

- **ACTION:** 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 will change with changes to habitat.

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

Stakeholder Team Comments/Questions:

- 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.

OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT
Stakeholder Team Meeting
The Hallmark Inn and Resort, Newport
Facilitator's Meeting Summary
January 20, 2006

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), Les Helgeson (Native Fish Society), Cindy Heller (STEP), Paul Heikkila (OSU Sea Grant Program), Wayne Hoffman (Mid-Coast Watershed Council), Bill Moshofsky (Save the Salmon Coalition), Lisa Phipps (Mayor Rockaway Beach), Dennis Richey (NW Steelheaders-Oregon Anglers), Blake Rowe (Longview Fibre Company), Johnny Sundstrom, (Oregon Assoc. of Conservation Districts), Terry Thompson (Assoc. of Oregon Counties), Bill Yocum (Freeman Rock, Inc.)

Resource Advisors:

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

Alternates and Technical Resources: Chris Bayham (AOC), Keith Braun (ODFW), Bob Buckman (ODFW), Jim Buisman (Lincoln County Public Works), Liz Dent (ODF), Mike

Gray (ODFW), Eddie Huckins (Lincoln SWCD), Dave Jarrett (WRD), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Dave Loomis (ODFW), Justin Mills (Frank Orth and Associates/TRT), Jo Morgan (ODF), Jim Muck (ODFW), Jim Paul (ODF), Johan Sanchez (US Forest Service), Tom Shafer (OWEB), Matt Spangler (Lincoln County Planning Dept.), Tim Stevens (ODA), Heather Stout (NOAA-TRT), Tom Wainwright (NOAA), Ray Wilkeson, OFIC

Other Interested Parties: Neil Coenen (public), Joel Gallob (Newport Times), John Raef (Newport City Council), Rusty Whitney (public), Chuck Willer (Coast Range Association)

Facilitation Team: Donna Silverberg and Robin Harkless

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Feedback on hatchery issues	Stakeholder Team to ODFW	February 20
Feedback on North coast and Lakes pops draft	Stakeholder Team	February 23
Send insights on NOAA consultation with COE on dredging projects	Rosemary Furfey to stakeholder team	February 23
Send NOAA letter of intent to continue Essential Fish Habitat consultations	Rosemary to stakeholder team	February 23
Revise stakeholder process timeline documents with suggested changes	Kevin Goodson	Prior to February 23
In-depth meeting on recruit models	ODFW and interested stakeholders	February 7
Send additional information on county road system improvements	Jim Buisman to stakeholder team	February 23
Send comments on TRT product to Kevin Goodson	Stakeholder Team	March 10

Comments on December 8 Notes

- Question about ‘Parking Lot’ issues: When will they be addressed? Some of the issues, e.g. hatchery, will be discussed at future meetings. Other issues will need to be incorporated into the process – the Steering Committee will discuss how to incorporate/address the remaining issues into a future meeting (see ‘Process/Plan for Coho Team Project’ item below).

Latest Tidegate Research – Rosemary Furfey, NOAA, provided reference materials on tidegate research, per questions raised at the last stakeholder team meeting. She noted that the shorter of the two articles on tidegate design draws from research conducted by the Coos Bay Watershed Council.

NOAA Listing Decision – Rosemary reported that an ESA ‘no-list’ decision for coastal coho was announced by NOAA on January 17. Rosemary provided materials: a press

release, Q&A, and the listing decision language that will appear later in the week in the federal registered notice (the actual notice is on NOAA's web page).

NOAA will continue to work with the state to produce a coho conservation plan and to participate with the stakeholder team via Rosemary and Jeff Lockwood's attendance at meetings and the TRT. The Magnuson Stevens Act still applies on the coast, and through this mandate, NOAA will continue Essential Fish Habitat consultations with co-managers to support habitat conservation. Finally, a coho progress report will be updated based on the listing decision. It will be posted on NOAA's web site within the next two weeks.

ACTION: Rosemary will share a letter with the stakeholder team expressing NOAA's intent to continue engaging in Essential Fish Habitat consultations.

Question: What is the status of MOU re: Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Funds (PCSRF)?

Answer-NOAA is engaged in internal discussions and will try to revise the MOU to support and continue restoration activities for coho. Discussions are ongoing. Louise Solliday, Governor's Office, offered that the appropriations to the state will continue to be used for the coast. What is the likelihood of that happening with all other listed species in Oregon and the cut in PCSRF funds to Oregon? The cut does not affect the current '05-07 biennium. If funds are not restored, the FY '07-09 budget would be affected. This could impact implementation of the conservation plan. However, it was noted that lottery revenues are up significantly, which also support recovery efforts in the state. Louise suggested that we keep moving forward for now, recognizing that decisions will need to be made later depending on future funding realities.

Is Oregon coastal coho an ESA candidate species? No, the ESA no longer applies to Oregon coastal coho. Southern Oregon/North California coast coho, starting at Cape Blanco, are still listed as threatened and will continue to be. But they are a different ESU.

Process/Plan Schedule for Coho Team Project – Kevin Goodson presented a process plan outline, in the spirit of keeping the group apprised of what commitments the state is asking of them. He requested that the team continue its involvement reviewing the draft plan, and meet every two months for discussion and clarification of the draft documents, as the state is now in 'high gear' developing the conservation plan.

Phase 4 was introduced as the 'Reviewing' phase. Consultant Paul Hoobyar crafted a draft background chapter, and Bob Buckman, Mike Gray and Kevin are drafting the other sections of the conservation plan. They hope to present draft background, current status, and adaptive management process chapters at the February 23 meeting. The draft will emphasize the need for future stakeholder involvement in terms of future planning, implementation, and adaptive management.

Questions and Comments from Stakeholder Team Members

- When will we have the 2004 numbers? The 2004 numbers are around 197,000 (ODFW is continuing to make adjustments and this number may change.)

- Will the draft chapters be available for review by the public as well as the stakeholder team? What is the process?
 - The role of the stakeholder team is to serve as a channel for the public members throughout the draft process. A public draft will be developed after the stakeholder team has reviewed and provided input. The public will have an opportunity to provide input during town hall meetings proposed, in the process schedule, for August. Note: If stakeholder team members are going to share the draft chapters with public members, be sure to emphasize that they are just drafts.
- What will the NOAA interface look like?
 - It is not fully clear yet. Kevin has been talking with the TRT about how they might connect.
- Will the TRT review draft chapters before they go to the stakeholder team?
 - The TRT is planning to meet prior to the February stakeholder team meeting to discuss this exact issue. Again, ‘NOAA’ involvement would mean TRT and regional office staff, as well as continuing participation of Rosemary Furfey and Jeff Lockwood with the stakeholder team process.
- From a process standpoint, we should meet to discuss the implementation/adaptive management chapter separately, instead of as part of the full plan.
 - **ACTION**: The stakeholder team will help identify potential conflicts with the plan before the full plan is drawn up. A half-day will be added to the April meeting to discuss the implementation/adaptive management chapter, before the full draft is put together.
 - **ACTION**: Change ‘Phase III’ so it is sequential – move management strategies and options up above RM&E, add ‘actions’ instead of ‘options’ to that bullet, and then add ‘time and cost’ as a final bullet.
- In terms of ‘cost’ we need to look at economic impacts, which have not been addressed at this point. Some analysis needs to be done.
- ‘Parking Lot’ issues: Will any of these be addressed?
 - Abandoned and dependent populations will be part of the desired status discussion in February. Hatchery issues will also be discussed in February.
 - **ACTION**: The facilitation team will discuss with the Steering Committee outstanding Parking Lot issues and how to address them in the coming months.

ODFW’s South Coast Chapter Follow Up – A question was asked about how major water events this year will impact coho in the south coast. Fall chinook will be more greatly impacted, given the timing of the rain events. Currently there are some issues with fish ladders, passage, and scouring of redds. No other comments were offered about the South Coast chapter.

Wrap up on Forestry Issues and Actions Relevant to Coho

Blake Rowe, Jo Morgan and Kevin Goodson worked together to address the list of forestry questions raised at the September 23 meeting in Bandon. They provided a handout addressing ‘forestry actions’ and ‘background information’, followed by a discussion with the stakeholder team about additional questions and comments:

Further explanation of the answer to: *Are there opportunities for trade offs between high and low potential areas?* Meaning, within the Forest Practices rules, would there be more opportunity to provide protection in high intrinsic potential areas than in low? The trade off challenge is where to do ‘less’; often there is not consensus and some are not willing to accept ‘less’ anywhere. So there is skepticism with the notion of tradeoffs.

Riparian thinning for large wood as not ‘economically attractive’ – is there a way to make it so? This answer was addressed just to the riparian area, not to the forest. There are regulatory restrictions on 20’, which is the basal area requirement. Thinning the riparian area to grow faster requires that you space the strip, from the outside, thinning not just the edge but the whole strip. Economically and operationally, this is very difficult to do with a cable operation. So, there are no economic incentives for doing so.

Management action suggestion for riparian areas: For small streams, landowners donate three pieces of wood and ODFW instructs on where to place them. For a medium size stream, three pieces of wood donated are tipped over but remain rooted to provide maximum benefit. ODFW should pay for this. Leaving more basal area would require 30-50 years. Direct placement of falling trees would provide a more immediate benefit. Generally, fewer regulations and more incentives will provide a better benefit.

Page 6 and 7 of the handout, re: changes to the Forest Practices Act: Jo Morgan reported that the Board of Forestry will likely adopt two recommended rules in June/July 2006 to provide RMAs above artificial fish passage barriers and leave trees along debris torrent prone non-fish streams. The board will consider alternatives to the basal area target increase for western Oregon small & medium fish streams in March. DOF was directed to develop a set of voluntary measures out of the FPAC recommendations – the list is included on page 7 of the handout. Ideas from the stakeholder team will also be considered and these voluntary measures will be presented before the Board later in 2006. Finally, the Board is waiting to address small non-fish bearing streams after they address fish-bearing streams. They are looking to better understand the degree to which channel migration zones occur on private forestlands and if additional protection is warranted. In the meantime, voluntary approaches will be used where an opportunity may exist.

Landowners often face an issue with a fallen tree moving down stream and taking out a piece of their property. If a landowner wants to anchor the log to keep it in the water – how do they get permission for this? They can do what they want with it as long as they don’t sell it for commercial purposes. This problem usually occurs on agriculture land, where there is a one tree buffer. This is an important issue to address because it causes erosive problems, destroys habitat and causes problems for landowners.

Question: The forestry report identifies stream complexity as important and EPA/DOF agrees. From one perspective, existing forest practices are not set up to fully support what we need. Voluntary measures are not adequate. We need more regulation. How do we get stream complexity on agricultural land and forest land? How are we affected by political and policy changes?

Response: The Forestry report was completed in 1999 and the IMST has since reviewed ODF's progress. It is likely the IMST's recommendations have evolved since they were first made in 1999. All recommendations were given to the Forest Practices Advisory Committee, who considered these and the sufficiency analysis. FPAC developed the 18 rule concepts. The DOF also conducted required analyses that existing standards are inadequate, and that scientific evidence supports new standards. Proposed new standards must be narrowly tailored to achieve their stated objective, and must be the "least burdensome" regulatory alternative. There has been much debate over the science. The Board did not feel that EPA's findings were sufficient enough to justify EPA's suggested changes. The three proposed rules and voluntary measures were the final result of this ongoing process. Voluntary measures provide an opportunity for landowners to test assumptions, and will help inform monitoring conducted by ODF. The information from these studies will help feed into fine-tuning the plan and decisions. New ideas the coho team may come up with can be considered by forest landowners to include in their Oregon Plan Volunteer Plan and/or addressed by the Board of Forestry's ongoing process.

Response re: EPA/CWA issues: DEQ is the authority and their sufficiency analysis suggests the Forest Practices Act is meeting clean water standards, and offers suggestions for ensuring that DOF is meeting them. DOF's focus is with DEQ. Suggestion: Look at a landscape scale to assess these issues.

Re: Opportunities to place large wood where it is needed. Voluntary measures can and do work. Between regulatory and voluntary efforts there is a middle ground, voluntary incentive-based activity. The 'incentive' often is monetary, so convince the public that what we are doing has a long term benefit. There will not be enough information out of voluntary efforts to change the plan nor the regulations. But incentives will provide information, benefit, and support from the public. DOF clarified that monitoring will not provide all our scientific information, but input from landowners about what they are doing adds value to the information base.

Review of research on light on streams is inconclusive, so the answer given is too far-reaching (page 5). Stated differently, it is a complex issue and some areas provide benefit where others do not. (ODF agreed that the issue is complex. It was noted that the language was pulled directly from the sufficiency analysis written by DEQ and DOF. The resource list has also grown since this was written.)

For the ag industry vs. regulations imposed on forestry, weighing voluntary efforts against regulations raises an issue of fairness. Distinguish between regulations aimed at water quality and those aimed at enhancing the stream.

The Conservation Security Act pays farmers for good practices, including for riparian support. Many farmers take advantage but some are afraid of federal and state government agencies' regulations. Put funding into the Conservation Security Act!

Donations have come from the US Forest Service and BLM for private land projects under the Wyden authority but there is not an equivalent authorization for state forest lands. There may be opportunities for donations in this area. Liz Dent, DOF, responded that on a case by case basis, DOF would be interested in engaging/collaborating on this. ODOT, State Parks and other state agencies have also donated restoration materials.

Re: light on streams: look at the entire matrix of the stream, the whole watershed – with constant changes and different shades of light. View it from a broad scale perspective.

Re: incentives –commercial fisherman did not have incentives, they went bankrupt in the 1990's when fishing was closed. Keep this in mind.

Leaving trees in high intrinsic potential areas: Are there maps for areas of interest? This question was raised to the Board, and yes those areas will need to be mapped. An initial screen will be developed by this summer. Landslide strategy will be developed and implemented on a site by site basis; this notion came from FPAC and was folded into a recommendation.

Management Actions to Address Limiting Factors and Current and Future Threats:

Local Governments

Terry Thompson, Lincoln County Commissioner, began the presentation saying that many county roads follow along rivers. How we manage the roads and how we plan has a big impact on the health of the rivers. To this end, he invited Matt Spangler, Lincoln County Planning Department, and Jim Buisman, Lincoln County Public Works, to join him in presenting a county perspective on management actions that address needs of the coho:

Lincoln County is doing good work with limited funds. The Self-Determination Act funds the Roads Department, for culvert improvements, road repair, etc. Lincoln County is in danger of losing funding which would have a detrimental impact to citizens and the environment. The county is proposing a tax restructuring that will help address this issue. Terry also noted that when the county acquires property (through tax foreclosures or other means) it retains and manages wetlands with the intent to provide conservation to the wetland and maintain them within the county as part of a reserve.

Jim Buisman, Public Works Director, shared information on restoration efforts from a Lincoln County roads perspective. In the late 1990's a road culvert inventory assessment was conducted by ODFW (funded by ODOT) to provide guidance to county roads. The county then engaged in collaborative efforts with ODFW, SWCD, watershed councils, DOF and others to look at culvert improvements. That inventory list was provided to the stakeholder team at the meeting. Jim noted that local support is very important for these kinds of efforts. The county used a road maintenance 'blue book' developed by ODOT. However, this book does not address gravel roads, many of which are county roads. Erosion and sediment runoff is another area of focus; requirements exist for all construction bids for protection. The county works with a property management team to deal with tax-foreclosed properties, which the county purchases and usually puts out for

bids. Through this process the county has identified environmentally sensitive areas and the Board of Commissioners supports efforts to protect these areas. The county has done a number of restoration projects, which were listed on the handout. A Pest Management Policy is in place, with the intent to minimize application of herbicides (which have been greatly reduced over the last 20 years). Finally, Jim suggested that NOAA's decision not to list the coho will not change the county's focus – for practical and other reasons, the county will continue restoration efforts as it is.

Challenges for the Roads Department:

- Different priorities by various agencies – ours is road maintenance – so there is a challenge to continue efforts within the context of our main focus.
- Funding; 106-393 at risk of not being re-authorized and that funding is crucial to our work. Title 2 and Title 3 funds go toward conservation easements (see below for more discussion).
- We need to quantify our efforts/progress. While complicated to measure, it will be valuable to see in numbers the results of our restoration efforts.
- Permitting issues – time and amount of work to obtain one.

Jim opined that, to achieve successful recovery, communication and cooperation are key. Also, funding should be invested in cooperative efforts, and all grants related to this effort should be filtered through one agency or one clearinghouse site, rather than various agencies. This will especially alleviate some of the strains on departments with small staff.

Questions/Comments from Stakeholder Team Members

- Are you aware of cutting edge management action, e.g. bio-swales? Is this handout the full list of your actions? No, this is not a full list, and the county is aware of cutting edge actions and taking them where we can.
- Funding from the Self-Determination Act will end, so start focusing on different kinds of management and streamlining your system. Replacing bridges and culverts/relocating roads that are problem areas are a good direction to be going in. (Support was echoed by other stakeholder team members.)
- What is the timeframe for the work you have done? The spreadsheet covers 6-7 years.
- We will never make it back to harvest levels we had in the 1980's and alternative funds are necessary to make up for this economic loss. Without them, many counties including Lincoln County will be in danger. This 'future threat' should be reflected in the conservation plan.
- How do you measure the success of collaboration? If it leads to better understanding, it has a positive impact. Still, collaboration is intangible, and funders require tangible measurements.

Matt Spangler, Lincoln County Planning Department, spoke about land use planning in Lincoln County (not cities, but unincorporated areas of the county). Rural areas of the county total 630,000 acres, and exclusive forest or farm comprise the majority of rural areas. Zoning is not designed with fish in mind, but there is an impact given the particular landscape. Counties have local estuary plans that determine how and how much

development can occur in aquatic areas. These local plans are in tandem with state and federal permitting requirements for the same areas. Regulations exist that govern development in floodplain areas, riparian buffers, and wetland buffers. Flood plain regulations cover in-water and floodplain, typically – and address channelization, etc.

Challenges for the Planning Department:

- There is a regional/national issue about floodplain management regulations, and at its root is the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Regulations are required for developing in flood risk areas. Counties participate in the program.
- There are adequacy, resource and political issues around buffer and set back regulations.
- Finally, Measure 37 is a challenge. Any new land use restrictions are not likely to happen and if so, much thought will have to go in to this.

Improvements could be:

- Oregon land use is very regulatory without providing enough incentives. Recent funding has been set aside for the Lincoln Land Legacy specifically for conservation easements – the county recently made its first acquisition through this incentive program.
- Education could be improved. The Planning Department could better educate landowners re: zoning issues and other questions that landowners have. And, work with scientific experts to act as a conduit to landowners to provide good guidance. If landowners are better informed, they will likely make choices to be good stewards.

Stakeholder Team Comments/Questions

- Encouraged by your activities (e.g. riparian management). Are regulations enforced? They are applied through typical permitting activity. Planning does not have a good regulatory handle on certain issues.
- Are there mitigation banking opportunities? Yes, but we do not have a bank at this time.

Lisa Phipps, Mayor of Rockaway Beach, shared a city perspective on management actions. Cities do have regulatory provisions but do not actively look to regulate. Rockaway Beach is similar to other small cities in implementing parts of the Oregon Plan, but many actions are not coho driven. Cities focus on water quality/quantity, quality of life, coordinating with watershed councils, county coordination re: estuaries; and land use using Goal 5. Also, each city is its own entity so actions may be done differently while sharing ultimate goals, e.g., a storm water management program is proposed in Lincoln City but not in others. Coho actions include replacing culverts and coordinating with ODFW.

Challenges:

- Flood hazard overlay zone is sometimes in direct conflict with the Oregon Plan (need to keep water vs. need to get water out) – struggling with this issue at the city level.
- To reach agreement on concepts in a conservation plan, from the city perspective, links with the League of Oregon Cities and the small cities network will be important. Significant outreach to the cities should be done emphasizing voluntary efforts that are

needed and social and economic benefits that will come from supporting the effort. This will be a challenge but many cities are buying into it.

- ODFW needs to be clear in its criteria for what is expected –again, focusing on voluntary efforts and keeping folks up to speed along the way will support this.

Questions and Comments

- Jo Morgan, ODF, provided handouts about forests in urban areas, including a piece on ‘What is an Urban and Community Forest?’ Lisa added that many cities are setting aside land for preservation and protection, toward open space and floodplain protection. Rockaway Beach has a 40-acre wetland preserve; Cannon Beach is doing significant work on this too.
- Cities will have the same opportunities for educating themselves on zoning regulations. Pushing landowners to talk with DSL and other statewide organizations. The Watershed Resource Center provides training for land management, sediment control, water quality, wetlands and pollution prevention. Cities are usually always involved in best practices for erosion control at construction sites.
- **ACTION**: Jim Buisman will pull some additional information together on improving road systems and have it forwarded to the stakeholder team. From the Midcoast Watershed Council perspective, all high priority work has been done and substantial progress has been made. One outstanding issue is with culverts that are now barriers that were not in 1997 – need a more comprehensive look at the culvert system to identify potential problem areas.

Large Group Discussion of Local Government Perspective

Current Actions

- Culvert inventory and fixing
- Erosion, sediment, runoff control
- ‘Sensitive area’ set-aside
- Estuary protection
- Riparian set backs
- Herbicide restrictions (For co-ops)
- Staff awareness training
- Public education

Opportunities

- Stabilize 106-393 funds
- Increase state permitting efficiencies
- Increase grant funds efficiencies
- Education through county/city planning offices
- Fixed flood hazard overlay zone
 - Improve with fish ideas?
- Link efforts with LOC, small coastal cities organization for outreach
- Learn from 4-D foibles re: specifics in plan
- Broader review of ODOT’s BMPs on gravel roads in counties to assist

Future threats

- 106-393 funds and effect on service delivery/adequate funding
 - Possible solution: NW Forest Plan implemented; lack of implementing either is also a threat
- Floodplain regulation review
- Forest management (in Lincoln County)
- Water quantity
- Rural-residential impacts

Suggested Management Strategies/Actions

- Encourage storm water management plans
- Encourage/support coordination and cooperation between agencies/levels
- Protection of non-forest, urban riparian areas
- Instream work season (as broader restoration issue than just municipal governments) needs discussion in plan
 - Problem for contractors, landowners, governments and fish.
- Other coastal counties could learn from Lincoln County's Road Works.
- Consider disaster management and fish together to benefit each.
 - Including spoil removal, large wood in streams (that are human hazards and fish friendly), changes in water quantity (maybe not always 'get it out'), education

Additional Comments

- What is the balance between development and restoration, and where are opportunities for additional habitat protection? Can the county seek additional property acquisition opportunities?
- Re: Tax-restructuring: County taxes are so small it does not make a difference anyway.
- Appreciate honesty about the realities of future funding concerns. As we move through our planning process, we should keep this perspective, that not all funding will necessarily be available.
- Side note about the 'blue book': While it may not fully address all county roads, using this resource provided efficiency with paper work. Also not all counties have the resources to write their own plans to address gravel roads.
- Zoning laws on floodplains – building houses on flood plains could require a large amount of habitat protection. Are there ways to stop this building from happening? This question ties in with the NFIP. Suggestion: bring in FEMA to talk with the stakeholder team about flood plain insurance – or to talk with counties/cities.
- Being pro-fish is not always good for the rest of society. Develop a document that acknowledges where conflict will be expected. (It was noted that there are ways to accommodate the needs of fish and landowners, such as landscaping a lakeside property to benefit fish and provide aesthetics to the landowner.)

Resource User Perspectives: Management Actions to Address Limiting Factors and Current and Future Threats. Focus: Gravel Industry

Bill Yocum, Freeman Rock, Inc., shared an aggregate perspective about consumptive uses; regulations/jurisdictions; habitat restoration; and future opportunities.

Consumptive Uses: An average house requires about 229 tons of aggregate. Each person uses over 50 lbs a day/365 days a year. Aggregate use has increased over time, with technology advancements and a higher demand for high quality aggregate.

Habitat Restoration: Harbors and rivers have been filled and have taken away from the ecosystem. Much loss of the diverse structure of waterways has occurred. So in 2002, Congress adopted the Estuaries Restoration Act. Managed by the Estuary Restoration Council (COE, NOAA, Agriculture, and other policy makers), its purpose is to stop the trend of taking away from habitat. No projects have been completed yet, but the idea is there.

Regulating agencies include the COE, DSL, DEQ, OR Dept. of Geology and Mineral Industries. Counties, MSHA/OSHA, NOAA, USFWS, FEMA, and ODFW are reviewing agencies.

Challenges to the aggregate industry: There is currently no analysis of the impact of loss of a resource. Also, the industry faces social objections to dust, noise, truck traffic – a ‘not in my backyard’ syndrome.

Opportunities: Create habitat rather than diminish it as has always been the case in the past. Bill provided an example of restoration planning and design on the Rogue River, involving COE permitting and DSL. He suggested that making the permitting process easier would provide an incentive to aggregate to do projects that benefit fish.

Forward-looking: The Oregon Plan says flood plain sand-and-gravel removal activities may contribute to meaningful habitat restoration, if a property is planned and the project is completed. To date, very little is known about the impacts and how meaningful creating and restoring habitat through gravel mining is. So, research is needed.

Comments and Questions

- A workshop on gravel mining issues at the South Slough Sanctuary on April 12 may be of interest.
- Gravel removal changes ecological conditions, e.g. attraction for fall Chinook. How will the industry address this? The industry recognizes this is an issue. This year, the industry worked with ODFW in one area to dig trenches and open an outlet but not an inlet to the area. This created large islands and deeper channels; they will know more about impacts when the water recedes. In the North Fork of the Lewis River in Washington, a channel was opened up where an old mine was just off the river. A pair of chum was found spawning there, so some actions appear to be working.
- Have you developed any partnerships with gravel pits with road waste materials? Not aware of this, but opportunities exists.
- Do you examine and/or treat gravel bars removed for invasive species? No, but materials are washed. There has not been an issue with invasive species and this industry, yet.

- What kind of commercial gravel operations are there outside of the estuary? Tillamook and other areas. DSL has a database that shows where there are permits to dig pits.

Management strategies and actions for coho:

- Design site-specific habitats that use aggregate to create successful habitat for coho.
- Manage floodplains better in Oregon, through better planning, implementation and monitoring.
- Study impacts of habitat when open channels and pits to river.
- Continue to explore partnerships between private owners, COE and NGO's to enhance fish habitat efforts.
- Continue site by site post-operation plans.

Additional Comments

- COE dredging projects have caused problems in the past. Are there suggestions for addressing issues? Contract work has not yet seemed to be economically viable for the gravel industry. But the industry will examine a longer term and whole system plan. Partnership opportunities with conservation groups and sportfishing groups exist.
 - **ACTION:** NOAA has been in consultation with the COE on dredging projects and will send insights on this to the stakeholder team.
- ODFW is in consultation with Coos County re: the South Coquille River. Widening is one issue, and they are working with the gravel industry on a post-operation condition that limits widening at least on one side, for fish passage (mostly for fall Chinook, not coho).
- ODFW comments –erosion problems exist. There is a lack of data so studying the impacts of erosion would be useful.

Presentation and Feedback on ODFW's Draft North Coast Chapter

Keith Braun, ODFW, presented information on the North Coast chapter of the conservation plan. The information is summarized below:

Priorities: Ensure independent populations achieve and maintain a health level beyond viability. Also consider other fish; spring and fall chinook, chum, winter steelhead, cutthroat trout, lamprey and non-game fish.

Limiting factors: Harvest, poor ocean survival, habitat in poor condition, stream complexity, connectivity/passage for juveniles and adults, floodplain habitat, water quality and quantity (quantity issues are site specific, and could be a bigger problem in the future)

Habitat strategies: Protect existing habitat, advise/coordinate/cooperate with other agencies and landowners to prevent or reduce loss of coho habitat, pursue additional voluntary protection measures and habitat restoration in areas beneficial to coho, and some others, focusing on high intrinsic potential areas.

Particular to the North Coast: 20% of the north coast area is federal forest land. 80% of Neskowin, Little Nestucca and Nestucca basins are federal forest land. In Tillamook, 80% is state forest land; in Nehalem, about 50% state forest, the other private timber; Necanicum and Ecola, mostly private timber. State forest land is managed under the State Forests Management Plan, developed with involvement from ODFW.

Agricultural land is mostly in the Tillamook area, and much of the high intrinsic potential area in Tillamook is agricultural land. Through cooperation with landowners, focus on restoration in high intrinsic potential areas – this poses a challenge because the land has high economic value. One project is the Tillamook Wetland Project, a recently acquired area to open up sloughs, breach dikes and provide agricultural use.

Land use: Look at site specific conditions on development to minimize negative impacts; incentives programs and how these may be used in these higher economic areas instead of just doing restoration projects (in cooperation with other agencies). Finally, adhere to existing regulations.

(A concern was raised that some regulations could be harmful to the fish, especially if development is for open space projects and others that may ultimately be good for fish.)

Water use: Increasing demands, stream withdrawals. Recommend alternatives to stream withdrawals – wells, storage, reservoirs in non fish systems. Passage issues at diversions.

Suggestion: At the Cedar Creek hatchery issue, blocking passage is a problem. Include this in the plan. (ODFW does have a grant to study this and improve the river to allow better passage.)

Much of the north coast areas are high gradient systems: lack of stream complexity makes carcass retention difficult.

Harvest as limiting factor: In-basin harvest in Nehalem is possible in good ocean conditions, but other areas are not stable.

Hatcheries as limiting factor: Small programs remain. ODFW recommends maintaining hatcheries in the north coast at current levels.

Future threats: Out of basin water use; land conversions/development; (A concern was raised that this statement will induce ‘blanket prohibition’ – Emphasize it as potential land conversions/development to avoid this concern); loss of wetland/floodplain habitat continuing; increasing local demand for water; and avian predation.

Research opportunities: Wetland function and restoration in high urban/economic areas; understand HIP habitats; local slough and estuary use by juveniles; tidegates; summer rearing habitat; mainstem rearing.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions and Comments

- How to measure the future problem of bird predation? No real good way to measure, but at least raise a red flag. Cormorants are an issue from some perspectives
- Are the maps efficient? They provide one piece of the puzzle to aid understanding but are not the whole picture.
- Consider a rule that governs ‘other’ lands that are not protected, e.g. rural residential and floodplain development? ODFW did not see a lot of areas where there were problems – see municipalities discussion.
- There has been an increase in timber harvest levels – does this cause concern? Not as much because there are other issues in play, e.g. Swiss needle cast.
- Water rights: In-stream water rights exist in Nehalem, so it is one tool for ODFW to use.

Lakes Populations

Bob Buckman and Mike Gray provided information on the three main lakes areas for coho: Siltcoos, Tahkenitch and Tenmile, and also looked at Devils Lake and Sutton-Mercer. The three main lakes are at pass+, and remained strongest during the 1990’s downturn. One theory is that flooding provided winter habitat and larger smolts were produced. Lakes populations are a management priority for ODFW.

Limiting factors: Competition (for food and space) and predation (on fry, fingerlings and smolts) is primary. Secondary are complexity and large woody material; water quality; sediment and nutrient input.

Question about dealing with bass as a predator: ODFW has not anticipated changes in the size of the bass population, and may not be able to alter these numbers to reduce the problem through angling or otherwise.

Habitat issues include: Agricultural conversion from wetlands; shoreline development; sediment and nutrient inputs; water withdrawals and management; exotic species and complexity and large woody material in tributaries.

Actions to address habitat issues: Wetland restoration, shoreline protection, water quality improvement (septic systems), water quantity protection and management, and education on exotic species.

Management strategies:

- Devils Lake – uncertain as coho abundance has increased and is stable
- Siltcoos and Tahkenitch water management – uncertain; Water Watch will study options with emphasis on coho implications; others may match funds for study (Johnny Sundstrom offered to work through this issue with ODFW).
- Tenmile Lake habitat – stream riparian improvement, sediment reduction; fish passage improvement and lake nutrient reduction.

Harvest: Very limited in the last two years in Siltcoos and Tahkenitch. Low harvest rates. Potential to open Tenmile in the near future.

Hatcheries: No coho stock exist in the lakes system at this time. Few coho hatchery strays go into the lakes basins; potential effects on coho salmon include fishing mortality and competition (but both thought to be low).

Future threats: Additional exotic introductions, shoreline development/riparian and wetland degradation; nutrient/sediment/pollutants inputs; increasing recreational uses; water demand and management.

It was noted that many landowners are building in riparian zones on lake shorelines, so ODFW may see a change in activity and attitudes around shoreline development.

Research ideas include: Water management in Siltcoos and Tahkenitch to understand how juveniles use them; Devils Lake carp effects; importance of riparian habitat surrounding the lakes; and septic/water quality innovations.

TRT Products/Alignment with Conservation Plan Development

Pete Lawson, TRT, presented the TRT's 'Biological Recovery Criteria for the Oregon Coast Coho Salmon ESU'. He walked the group briefly through the basic concepts of *persistence, sustainability, and restoration*. Criteria were described as 'true', 'unsure', and 'false'.

Persistence involved measuring productivity, persistence and abundance – and began with an evaluation of independent populations. For the north coast, the analysis found overall persistence to be mixed. At an ESU scale, persistence was close to 'true'. While the north and midcoast were 'unsure', persistence was stronger in the south.

Sustainability at the ESU level was subjectively measured looking at genetic diversity, phenotypic diversity and small populations. Coho were again found to be more 'unsure' in the north than south, and overall almost green, toward 'true'. Sustainability was also measured quantifiably, and compared to the Oregon Plan, which used pass/fail measurements. The two analyses generally lined up. One discrepancy was the South Umpqua River – TRT found it 'uncertain' and the state gave it a 'pass+' – Pete suggested this was likely due to weak distribution.

Restoration criteria was the least developed, described as: Naturally produced fish are sufficiently abundant, productive and diverse; and the ESU as a whole is self-sustaining (all populations are sustainable) and provides environmental, cultural and economic benefits. TRT has not done a full evaluation on restoration criteria but hope to make this a tool to help analyze the effectiveness of proposed restoration actions.

Stakeholder Team Member Comments and Questions:

- Looking at rollups, the listing decision would have been easier to justify in the south than in the north. Yes, and the TRT combined the stratum to get to one ESU evaluation.

There is less confidence in the north than the south. It appears it would fail by the state's methodology using TRT's criteria.

- Suggestion: look at other models to ground truth this one.
- The TRT offered that monitoring will be key to evaluating whether we are successful or not. This model is not the tell-all, it is just an evaluation of current conditions with respect to criteria.
- Was the analysis driven by 1990's data? Yes, some criteria were. Would these change as we use more current data? Yes, they could.

Pete requested that the stakeholder team comment on the draft but please do not distribute the draft document as what he provided was a co-manager draft, not yet a public draft.

ACTION: Stakeholder team members were asked to send comments on the TRT document to Kevin Goodson by March 10.

Wrap-up

The next stakeholder team meeting is scheduled for February 23 at the Community Hall in Coquille,

Agenda items include:

- Hatchery issues
- Finalize desired status
- Effect of NOAA decision on this process
- Follow up on north coast/lake chapters – send comments via email directly to Kevin or Bob before the meeting
- Background Chapter (from Paul Hoobyar)
- TRT involvement in conservation plan process
- Social economic impacts

Other

Stakeholder comment: This process is crucial to allay fears that a no-list means we give up. The state's conservation plan is more critical than it has ever been. Keep the plan broad so people can buy into it, and the stakeholders should practice tolerance as we go through the rest of the process.

Desired Status In-depth Meeting – Kevin Goodson will organize a meeting to discuss the recruitment model before the next meeting. Anyone that is interested should contact Kevin for details.

OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT
Stakeholder Team Meeting
Coquille Community Hall, Coquille
Facilitator's Meeting Summary
February 23, 2006

Attendees for all or part of the meeting:

Stakeholder Team Members: Tom Forgatsch (Farm Industry), Wayne Giesy (Aalsea Valley Alliance), Jennifer Hampel (Coquille Watershed Association), Les Helgeson (Native Fish Society), Cindy Heller (STEP), Paul Heikkila (OSU Sea Grant Program), Wayne Hoffman (Mid-Coast Watershed Council), Tom Kartrude (Port of Siuslaw), Kaitlin Lovell (Trout Unlimited), Bill Moshofsky (Save the Salmon Coalition), Dennis Richey (NW Steelheaders-Oregon Anglers), Blake Rowe (Longview Fibre Company), Stan Van de Wetering (Siletz Tribe)

Resource Advisors:

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

Alternates and Technical Resources: Bob Buckman (ODFW), Steve Chesterton (Oregon Trout), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Mike Gray (ODFW), Dan Knoll (ODFW), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Dave Loomis (ODFW), Jo Morgan (ODF), Jim Muck (ODFW), Jay Nicholas (ODFW), Randy Smith (ODF), Heather Stout (NOAA-TRT), Ray Wilkeson, OFIC

Other Interested Parties: Jack Christian (Public), Sandy Gilliard (Coquilles River Parkway), Dan Gonzales (Lakeside Lions/Eel Ten Mile STEP), Madeline Gonzales (Eel Ten Mile STEP), Jerry Greene (Coos River STEP), Sally Greene (Coos River STEP), Paul Merz (Commercial fisheries/Coos watershed), Walt Morgan (Public), Otar Overacker (Commercial fisheries/Coos watershed), Steve Pennington (Coquille STEP), Ron Sadler (public), Tim Vredenburg (Coquille Indian Tribe), John Ward (Northwest Steelheaders),

Facilitation Team: Donna Silverberg and Robin Harkless

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Feedback on DRAFT Background Chapter of conservation plan	Stakeholder Team to Facilitation Team	March 10
Feedback on comments to Draft Background Chapter	Facilitation team to ODFW	March 15
Draft conservation plan to stakeholder team	ODFW	First week of April
Send comments on TRT product to Kevin Goodson	Stakeholder Team	March 10
Talk with various state agencies involved in coal bed methane issues, and report back to the stakeholder team	Louise Solliday	April 20 meeting

Comments on January 20 Notes

- Question: Page 12 – 2nd bullet under comments: Change ‘Folk’ to ‘Fork’ and clarify the Lewis River *in Washington*.

- Page 14: Bullet with question: Refers to a rural/residential issue. Out of compliance with SB 1010 rules. Include, ‘*e.g. rural residential and floodplain development*’ to clarify.
- Will ‘Parking Lot’ issues be discussed? Yes, the facilitation team is tracking them and most are on the agenda for today or a future meeting.
- Page 6: third paragraph. ‘Weighing voluntary efforts...raises issues of fairness.’ Clarify by saying... ‘*for the agriculture industry vs. the regulatory approach imposed on the forestry industry*’.
 - Also, as the state considers using rules and regulations, consider whether or not they help create jobs. If they don’t help, than they are a mistake.
- **ACTION:** Page 12: The action for dredging is related to private projects – Rosemary Furfey will get information on this and send it to the stakeholder team.
- Page 14, re: the Cedar Creek hatchery weir. In conjunction with this, consider the possibility of establishing a life cycle monitoring site there.

Follow up From 1/20 Meeting

North Coast/Lakes Populations Presentations – A suggestion was made to capture a management action being taken in response to Shawn Reirsgaard’s resource user presentation on Tillamook agricultural land about the amount of acreage needed to spread manure: Work is being done to expand an existing project taking manure and using ‘digesters’ to produce energy and high quality potting soil. The water is then returned to the dairies without bacteria or pathogens for application to the land. Discussions are occurring with potential private investors to partner with the Port of Tillamook Bay on project expansion. **This action should be captured in the North Coast chapter.**

Timeline Update – Ed Bowles shared that ODFW and the Governor’s office have prioritized completing a full draft of the conservation plan before sending it out for review by the stakeholder team. So, instead of receiving the draft plan in parts, the stakeholder team should expect to see a full draft at the end of March/beginning of April. Three weeks after the draft is sent a meeting will be convened to discuss the document (*NOTE: this meeting was scheduled for April 20*). They would then spend their time working with the stakeholder team to refine the full draft which will later be taken to the public and then on to the Fish and Wildlife Commission for approval.

Ed reiterated that the plan will build off the Oregon Plan assessment for coho and meld with the TRT co-manager viability document, it will identify desired status and management actions, and will include an RM&E component. Any new actions written in to the plan will need to undergo an additional public process to make them ‘binding’ (via regulations or voluntary processes), as appropriate. The entire process will include any agencies, in addition to ODFW, that may play an active role in enforcement and/or implementation. The fish management action in the final plan will be adopted by the Fish and Wildlife Commission as an Oregon Administrative Rule.

A question was raised about the stakeholder team’s role relative to the document. It was noted by several members that not all issues raised during this process have been incorporated into the outlines that the team has seen thus far. How will the group have an

opportunity to make an impact on the draft? Once the draft is written, the agency will work through an iterative process to refine the plan. A stakeholder team meeting will be held in mid-April and then, after further discussion and digestion, the group will be reconvened to discuss and hear responses to comments. After this discussion has occurred with the team, then there will be time in August for public forums on the plan. Ed said they are targeting a final plan to the OFWC by the end of the year. The facilitation team will write a report about the full process and the various views expressed on the key issues and present it to the Commission at that time. This will give a ‘voice’ to any ideas that were expressed but not incorporated into the plan.

Finally, it was clarified that NOAA will continue to support the process and stay involved via TRT recovery products and through the stakeholder team. Rosemary Furfey said that NOAA’s Regional office will actively comment on the plan through the iterative process that Ed laid out today.

Effect of a No-List Decision – Louise Solliday supported Ed’s description about writing the plan, and offered a commitment and request to the stakeholder team to stay involved. That said, there will likely be litigation filed about NOAA’s decision not to list the coho and questions have been raised about how this will affect our process. Given this, she requested that the stakeholder team stay the course and continue providing input to the plan. She clarified that the state will continue seeking buy-in from the team and their constituent groups before taking the plan to the greater public in August.

Louise acknowledged fears expressed by team members that future decreases in funding will pose a problem. She noted that OWEB has provided additional funding for monitoring program gaps and that the MOU is being amended to allow use of Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery funds (PCSRF) for non-listed species. Louise provided a handout on this and shared that the Governor’s office plans to direct state agencies to implement management actions once they are more fully developed in the Conservation Plan.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions and Comments

- Can the state use PCSRF for non-listed species? Yes. NOAA’s answer is also yes, and an MOU is being amended to clearly state this.
- What is the long-term economic outlook, considering a forecast of ‘additional needs’ and a shrinking funding base?
 - While the PCSRF is being reduced, Measure 66 (lottery) funds are increasing. Expect more from the latter in the ‘07-09 biennium, which should balance out the loss of federal funds. Also, the federal allocation has not been fully worked out. Oregon plans to submit a request for total recovery funds to be increased and that the same portion go to Oregon in the future as has in the past. But this year it will be lower. Rosemary Furfey noted that completed recovery plans will be the key to federal funding.
- From a broader perspective, we need to make a conscious effort not to complicate questions and issues with new monitoring, but rather use discipline and simplicity to

prioritize monitoring needs to adjust to shrinking funds. (The state agreed that monitoring will need to be prioritized. The state’s monitoring team is in the process of discussing: What level of monitoring is required to get the information we need?) And, it was noted that we need to consider the long-term reasons for and consequences of a continuing decline in fish numbers. We should not stop asking questions until we understand that.

- Can the state rationalize continuing to put funds into the coast given other needs in the state, and a no-list for coho? The coast began as the state’s main focus, and the state has put a lot of effort into it—the state is committed to seeing it through.
- What is the funding issue for monitoring – staffing or actual work? The analysis component.
- The state and NOAA have been in ongoing discussions about a cooperative conservation agreement (Section 6) to end the ‘List/no list. Sue. Repeat’ cycle. There is a need to first develop a plan for NOAA approval before formalizing an agreement.
- Conservation groups: In terms of a lawsuit, we see these as two very different processes – development of a state conservation plan and a federal no-list decision. We are gauging whether it is worth it to us to continue to engage in THIS process, which has been difficult to decide given the lack of details thus far. Anxiously looking forward to seeing the draft plan, to determine where we stand with it. In the meantime, we intend to stay and give input to the plan—we are in for the long haul.
 - The state responded: We agree we all have a shared interest: we want the fish to be at a level above where we are now, and to rebuild the population to a place that it can provide a full range of societal benefits. That will take time. And we believe we can achieve it if we all work together.
- Industry: It DOES matter whether a suit is filed. While these are separate processes, the words used in these discussions could be used in court against any of us. So, this would put a spin and a chill on how we discuss the state’s plan if not everyone stands behind it. Still, there is commitment to stay and work through this process for now.
- Tribes, watershed councils and fishing interests are interested in seeing this through, and in meeting a common goal for viable fisheries. Reducing restrictions on people who are trying to do the right thing will be important. Some have become even more motivated with the de-list so they can support the state without having to answer to the federal government. Look at the Oregon Plan and work collaboratively to reach our goals.
- Landowners: The fish are still threatened and we want to help solve the problem. The Oregon Plan was a long process that required much energy, many were invested, and its purpose was to NOT list the fish. So let’s keep moving forward to support the state. The federal government should continue to look at off-shore, ocean effects and not put the full burden on on-shore actions. Even though there is no way to quantify, ocean effects should weigh into the report because many of our on-land efforts may not prove fruitful if those factors out of our control have more influence.
 - It was noted that we need to get the smolts TO the ocean first or it doesn’t matter what the ocean conditions are. There are many actions on land we can and should do. Our on-land actions are most important.
 - NOAA needs to do more research, and needs to get funding to do RM&E to look at ocean conditions and better understand them.

Concerns about Measure 37 Effects on the Plan

- Fear was expressed that Measure 37 may eradicate the Oregon Plan. Yet, one member noted that if we are all supportive of the Oregon Plan, how are we going to be affected by Measure 37?
 - The state responded: So far, Measure 37 has not halted our efforts/actions with the Oregon Plan. Like other measures and actions, Measure 37 is not a black and white issue.
 - But what weight does the Oregon Plan have? The willingness of partners to implement it. Watershed council work, like other voluntary efforts, is continuing. There is still a vested interest, from the watershed council perspective. And this is a different mentality compared to 10 years ago. Folks involved with watershed councils have expressed that a true commitment exists.
- The spirit of the Oregon Plan will drive us, and take us to the next level.
- From the forest industry perspective, when coho first were listed, we did not walk away from the process even though our voluntary efforts to that point had not been honored, or had been undermined by the listing. Now that there is no listing, there will be less resistance to do voluntary efforts vs. when people were ‘forced’ to do them.
- Measure 37 speaks to balance and fairness. It has exemptions for health and safety and the environment. Reasonable regulations and incentives for voluntary efforts will not cause a push-back from landowners. This is not a great threat to coho or the Oregon Plan—that was not the intent of the legislation. Measure 37 provides a protection but not a manipulation of most landowners. On the other hand, there is (perceived by some) federal influence on landowners to litigate or risk losing funding support. This is counterproductive to what the state is trying to do.

Desired Status

Kevin Goodson, ODFW, shared a power point presentation on desired status, suggesting that the purpose of the presentation today was to show the state’s perspective and an alternative perspective to see where the two line-up and then decide how to proceed.

Generally, desired status objectives include:

- Coho utilizing all habitats.
- Numbers that provide societal benefits (fisheries, carcasses, viewing)
- Diversity of habitats and life-history strategies are represented
- Able to withstand low survival conditions and bounce back quickly to robust levels.
- Still need to define desire for dependent populations.

The state’s desired status criteria:

- Persistence
- Distribution
- Diversity
- Productivity

- Abundance

Persistence – 1% or less chance of extinction in 100 years. Use most conservative TRT models (meaning the most sensitive).

A suggestion was made that taking an average model, rather than the most conservative, would be more statistically accurate over time and, therefore, would be the best approach. This approach would promote ground-truthing.

Distribution – expressed in terms of spawners and summer juveniles, using the existing Oregon Plan monitoring program. More work is needed to define appropriate metrics for distribution.

Comment: What about winter distribution of these fish? ODFW focused on what was available to them, and there is a summer monitoring program already in place. There is a need to look further into winter distribution. Work is already in progress to expand winter sampling.

Diversity – ensure a diversity of life history strategies that will result in a diverse gene pool. Identifying and quantifying life history strategies will be difficult to do on a population by population basis. Instead, quantifying reasonable-to-high abundances and distribution of coho in each population may be enough to suggest there is a reasonable-to-high level of diversity. (TRT struggled with this aspect too.)

Stakeholder Team Member Comments and Questions on *Diversity*

- You could go further with diversity. Wayne Hoffman provided a handout on life history types and shared it with ODFW during an in-depth meeting on desired status (2/7) which he shared with the group today. While not complete, it is a good baseline to show what exists and what the effects would be if the different life history types did not continue. Wayne suggested that others could add to the list. Also, look for changes in spawning seasonality trends and incorporate the inconsistencies. Finally, include/review the latest information from Dr. Banks and others on diversity, and a statement that ODFW will include information as it becomes available, with the goal of ‘no net loss’. Overall, protect diversity in addition to abundance and distribution criteria.
- Until you determine the metrics, it will be difficult to state your goal, for example, of ‘no net loss’. The state could include counts of different life history types.
- Salmon are very adaptive. Use caution when looking at two different strains and trying to support both. Do not attempt to micro-manage genetics.
- In the Coquille system, there are very many life history systems, and many unknowns. Each watershed is different and has different diversity in life cycles; keep this in mind as you develop a desired status for diversity.
- There is danger in being able to detect change, and then subjectively determine whether the change is positive or negative. Caution: do not jump to conclusions with observed change.

Productivity – Recruits per spawner value of 2.1 during low abundances. However, if we meet desired status for abundance, we will not reach ‘low abundance’. ODFW will look into other possible metrics for productivity, using TRT expertise. TRT offered that to get to full seeding may require additional habitat. Using a static habitat, we may not get at desired status for productivity.

Abundance – Three proposals, 100,000, 200,000 and 250,000. The state’s (100k) number is based on recruitment modeling. TRT’s (125k) is based on restoration criteria.

Stakeholder Team Member Comments and Questions on Abundance

- Also look at what would happen if habitat declines to ensure we do not lose ground. Yes, this is a legitimate way to approach desired status as an overall goal.
- (The following alternative approach was shared during the 2/7 in-depth meeting on desired status between ODFW and members of the stakeholder team.) Look at smolt potential and determine what the current habitat can produce. Identify high intrinsic potential areas, determine the smolt potential of those areas, and use this as a basis for identifying desired status. It appears this could be done using the Nickelson/Lawson habitat model. And, more discussion at the TRT meeting on 2/22 resulted in TRT’s willingness to engage in exploring this alternative – so more resources are available to do this. The TRT offered that this approach would not necessarily require a look at high intrinsic potential (HIP), but could also examine other potential levels, e.g. medium potential to reach functional levels, and could include analysis of resulting smolt numbers. As of today’s meeting, ODFW was able to look just at HIP, and still needed to look at potentials for high quality habitat, medium quality, etc. (Not necessarily, it was suggested: intrinsic potential has been identified throughout watersheds, so just apply reasonable measures.)
- We should not set a desired status beyond what the habitat can actually produce. Take a realistic approach; look at what truly is accessible as a resource.
 - ODFW plans to develop an upper boundary and then do reality checks. Concern was expressed that this number, if unrealistic, is going to be perceived as the goal. Why even put it out there? Development of desired status will be an iterative process. Make sure this is clear – that this is not the end goal, but a picture of what the levels of desired status might be, and that they are only models.
- The Hatchery Resources Center gathered various scientists to look at full seeding potential given current realities. They agreed that full seeding cannot occur, so look at most recent highs, and work from there. With the alternative approach (smolt production), is ODFW confident that the resulting numbers will dictate or change the course of action with the conservation plan? ODFW response: We want to reveal a variety of numbers to then get feedback from stakeholders. And, models are models, and can never fully reveal reality. This will not necessarily change the conservation plan. Suggestion: Put something in for desired status as a placeholder. Move on with the other components, and get the plan written. Move forward with a commitment that desire status will improve.

- How much of the Nickelson/Lawson model is based on ‘fuzzy logic’? None – the model used habitat data collected on streams and then represented what the fish do in different life cycles and how they would react to certain conditions.
- We can measure full seeding in current streams at life cycle monitoring sites. With the alternative approach, we have an opportunity to tailor management actions to specific areas, basin by basin. This has value as a planning tool.

Kevin provided handouts of the resulting numbers of smolt potential in wadeable HIP from poor to high quality habitat. The potential was then converted to adults at 1% and 3% smolt to adult survival. The remaining unknown – non-wadeable high intrinsic potential – suggests that the numbers in the handout may not be fully accurate.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions and Comments on the handout

- Have you used sonar to gather smolt information? Some sonar analysis has been used for adults, but not for smolts.
- There are 209 miles of non-wadeable HIP. What about non-wadeable low intrinsic potential? And which are wadeable that are low intrinsic potential? Of 6,000 coho stream miles, about 1,200-1,300 are HIP, and of those, about 900 miles are wadeable.
- This model does not consider diversity. Much smolt production is occurring in these wadeable streams, so it is confusing. It would be difficult for watershed councils to use this model to do their restoration work.
- There may be a life history condition that supports persistence – this is a very complex component.
- Why would numbers go down if HIP was recovered? E.g. Coos. The numbers refer to how many additional smolts could be produced, not total numbers. (Clarify this in the document.)
- Are the resulting numbers in the ballpark of ODFW’s estimate/goal? Yes, and it also raises further questions.
- It is not clear yet where the line is between information used as the basis for the conservation plan, and what will be the conservation plan. Clarify how the approach is coming along and what we should expect out of the first draft.
- This is a vast improvement to what we have seen in the past. It is a good workable approach so far, and members look forward to reviewing the work as it continues.

Kevin cautioned that the numbers in his handout are preliminary, and given that they are not complete and can be confusing, he asked that if members share them with their constituents, folks should note this caveat and contact Kevin with questions.

Kevin also noted that the lakes populations, because of overwintering, are not supported by the Nickelson/Lawson model. For the lakes, ODFW used average abundance from 1993-99 smolt numbers and converted them to SAR’s. If work is done on summer habitat and streams entering the lake, the Nickelson/Lawson model could support the lakes populations.

Additional Comments/Questions

- As a result of seeing these numbers, I am more comfortable with the state’s 100,000 target, as a viable option.
 - ODFW responded: This is a living document, and as we get closer to comfort with a realistic desired status, there will be room to move. Target numbers may change, which could cause a shift in the goal over time.
- Suggestion: Use different criteria for short and long term goals. Start lower with the first goal. (Others agreed that this should be a tiered approach.)
- What is the timeline for getting to desired status? First gauge how long it would take to get to 100,000, etc.
 - ODFW responded: The timeline will be more relevant to management actions than desired status. Need to stay within a reasonable, attainable goal given current knowledge about capacity.
 - If you use a 100-year goal, then set benchmarks. If 25-year goal, numbers might look different. Or, benchmarks could be a percentage increase in smolt numbers.

Les Helgeson, Native Fish Society, provided a handout that highlighted the objectives of the fish conservation group’s proposed desired status approach: He offered two key points: Emphasize a population level approach –population benchmarks, and habitat benchmarks. Also, ODFW should work with the TRT to improve models for now, but eventually move away from models and be able to use real data to determine desired status and eliminate the guess work. Les offered that, given today’s presentation, he is hopeful, and supportive of how the state is moving forward.

Kevin reiterated that ODFW will not do any additional modeling before the draft plan is completed, which will for now include a placeholder for desired status, the 100,000 number put forth by ODFW. ODFW is committed to do more with desired status later and to work with the TRT as this develops.

Public Comment

- Ron Sadler, North Bend resident, retired forester and administrator. Coal bed methane program in Coos County is just about to begin, with plans to install 300 wells in the next 10 years. Underground beds in Coos County are saturated with methane gas. Dewatering the coal beds provides a source of clean methane gas that can be used for energy purposes. This process removes ground water that may affect stream flows where coho spawn. Also, coal bed methane is considered a toxic. A major source of this is in the Coquille River basin. In one year, with the above mentioned program, nearly 45 million gallons of water would be removed from the ground. Toxics could affect the fish, impact their homing ability with reduced water quantity, and change temperature regimes that could impact the fish. From Ron’s perspective, this is a monumental problem that needs to be elevated to public awareness. Additionally, a number of unknowns could have a great impact on fish. His hope with the comment was that this group will help push for regulatory mechanisms before the program becomes operational, to ensure that the species are protected. The program is scheduled to be operational within a year in Coos County. Jeff Lockwood, NOAA, also noted that there is an NPDES exemption going in to place so there may be less

CWA protection relative to this issue. FOLLOW-UP: Jeff has since determined that the proposed exemption is only for stormwater from gas and mineral extraction facilities, so drilling water would not be exempted.

- **ACTION**: Louise Solliday will talk with various state agencies involved in this, and will report back to the stakeholder team at the next meeting.
- Tim Vredenburg, Coquille Indian Tribe. The Coquille Tribe is in the process of writing a salmon management plan for the Coquille watershed. Working with federal and state agencies, the Tribe's goal is to work concurrently with the state conservation plan for coho, at a more detailed level. Many partners are involved, and the Tribe would like additional partnerships, through advisory, review, or other roles. He asked anyone interested to share contact information with Tim. The limiting factors analysis for the plan was completed last year.
- Dan Gonzales, Ten Mile STEP program. Comment re: HIP relative to desired status of Lakes populations. Many coho carcasses have been found in the Ten Mile watershed; this could be a place to improve habitat for coho, as the fish pool there over winter. Use STEP volunteers to improve habitat if possible.
 - ODFW response: Overwinter habitat was identified as a potential for improvement, but in Lakes areas, spawning habitat could also be improved. The state is not overlooking these areas as a potential for improving habitat, and appreciates the efforts of local watershed groups and others to prioritize areas where most benefit could be made.

Hatchery Issues

Kevin Goodson provided a handout on current hatchery programs and background information on how hatcheries could be used as a tool: Relative to the state's assessment findings, relative to harvest, and in terms of logistics. ODFW focused on two areas, the Salmon River and North Umpqua. The handout included three options for consideration: ODFW preferred Option 2 at this point, but was open to discussion.

Option 2: Move the Salmon River and North Umpqua to Pass+ by addressing high stray rates of wild fish as the primary limiting factor. The Salmon River hatchery raises 2,000 coho smolts, but they are transported elsewhere (to Young's Bay CEDC) for seining and release where they realize a higher contribution to the fishery. This option does NOT propose that Salmon River STEP programs be discontinued.

Stakeholder Team Member Comments and Questions

- Second paragraph about the role of the program: "The only method available... is to isolate programs spatially or temporally" – this is not the only method, but rather the primary method used. Also use brood stock. 'Today, isolation... has not been successful.' True for some but not all hatcheries; it depends on how they have been released. (The main concern is with long term implications of the document, that the language as written could negatively impact funding for hatchery research, etc. The Plan needs to be more optimistic to leave room for later research. Others disagreed,

and felt that funding for hatchery research is irrelevant to this, suggesting that the language stay as written.)

- Under logistical and fiscal considerations: Coastal/Willamette Salmonid Hatchery Program review – look closely at this, and itemize the hatchery maintenance backlog to look at a cost benefit.
- Are you speaking to cost effectiveness of the hatchery program, or to a goal of restoring wild coho, and whether or not hatcheries should be part of that effort?
 - ODFW is looking at both: What hatchery contributions are limiting the fish, and also whether hatcheries could be used to restore the fish.
 - If ODFW focuses on the latter, do a basic economic analysis of this, e.g. cost of land to restore habitat vs. building hatcheries.
- If moving production fish, why keep the hatchery in the Nehalem? Consider moving the Salmon River hatchery fish up north to provide an opportunity for a larger fishery. ODFW agreed that this is an option.
- Could we directly point the finger at hatcheries, when likely the Salmon River will not see an improvement if/after the hatchery is removed? The answer to this is not fully captured in the language as written. ODFW can broaden the idea to say, monitor the area and then decide whether or not to restore the population. Others offered support for enhanced monitoring in the Salmon River, citing this as an incredible opportunity to do research, involve volunteers, and as a good control study to look at impacts of removing hatchery fish.
- There is a potential for coho growth in the Salmon River, even if it is primarily a steelhead habitat. A concern was raised that the current Salmon River hatchery stock there is not suitable for colonizing the river. If ODFW closes the program, they would rely on strays to re-colonize the river. So, how long are we willing to wait? Consider giving the fish a jump start, and provide a good research opportunity to study re-colonization. Don't walk away for ten years and then ask why the fish have not returned.
- The Salmon River hatchery fish are a weak stock, due to in-breeding and changes in spawning seasonality. The hatchery contribution is nothing more than carcasses to the river. Don't transfer them to a different area. Use the Columbia River stock instead.
- Chinook will compete with coastal coho, with or without the use of the Salmon River hatchery. (note: ODFW did not find fall Chinook to be a problem.)
- In terms of stray rates, is the pattern seen with Salmon River hatchery fish typical with other weak stocks?
 - It is not clear, but at this point, it appears that the pattern is particular to the Salmon River.
 - Suggestion: Amend the proposal to include a monitoring component to understand the implications.
- On the North coast, there is an issue with steelhead releases competing with coho for rearing streams. So, look at other hatchery programs for adjustment, e.g. steelhead as it affects Nestucca stocks.
- Estimates show continuing trends of low number returns on fin-clipped fish. Those hatchery fish that find gravel to spawn do not reproduce a lot of offspring. So the Salmon River stock is a dead end.
- Is ODFW doing 100% marking of the hatchery coho?

- Yes. Suggest continuing this as part of a monitoring program. What is being done to change or improve performance of other hatcheries, as secondary actions? Is there M&E happening to show there is room for improvement in size, numbers, etc? What are the specific impacts of hatchery fish on the wild run? Write into the plan how you are monitoring.
- Re: the North Umpqua hatchery: ODFW is proposing, based on one year of data, which they continue to track this, and move forward with trying to remove these strays before they reach natural spawning grounds, move them, or decrease the numbers. The agency wants local (public) feedback before it takes action.
- Does the FERC re-licensing process include local input? Yes, it requires an extensive public process to go beyond the current mitigation agreement.
- What are the implications of ODFW's hatchery prioritization process on coho?
 - At this point, it is an internal exercise for ODFW, part of a maintenance management plan to help guide ODFW on making difficult funding decisions. It is not clear how public the document will be, nor how it will be used. If the document will affect this ESU, Ed Bowles will share more through this process.
- What does 'economic analysis' mean? Cost benefit? For some, it means comparative cost, between management options. Other perspectives: investments and returns, and whether modifications need to be made to get a better return. Need to look at the goal, not just the cost of the action. All agreed it is complex (see agenda item "Social and Economic Impacts' below for more discussion on this).

No objections to the proposed Option 2 were raised by the stakeholder team during the meeting, with the caveat that since the details will be in the draft chapter, team members reserve the right to comment later. Ed Bowles noted that Option 2 is a proposal out of the assessment, and would be a major change to the existing hatchery program. ODFW feels this option is biologically justified and will get us to Pass+. The agency recognizes there is a potential to reduce fisheries, but on a sliding scale ODFW will try to supplement any loss through other means. ODFW expects that other state agencies will put forth significant efforts to get these populations to pass+. (Hatcheries are within ODFW authority.) Option 2 proposes measures to identify limiting factors for now, and ODFW will need to monitor the management action to see if this change proves beneficial.

The Role of the TRT in the Conservation Plan

Rosemary Furfey and Heather Stout, NOAA, updated the group on a TRT meeting held February 22. Two years ago this TRT was formed to develop technical products, guidance, etc. to a recovery plan. With the no-list decision and the state's condensed schedule for writing a conservation plan, questions were raised about how the TRT will continue its involvement. The ODFW process schedule was shared with TRT at their meeting yesterday, and they in turn set specific tasks for the TRT to provide assistance on the development of the plan from here forward. Draft letters from the Regional Office and Science Center were sent to the TRT, directing them to stay involved. They will:

- Help ODFW write a draft plan: Reviewing the outline, providing input on intrinsic potential and doing modeling exercises.
- Continue to be part of the iterative process, with analysis.

- Help set hypotheses, to make the conservation plan a testable document.
- Evaluate strategies and sustainability of actions.
- Conduct analyses on what restoration science says about coho, and other analyses, e.g. how to preserve the best remaining habitat.
- Heather Stout will remain a liaison between the stakeholder team and TRT; if you have a question, she will put you in contact with the appropriate TRT member.

Stakeholder Team Member Comments and Questions

- The TRT viability document lacked limiting factors information, so it seemed premature to put out. The TRT expects to produce a limiting factors analysis, and an RM&E document, both of which can be folded into the conservation plan.
- What are the priorities for this TRT? Each domain has its own recovery team, so this TRT will stay committed and engaged with this process.
- Coordination between the different TRT's: They will be sharing guidance with each other, including cost analysis estimates, etc. (The TRT will share its cost analysis with the state as soon as possible.)

Heather offered kudos to the state for their immense efforts, and to the stakeholder team for their commitments and contributions to this effort.

Storyboards

Jay Nicholas, ODFW, presented storyboards with hypothetical examples of the process the state will go through to identify recovery actions and showed a graph of desired status that reflects ODFW's proposal. For each basin, a population is identified. Then for the population and basin, the following are identified: Land use, limiting factor, legacy impact, current threats, management actions existing to address the identified threats and who is responsible for those actions, new actions proposed, and current and future RM&E.

Stakeholder Team Member Comments and Questions

- Given the heart of the conservation plan will be based on voluntary measures, there is disconnect in the current format, which focuses on agencies. Also, say 'watershed councils', not 'OWEB', to more clearly show who will be doing the work.
- This addresses limiting factors, so cut the list back to real action organizations and agencies for each population, and put that short list at the top. (Caution was also given against scaling back too much to avoid missing areas where agencies could trade actions, partnerships etc.)

Social and Economic Impacts

Louise Solliday presented the state's thoughts on cost estimates that will be required in the recovery plan. It is possible to assess cost for management actions in terms of restoration work, and timeframes for implementing those actions. The 'business plan' concept, a cost benefit analysis, poses a dilemma. The business plan model does not work for this conservation plan, as we do not have a way to calculate how many fish will be produced by doing x amount or type of action. Alternatively, we can cost out management actions and look at the dollar value of the fish in a recreational and

commercial fishery. (E.g. If you increase from x number of fish to y number, here's the economic benefit it could provide.) There is a broad potential economic benefit from a fishing perspective, but we cannot conduct the same value assessment on cultural, aesthetic or other factors. Louise asked for thoughts from the team.

Stakeholder Team Comments and Questions

- Think in terms of public works, not fish. What kind of jobs would be produced per investment of projects? Use the ODOT model for measuring roadways, to gain short term justification of implementing the conservation plan. (It was noted that watershed councils are assessing job creation, in terms of restoration work that is needed, at a watershed scale. OWEB contracted with the U of O to do an analysis of job creation by county for their services as well. Look to their model.)
- What is the cost of NOT having a fishery? How much are people spending to fish? How much are they spending on recreational uses? This data is available.
- Do a cost benefit analysis for job creation for the short term, and potentials of fisheries for the long term. Factor in ecological values, e.g. improvement of water quality, etc. – ecosystem services.
- If the focus of the conservation plan is publicly funded/voluntary measures, the public works approach to an economic analysis is appropriate. If costs are inflicted on landowners and participants, it is NOT an appropriate approach.
- Look at costs across society—include regulatory costs.
- 'Cost' has already been paid by cuts to harvest in the past. Gains in the long term will outweigh the costs of our loss. Include cost to commercial fishers for restoration.

Next step—The state will do a cost analysis of management actions in the near term, and continue discussions about how to do a longer term cost benefit analysis. A comment was shared that both analyses will be vital for the state to receive Measure 66 funds. The state needs the analysis to back up what it is trying to do.

Looking Ahead

- ODFW will email the **Background Chapter** of the plan in the next week (NOTE: It was sent to the stakeholder team on 2/27). Send comments to the facilitation team by March 10, and they will then make recommendations to ODFW for incorporating the comments into the draft plan.
- ODFW is working on comments to the **TRT's Biological Recovery Criteria** document (presented by Pete Lawson at the 1/20 Stakeholder Team meeting) and asked that stakeholder team members send any additional comments to Kevin by March 10.

Wrap Up

The next meeting will be held on April 20 at the Oregon Hatchery Research Center in Alsea. An agenda will be sent out two weeks prior to the meeting. Agenda items include: Presentation/Discussion of Draft Conservation Plan

OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT
Stakeholder Team Meeting
Alesea Hatchery Research Center
Facilitator’s Meeting Summary
May 26, 2006

Attendees for all or part of the meeting:

Stakeholder Team Members: Bill Bakke (Native Fish Society), Paul Englemeyer (Audubon Society/Public), Tom Forgatsch (Farm Industry), Wayne Giesy (Alesea Valley Alliance), Jennifer Hampel (Coquille Watershed Association), Wayne Hoffman (Mid-Coast Watershed Council), Kaitlin Lovell (Trout Unlimited), Mark McCollister (Oregon Trout), Bill Moshofsky (Save the Salmon Coalition), Shawn Reiersgaard (Tillamook SWCD), Blake Rowe (Longview Fibre Company), Johnny Sundstrom (Assoc. of Soil and Watershed Conservation Districts), Bill Yocum (Freeman Rock, Inc.)

Resource Advisors:

Ed Bowles (ODFW), Sue Knapp (OR Gov’s Office)

Alternates and Technical Resources: Bob Buckman (ODFW), Dan Delany (Coquille Tribe), Douglas Fitlong (OWEB), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Mike Gray (ODFW), Ross Holloway (ODF), Liz Klicker (OWRD), Bridget Lohrman (NOAA), Bruce McIntosh (ODFW), Jo Morgan (ODF), Jay Nicholas (ODFW), David Noakes (OHRC), Joseph O’Neil (OHRC), Jeff Rodgers (ODFW), John Sanchez (USDA Forest Service), Heather Stout (NOAA-TRT), Ray Wilkeson, OFIC

Other Interested Parties:

Facilitation Team: Donna Silverberg and Robin Harkless

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Feedback on DRAFT Conservation Plan	Stakeholder Team to Kevin Goodson	June 16
2 nd Draft of Plan to Stakeholder Team	ODFW	July 14

Introductions/Housekeeping

Welcome Sue Knapp

The facilitator introduced Sue Knapp, resource advisor to the Stakeholder Team from the Governor’s Natural Resource Office. She explained that she is on assignment from ODFW to GNRO and looks forward to getting to know everyone as we move through this process. Applauding the team’s efforts to date, she suggested that we are on the cusp of putting a great plan together and that contributions from this Team are vital to success. The Hatchery Research Center is an example of the state’s commitment, cooperation and

collaborative efforts. Great things will come out of the facility and the Coastal Coho Conservation Plan.

Comments on February 23 Notes

No comments were shared on the 2/23 meeting summary. The facilitation team committed to sharing any major substantive changes with the group if comments were submitted after today.

Overview of Draft Coastal Coho Conservation Plan

The purpose of today's meeting was for ODFW to share the State's draft Coastal Coho Conservation Plan with the Stakeholder Team and for the team to ask questions and provide suggestions for improvements to the plan. The Stakeholder Team has until June 16 to send in their written comments on the plan. Handouts of each presentation on sections of the plan were provided at the meeting.

Outline

Bruce McIntosh, ODFW, began by referencing the annotated outline, an overview that provided perspective on the whole plan with highlights of elements written into the current draft. He reported that ODFW is still working on limiting factors and threats and details of the management actions, and anticipates reaching a final draft in the next 3-4 months. The plan will then go before the Fish and Wildlife Commission in Fall 2006. From ODFW's perspective, progress has been made to date, and the state continues to work diligently.

Introduction/Section 1

Jay Nicholas, ODFW, presented the Introduction of the draft. The basis and format for the plan were listed as: Conservation biology, Oregon's ESU assessment, Oregon Plan experience, NFCP and NOAA Recovery Plan elements. Key conclusions from the Oregon Plan Assessment of coho were listed, along with an overview of desired status goals and strategic actions to achieve the desired status, described as: Securing the viability of the ESU and significantly improving the productive capacity of all populations within the ESU. A handout was provided.

Q: Why were public lands exempt, per the strategic actions slide? They were not. The challenge to recovering coho requires habitat improvements on low gradient lands, many of which are private. Public lands are largely in the headwaters of river basins and are important for providing water quantity and quality but not over-wintering rearing habitat which has been found to be, ESU-wide, the biggest need. No ownerships are exempt – the plan needs to make this point very clear.

Q: Re: the conclusion about the importance of private lands. The emphasis on private land is misleading and reiterated throughout the report. Jay will talk with Bill Moshofsky more about this.

Q: Water quantity is an important factor. The need for storage should be included in the Plan.

Desired Status and Measurable Criteria

Bruce McIntosh, ODFW, presented the latest draft Desired Status section. Changes from the draft sent out on May 18 included: A timeframe for distribution criterion was added; abundance tables were corrected; population status was added as a criterion; and language on dependent population criteria was added. The desired status/broad sense recovery goal was quoted directly from the TRT's restoration goal and will be used as the operating paradigm.

Q: Timeframe for that goal? Not explicitly stated in the Plan; ODFW agreed it needs to be addressed.

Definitions of biological status were taken from ODFW and NOAA language. The state is focusing on how to move from current/viable status to a desired/broad sense recovery goal.

Q: Will biological status and broad sense recovery goals be defined for each population? Yes.

Q: Attributes of dependent populations included spawner trend and habitat conditions as measurable criteria. Why is 'habitat conditions' not included for independent populations? The same concept is expressed through the other attributes (persistence, distribution, etc.) for independent populations.

Q: For abundance, a 3- and 12- year time frame was included in the metric to track for trends. What are you averaging? ODFW responded that generally, each population is 'standardized' for a poor ocean condition. The group agreed at this point to come back to this issue after ODFW presented more of its draft. (See ** below.)

The foundation for setting abundance targets was a doubling in abundance relative to the 1993-99 poor ocean years. The target is set across the ESU, so, independent populations may be required to do much more than double in abundance. ODFW shared a quantitative table for ESU-wide abundance goals. During extremely low ocean survival, the goal is 1.1% average survival and spawners are 101,000.

Q: How are you using Amendment 13 numbers? They were calibrated to meet this ESU. Concern was raised for the lack of clarity on the linkages between Amendment 13 and life cycle monitoring sites. There is a real need to understand how ODFW has calibrated this. While there is support for the general direction the state is going, more clarification is needed. ODFW acknowledged the comment, and explained that the table reflects minimum production and escapement and only covers high quality habitat. It looks at maximum exploitation under Amendment 13, so provides a worst case scenario. ODFW requested that this concern also be shared as a written comment.

**Q: What is the average survival percentage? Both a 3- and 12- year running average will be expressed for survival: the past three years and a running average of 12 years.

ODFW chose this method as a way to standardize for poor ocean conditions and shift from retrospective to real-time. The ESU must pass both the 3- and 12- year average.

Need: The Stakeholder Team would like to see an example of how this metric is used.

For independent populations, habitat goals vary more during extremely low marine survival, and goals are more uniform during medium or average marine survival across the ESU. ODFW pointed this out to show a need to increase habitat capacity across the board and that the solution is different basin by basin during low vs. during average ocean years. A suggestion was made to remove the bar across the top of the graph to reduce confusion.

Q: Where is escapement measured? Through the existing monitoring program, at random sites.

Q: Concerns for the 3- and 12- year average threshold – you might need to respond faster than twelve years. Consider different statistically valid approaches for how FAR above and below the threshold you are, assessed on a shorter time frame. Adjust the magnitude?

Q: Were spawners measured outside high quality habitat? Yes. Be sensitive to which habitat is included when gauging smolt capacity once a translation is made from recruits/spawner.

Bruce described Criterion 5, Within Population Distribution. To pass, more than 50% of 5th field HUC's in each independent population have spawning densities of greater than or equal to 4 adults per mile. Distribution does not appear to be a problem for coastal coho at this point. ODFW feels that while work could be done on this criterion, at this point they are comfortable moving forward with what they have.

Q: Where are juveniles measured here? At the strata level. Currently, distribution is based on adults. Concern was raised with only using adults to measure distribution. There are cost effective ways to change the way you assess current status that will get you more sensitive data at a finer scale. A survey of juveniles at the 7th field scale, at a cost of under \$100,000 a year, could be done. ODFW suggested this be included in written comments and shared with Jeff Rodgers.

Q: re: Criterion 6, Diversity: ODFW has taken a very robust approach to protect the ESU from random genetic loss. In addition, include strategies for preventing selective loss. (E.g. look at summer rearing in the Lakes, whose populations experienced a loss from predation, reducing overall productivity.)

Bruce went on to discuss criteria for dependent populations. The first criterion, spawner trend, looks at differences in trend lines for adult escapement of independent vs. dependent populations in the same stratum. There was a need identified to define 'significant', stratum by stratum.

Q: Pass vs fail language is misleading. If an independent population is diminished and a dependent population improves, this should not be a fail. ODFW agreed they need to re-word this.

Criterion 2, Habitat Conditions, is measured at five year increments. It focuses on availability, not usability of the high quality habitat.

Q: How do you define high quality habitat? Clearly define this in the Plan. A comment was made that for dependent populations, instream complexity may not be the highest need as is true for independent populations. Definitions of high quality habitat will be different for individuals than for ESU-wide.

Strategic Framework

Jay Nicholas presented the strategic framework section of the Plan: Strategies were divided into three areas: Statewide or ESU action, regional conservation, and local conservation.

Statewide or ESU Action: Continue Oregon Plan implementation, improve performance of all populations, RM&E commitments and adaptive management.

Q: What is the ‘landscape’ perspective for the strategy for independent populations? The entire watershed. Change language to ‘watershed’ perspective.

Jay clarified that independent populations include 21 populations in the largest streams that retain their genetic identity. Dependent populations are the smaller streams with limited habitat so the population may disappear during poor ocean survival. The Umpqua has four independent populations.

Q: To address water temperature and quantity issues, storage could be provided in upper areas.

Q: Only ‘natural spawning’ fish are addressed in the draft. Acknowledge in the document there is room for hatcheries as a tool. Omission could be interpreted as exclusion. ODFW responded that this concept will be included in the document clearly if it is not already.

Q: Why are marine derived nutrients not included? ODFW has discussed this and do not have a clear way to provide a metric, other than through abundance (and complexity?). Suggestion: if ODFW does not discount this as a strategy, include it explicitly in the Plan. Overall, provide more details for each strategy.

Q: Is there a scientific basis for distinctions between independent and dependent populations? Yes, the TRT has provided this and it is well documented. Given that, why not explicitly address limiting factors for dependent populations? ODFW is not focusing as much on dependent populations, partly because there are not enough resources to do so. Watershed Councils are doing some work for some dependent populations.

Suggestion: Be clearer in the document that limiting factors are being addressed for dependent populations.

Q: How does adaptive management relate to ocean conditions? There is much research ongoing. Include management actions for off-shore limiting factors? ODFW cannot manage ocean conditions and has no plans to provide management actions, but will include language that they will track ocean conditions.

Regional Conservation Strategies: The state will continue to collaborate on regionally shared conservation strategies.

Local Conservation Strategies: Similar to the regional strategies. The state does not expect that all local groups are going to provide all management actions specifically for coho, but some actions will provide support for coho and the state will continue to support local efforts, e.g. through exchange of data.

Comment: If collaboration is our strategy, we need a measurement of success to justify resources spent. Identify and emphasize areas that can be measurable and show ‘success in collaboration’.

Q: Will there be a separate work or ‘business plan’ as discussed throughout the Stakeholder Team process? The state’s intent is to include some form of ‘business plan’ as part of the overall conservation plan.

Section 8: Conservation Actions

Kevin Goodson presented the section on Conservation Actions, noting that regional and ESU-wide actions were included in the current draft and that population-specific actions will be completed later. The actions are summarized below:

Program Continuation

ODFW – Harvest: Manage fisheries through Amendment 13 to achieve desired status; consider terminal fisheries when possible.

Comment: Review Amendment 13.

ODA – 100% compliance with agricultural water quality management plan rules, use remote sensing to monitor riparian condition.

Comment: The question is not about whether there is compliance, but whether the rules are adequate.

Modifications

ODFW – western Oregon stream restoration program will focus on high quality habitat; streamlined process for wood placement in conjunction with forestry operations (no longer required to go through the COE per EPA’s ruling); focus riparian on diverse and

locally adapted plant communities; and develop restoration projects to encourage beaver dams where appropriate.

Q: Will the focus be more broadly on lowlands than in the past? Yes.

ODF – Watershed assessments on north coast 5th field watersheds on state forest lands; Elliott State Forest’s revised Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) will identify conservation management strategies for coho (will do for other state forests too); Annual Operations Plans for Tillamook and Clatsop State Forests allow for targeted restoration projects.

Suggestion: It is possible that the revised HCP, still under review, will not move forward so do not include as an action in the Coastal Coho Conservation Plan until it is certain that the revision has been approved. ODFW suggested that it should be included as a desired strategy with a note that the revised HCP is one way that might be a means for carrying forward the strategy. Note: There IS an HCP in place so wordsmith so it accurately reflects reality.

DEQ – TMDL implementation and effectiveness monitoring at a finer level; will implement statewide water quality monitoring strategy.

New Programs/Actions

Many will be described at the population level.

Multi agency – Coordinate restoration of winter high intrinsic potential on agricultural, small woodlot and rural/residential.

Comment: ‘WHIP’ as an acronym is already used in a different context, so use a different one.

Q: Where does urban land fit in? Under rural/residential. Specifically include an ‘urban’ category separate from rural. ODFW will do an urban forestry plan and would like to highlight in the plan the importance of the urban forest.

ODFW – Beaver dams: update beaver maps to better identify potential dam locations; train biologists to identify habitat conditions favorable for beavers and assist landowners with damage.

Q: Include also a strategy to reduce the loss of beaver dams, or a strategy to seek legislative measures to remove beavers as ‘nuisance’ animals. On private lands (mostly agricultural), there is no requirement but ODFW will be looking for non-regulatory means to get at this. Suggestion: Distinguish between commercial and nuisance since there are different means for addressing beavers.

ODFW – Hatchery: ESU smolt releases reduced from 760,000 to 260,000. Hatchery releases into Salmon, North Umpqua, Siletz, Coos and Coquille will be eliminated. Research from OHRC will be considered in future hatchery program management.

Q: Will information on ways to use hatcheries be included? Include specifics on improvements to management actions known to ODFW already.

Comment: The smolt release reductions seem like a huge loss of hatchery fish. ODFW responded that this reduction is small in comparison to all smolts that comprise the ocean fishery, so ODFW does not anticipate this will be felt in the ocean fishery.

Question about deferred maintenance issues of hatcheries: ODFW has a statewide documented piece on what the hatchery facility maintenance issues are to be shared with Legislature.

A table of hatchery coho releases in the ESU comparing recent targets with those proposed in the Plan was included in Kevin's handout.

Q: Is the STEP program included in the table? Yes. A suggestion was made to explicitly identify the STEP program in the table.

OWEB – Restoration priorities are being developed for the coast that will utilize limiting factors identified in the plan; additional funding is available in the current biennium for restoration and protection projects; will work closely with Watershed Councils and SWCD's to address limiting factors on private lands; an effectiveness monitoring initiative is currently being developed.

Comment: Funding may be available but the pie is being divided much less for coordinators to organize the work and use the funding on the ground. Include as a necessary action or strategy more support for watershed councils and districts in terms of coordination and technical assistance. Note also that the funding increase is statewide, not just for the coast. The Oregon Plan 'delivery system' needs an assessment. Administrative and technical assistance is lacking.

ACTION: For the next draft, ODFW will work with OWEB and stakeholder team members on a management strategy that covers these issues.

Q: Why not start the Plan with limiting factors and follow with management actions responding to those factors? ODFW agrees; the draft is outlined that way.

ODF – The Board of Forestry is considering proposed rules for riparian protection; ODF is working with private forest managers to develop a list of non-regulatory actions aimed at large wood recruitment; and recent de-regulation (from EPA, as mentioned above) of large wood placement during silvicultural activities should lead to more projects being implemented.

Comment: The ODF actions are speculative so use caution when referencing them. There is inconsistency between ODF and all the other agencies' proposed actions. Only include what exists, not what may be. Ed Bowles, ODFW, responded that all management actions will be formally reviewed by each of the agencies before adoption. The Plan sets

up the strategy while the vehicle may or may not be in place yet to implement it. Still, use extreme caution when doing this –remove regulatory discussions and use caution with non-regulatory actions before they are fully worked out. You may be pushing too hard in this process which may truncate the Board of Forestry process.

Comment: Consider Measure 37 and its impact on management actions and strategies.

Kevin noted that other agencies' actions are still under development.

Lunch with Dr. Noakes

Dr. David Noakes, Director of the Oregon Hatchery Research Center, provided an overview of work being done at the Center, noting the unique partnership between ODFW and OSU. This is a place for folks all over the world to come and do research on the relationship between genetics and environment. A tour of the facilities was scheduled for after today's meeting.

RM&E

Jeff Rodgers presented the Research, Monitoring and Evaluation section of the draft Conservation Plan. He listed a number of research needs and provided a handout of the needs (in no priority order).

RME Need: Research on the relative importance of life stage specific limiting factors throughout a watershed at the population scale. (Linkage across landscape/influences through entire life cycle.)

Comment re: 'limiting' factor vs. 'optimal' factor. It was noted that the MidCoast Watershed Council uses the Nickelsen/Lawson model to make predictions about 'optimal' using research on carrying capacities in the coast range. As we market this plan, we need to answer 'how much is enough?' Don't just focus on limiting factors, it is not a good way to address the public for buy-in. ODFW is working on this across recovery plans and the TRT has been looking at 'optimal' conditions in terms of restoration.

Q: Have you included in this RME need a focus on mainstream and tidal rearing areas? Yes, ODFW will need to look at limiting factors on a finer scale.

Suggestion: Add, as a placeholder, a need for social and economic RME.

RME Need: Monitoring the effectiveness of restoration actions. For now, propose adopting Washington's "Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy for Habitat Restoration and Acquisition Projects".

Comment: Use caution with using Washington's strategy because it may not be inclusive of the real issue of cause and effect on fish. Re-word to use Washington's strategy as a component for monitoring effectiveness of restoration actions.

RME Need: Refinement of Winter HIP Model. (Now referred to as HAP – high aquatic potential).

RME Need: Evaluation of ‘passive’ vs. ‘active’ approach to future large wood recruitment.

Comment: Don’t specifically include the ‘Alternative to Rule Concept #8’ proposal which may not be approved; simply describe the intent.

RME Need: Monitoring status and trend of coho and their habitat at population scale. (Up from strata scale).

Comment: Use caution when monitoring water quality to line up reality with what is being monitored. Water quality can be (and has been) incorrectly determined ‘poor’.

RME Need: Beaver populations and their habitat to maximize their benefits to coho.

Q: Are there studies on beaver dam effects on temperature? Yes.

RME Need: Case-study research on the re-establishment of a self-sustaining population of coho in Salmon River once the hatchery program is eliminated.

RME Need: Ways to reduce limiting factors to production of coho from the Lakes.

RME Need: Development and evaluation of tools to identify and prioritize restoration projects.

Comment: Development of tools vs. social opportunity is split, 50/50. Suggestion: Include this concept for the entire RME piece. Ask SWCD’s how to do this.

Comment on The Lakes: In other parts of the world, coho are doing well in the lakes. Spawning areas might be a solution for this. Still, in the long term, the lakes populations are deteriorating.

Comment: Request for discussion on RME Budget: What will each need cost, program cost for status assessments, ways to be more efficient, etc.

Expected Outcomes

Jay Nicholas covered the Expected Outcomes section of the Plan. He suggested that it will take commitment, accountability and time for implementation to succeed.

Long term Strategy – 50+ years

Comment: This strategy is characterized for expected outcomes. With forest lands at the top, it appears that all blame and responsibility is on forestry. While the intent may not be there, perception is reality, so re-characterize this section. One suggestion was to change the format to cover lowland, highland, etc. and later present that the land is 50/50 private

forest and agriculture; 20% urban residential. ODFW emphasized that the Plan does not intend to say regulatory actions are not working, but rather are pushing more to non-regulatory actions. The authors need to write this in a way so as not to push those kinds of buttons.

Comment: The implication that benefits will not really appear for 50+ years is pessimistic. Interventions work in the short term. Put the slides in a different order so the short term comes before longer term. (Others felt that it is important to show that a long term effort will be required. Don't mismanage expectations.) ODFW responded that the intent toward forestry was that there is not an expectation to do things overnight – it takes time to grow trees.

Suggestion: Add economic changes/impacts to forest lands.

Suggestion: Add water quantity and emphasize opportunities for urban areas.

Comment: For agricultural lands, we are targeting restoration. Recommend putting 'targeted restoration' in for a long term outcome.

Short Term Strategies: Harvest management, hatchery management, habitat

Comment: Urban areas are increasing at a high rate. Agricultural land is decreasing. So include urban, state and federal lands.

Comment: 'Maintain existing land management protections' is not good enough. We need to ratchet up the level of protection. ODFW responded that this may be part of the long term plan as a component of adaptive management. For short term strategies, ODFW echoed the Oregon Plan assessment of coho, which recommended maintaining existing protections and developing non-regulatory actions.

Comment: Short term efforts are essentially an ER response in order to get longer term practices to take effect. It will take a very long time and over many different circumstances. We need to acknowledge both and link short and long term efforts.

Comment: Farms are being replaced by urban areas. Need to acknowledge this in the long term strategy. There is no data to support this as critical. The report is flawed, out of synch with reality – e.g. Bandon.

Ed Bowles offered that the conservation plan is not a 50-100 year plan. It is living and adaptive. The presentation on expected outcomes seeks to paint a realistic picture on how long it will take to see results of our efforts. The time scale for the plan will be much shorter in terms of governance. At benchmarks, the plan could change, shift, stay the course, etc.

Timeline

Kevin provided a handout of the proposed timeline for completion of the Coho Plan.

A question was asked about the process for incorporating comments. Comments will be considered during each round of drafts. Also, a facilitator report on the stakeholder team process will be appended to the plan, similar to that for the Native Fish Conservation Policy. What about additional comments that are not incorporated into the Plan? With the final product, any dissent should get recorded and presented to the Fish and Wildlife Commission, either through the facilitator's report or separately.

Comment: On the timeline, what does 'assess level of support' mean? What is the process? Again, it was suggested that there will be two options – through the facilitator's report and individual comments to the Commission. Concern was raised about including all the dissenting views, given the ongoing litigation.

ACTION: The facilitation team will send the facilitator's report on the NFCP to the Stakeholder Team.

Intent to File Suit against NOAA

Sue Knapp shared the GNRO perspective that the state's conservation planning process is separate from the intent to file suit against the federal government. The Plan will be completed. From GNRO's perspective and other legal perspectives, nothing said here will be used as evidence as litigation. Oregon Legal Council has offered that at the time of the Coastal Coho listing decision, what was on record will be reviewed; anything since then is not part of that process. This is a state plan, not just ODFW's. Sue will be working to get all state agencies informed and involved and the Governor's office will be responsible for ensuring that all agencies participate. The Core team meets regularly to discuss these issues so continues to be a resource. Agency leads have been asked to attend the July stakeholder team meeting. The Governor's office will take the lead in presenting the Plan to the public. Again, Sue acknowledged and thanked the stakeholder team for its involvement in this process, adding that the exchange with the Stakeholder Team continues to be valuable to the product the state is developing.

Issues Discussion of the Draft Plan

The stakeholder team raised issues and shared comments on the Draft Plan presented today.

- The Oregon Plan was supported long ago. Concern with the current litigation course. To show the state is making progress will take longer than is provided before NOAA potentially starts regulating us again. Short term efforts should be toward over-wintering habitat through non-regulatory measures. Suggestion: Landowners donate three logs and have ODFW provide training on how to best place the wood. Involve NOAA as support. Also, ODFW needs to control predation. Need specific recommendations. Let ODFW continue to do the good work they are capable of.
- Provide a 'business plan' to the public, not fully quantified but provide estimates as a guide. Turn technical information into a socioeconomic component. ODFW is not equipped to do this so enlist other state folks. Resolve issues between Watershed Councils and Soil and Water Conservation Districts. Include an analysis of effectiveness and suggested improvements to these 'delivery systems'

in the Plan. Clearly identify restoration practices. Include cabling (movement of large woody debris) as a management action.

- Provide an Executive Summary in the beginning to give a flavor of the Plan.
- Set priorities for the agency and the public – this could be achieved through a business plan. Outreach is critical. Predators, e.g. are a social issue if not a real issue.
- **ACTION**: Wayne Hoffman and other interested stakeholder team members will continue discussions with Jeff Rodgers re: monitoring improvement opportunities.

Ed Bowles shared thoughts on the plan, noting the tension between writing a plan that includes everything vs. a plan that sets the stage for additional ‘business plans’ or other implementation plans. The state’s Plan lays out the vision, principles and strategies. From his perspective, individual business plans would get into finer details of actions, cost analysis, etc. The finer tune requires extra work and local stakeholder involvement, and requires commitments from non-state agencies to carry out. Ed asked for others’ thoughts on this:

- The business plan would be a priority area for each population, and then rolled up to ESU-wide. Take limiting factors and put pressure on those factors to increase viability.
- What is the cost and benefit to coastal communities to carrying out ODFW’s desired status goal? It was suggested that the Governor’s office should take the lead on finding an answer to this question.
- Show how bringing the fish back will provide economic, social and cultural benefits. Clearly put that vision in the Plan, up front.
- Look at various levels of achieving the goal. Develop agency costs and benefits, across different timeframes. Different approaches with different levels of probability of success as a separate document for agencies to use. This should be developed before presenting the conservation plan to the public.
- Develop the business plan as a separate report to be used by funding agencies to prioritize projects, e.g.. A ‘soft’ business plan that includes general estimates and guidance.

Next Steps

The Stakeholder Team will provide written comments to ODFW (Kevin Goodson) by June 16. ODFW will write a second draft of the plan and send it to the team around July 14. Agency leads will be asked to attend the next stakeholder team meeting (in early August) to answer questions and provide additional insights into their contributions and commitments to the state’s Coastal Coho Conservation Plan.

OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT
Stakeholder Team Meeting
ODFW South Willamette Watershed Division Office
Adair Village
Facilitator’s Meeting Summary

August 4, 2006

Attendees for all or part of the meeting:

Stakeholder Team Members: Paul Englemeyer (Audubon Society/Public), Wayne Giesy (Alesia Valley Alliance), Jennifer Hampel (Coquille Watershed Association), Paul Heikkila (OSU Extension/Sea Grant; Oregon Salmon Commission), Les Helgeson (Native Fish Society), Wayne Hoffman (Mid-Coast Watershed Council), Kaitlin Lovell (Trout Unlimited), Mark McCollister (Oregon Trout), Bill Moshofsky (Save the Salmon Coalition), Dennis Richey (Oregon Anglers), Blake Rowe (Longview Fibre Company), Johnny Sundstrom (Assoc. of Soil and Watershed Conservation Districts), Stan Van de Wetering (Siletz Tribes)

Resource Advisors:

Rosemary Furfey (NOAA), Sue Knapp (GNRO), Jay Nicholas (ODFW)

Alternates and Technical Resources: Amy Amoroso (Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe), Greg Apke (ODOT), Sheila Ault (DOA), Ken Bierly (OWEB), Bob Buckman (ODFW), Mike Cafferata (ODF), Larry Cooper (ODFW), Dan Delany (Coquille Tribe), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Mike Gray (ODFW), Ross Holloway (ODF), Chris Jarmer (OFIC), Elizabeth Klicker (OWRD), Dan Knoll (ODFW), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA), Bridgette Lohrman (NOAA), Gary Lynch (DOGAMI), Bruce McIntosh (ODFW), Kelly Moore (ODFW), Joe Moreau (BLM), Jo Morgan (ODF), Nicole Navas (DSL), Eric Nigg (ODEQ), Sharmila Premdas (BLM), Bob Ruediger (BLM), Tom Shafer (OWEB), Heather Stout (NOAA-TRT)

Facilitation Team: Donna Silverberg and Robin Harkless

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Feedback on second DRAFT Conservation Plan	Stakeholder Team to Kevin Goodson	August 25
Public DRAFT Plan to Stakeholder Team	ODFW	September 20
Draft Facilitator Report to Stakeholder Team	DS Consulting	September 20
Next Stakeholder Team Meeting to discuss public draft Coho Plan and Facilitator Report	All	September 26 (*Note potential date shift)

Introductions/Housekeeping

Comments on May 26 Notes: No comments were shared on the 5/26 meeting summary. The Facilitation Team committed to sharing any major substantive changes with the group if comments were submitted after today.

Overview of Draft Coastal Coho Conservation Plan

Jay Nicholas, ODFW, gave an overview of the general concepts of the second draft of the Oregon Coastal Coho Conservation Plan, emphasizing that this is a *State of Oregon* plan, not just ODFW or any other single entity. The timeline shifted somewhat due to the delay in getting the second draft to the Stakeholder Team. Jay provided an updated schedule to the group. Written comments on the second draft are due by August 25. The final draft plan is expected to go before the Fish and Wildlife Commission for review in December 2006, for adoption in January 2007. The expectation is that the final draft will be reviewed and endorsed by all contributing state agencies before it is presented to the Commission.

Jay described the conservation plan as a refinement and outgrowth of the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds, and clarified that this conservation plan is not a departure from or replacement of the Oregon Plan. Changes to the second draft included more specificity on adaptive management; additional language on the conservation strategy; more detail and clarity on leadership and accountability; and new sections on ‘uncertainty and critique’ and ‘basis for optimism’. Three key messages about the Plan were shared: 1) The plan is staged for immediate implementation. 2) It sets the stage for further refinement of within-population strategies and action. 3) Finally, monitoring and future review of the plan will be important to establish trends and detect effectiveness.

Key new actions include:

- Leadership and Accountability – More clearly lines out the responsibility of all state agencies involved.
- Private Lands Initiative – A state initiative to partner with local planning teams and provide incentives to landowners to participate in landscape scale conservation actions. (This was further discussed later in the meeting, and was noted as an important new action.)
- Hatchery program changes – Key for 2 of the 21 populations.
- Priorities – Established via limiting factors and populations.
- Conservation tools – Coho Winter High Intrinsic Potential (CWHIP)
- Monitoring – Improvements made and plans to continue improving.
- Early Warning System – Includes an annual report on the breadth of current information and a trigger to help determine if assumptions were wrong and enable the public and agencies, etc. to make adaptive management changes.

The latest draft emphasizes a shift in management to enlisting the support of all state agencies to take a more comprehensive approach to address the needs of the fish. Few changes were made to desired status (the time frame for reaching desired status is 50 years). The principles remain to not lose ground, to improve all populations to viable for survival during poor ocean conditions, and to strive for improvements to abundance and habitat. The latest draft includes a commitment to develop habitat criteria, and to provide a retrospective example to show how all criteria are applied. A ‘desired status vision’ was added to show what desired status will look like when achieved. It included, e.g., opportunities for harvesting hatchery and wild Oregon coast coho, working across the landscape, local economic improvements, and providing carcasses for nutrients. Jay

encouraged stakeholder team members to provide written comments on any additional suggested descriptions for the vision.

The conservation strategy includes improving the status of all populations. From ODFW's perspective, the Lakes populations pose a challenge. Actions within the strategy will occur simultaneously. ODFW is open to suggestions on harvest management. A new action included researching the impact and control of predation. Finally, integration is the third piece to the conservation strategy. This recognizes the importance of ecological processes, and seeks balance between restoration activities and impingements on private landowners.

The within-population strategy is proposed to be locally-driven and includes verifying, mapping, looking at local limiting factors, and sequencing action plans. The plan suggests that a strategy will be developed through work between landowners, fish biologists, ports, SWCD's, WC's, etc – all who have a stake and local expertise – by January 2008 with help from the Implementation Team.

RM&E: As a basis for informed adaptive management, RM&E includes improved monitoring at the population scale, better detection of trends in habitat, and annual reporting on coho and habitat status from the Leadership group. RM&E components also include the Early Warning System mentioned earlier, a 6-year formal re-assessment of the plan and a 12-year assessment of habitat trends. Research priorities were established and included in this draft. Jay noted that no priorities in the top and middle tier are funded at this point.

The plan is ready for implementation. It recognizes that local investments and partners (SWCD's, Watershed Councils, etc.) may have other policies, species and goals to consider. Priorities will be set through local decisions. Again, the plan encourages a within-population strategy to be developed by January 2008.

Feedback Requested: Leadership Accountability: With regards to leadership accountability, the goal is to make certain that actions are being taken to reach desired status goals. Questions to be considered include: What has been done? Who is responsible? To whom should the report be sent? Who will provide input to the report? ODFW requested written responses from the other state agencies and stakeholder team members on the above questions.

A question was asked about the targets for annual reporting: What will those be? ODFW responded that the annual report will look at whether those agency-committed actions were delivered, a description of the work, and the impact the action had.

Feedback Requested: Funding: The state requested that stakeholders provide written comments on funding issues relative to meeting key actions in the plan, specifically needs for additional funding.

Feedback Requested: Areas of Uncertainty: The ‘areas of uncertainty’ section looks at key elements that may have been missed. The state requested that stakeholders include any additional missed or mischaracterized uncertainty elements in their written comments.

Finally, Oregon is cautiously optimistic for a number of reasons: Compared to many other ESU’s, the coast coho ESU is closest to being viable. The state has seen positive responses in recent years, good non-regulatory work is happening, and improved monitoring and other tools are being utilized.

Sue Knapp, GNRO, offered comments on accountability and leadership. A Core Team is in place and will play a role in helping this piece along, as it includes multi-agency representatives and links to policy level folks in each of the agencies. Additionally, directors of all natural resource agencies have received a copy of the plan, are engaged and informed, and are providing comments on the plan.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions and Comments that Need Clarification in the Body of the Plan (in alphabetical order to help with editing)

- Actions
 - Per ESA requirements, NOAA is interested in seeing site-specific actions and time/cost for those actions. What is expected for January 2008? ODFW: What is the action, who owns the land, is an action working well, can improvements be made, sequencing issues, etc. Priorities will be based on need and opportunity. NOAA offered to provide support/guidance for the level of detail required from an ESA perspective.
- Amendment 13
 - Provide an evaluation on this. Include more information about its effect on the Plan.
 - Note on A-13: Improvements are being made and moving in a positive direction.
- Assessment
 - Will we assess what HAS been done? Some monitoring of subsets of habitat restoration projects have been done, but could be improved. Will a cluster of restoration projects within a population be assessed? Perhaps a shift to more research than just on the ground actions would be the best strategy. OWEB is looking at effectiveness of types of projects, but at what *scale* has not been addressed yet. Discussions are happening at OWEB. The state does not plan to halt actions in order to do research. Concern was raised that focusing on population evaluations may not answer the effectiveness of the work we are doing. This could be better clarified.
 - The 6-year review timeline is too short from a practical standpoint. Change or better describe this check-in to express that the true review will happen in a 12-year time frame. ODFW responded that the 6-year check-in will only

happen once, then will go to a 12-year. ODFW will better describe what the 6-year review will look like.

- Do not wait 12 years to check in and evaluate actions/status. Build in a plan to check in sooner.
- Beavers:
 - Support it as a research priority but concerns remain with other text on the topic, including page 97 on take assertions, etc. ODFW suggested that specific written comments be provided on this.
 - Stream complexity as a limiting factor can be addressed by ODFW through beaver actions. Put more emphasis on this in the Plan.
 - A strategy and realistic goals are needed to get funding. Predation as a high research priority is a good selling point for the public, and makes sense as we do not know what a shift in beaver management will do.
 - Beaver as a ‘predator’? This does not make sense. Please clarify.
- Delivery system:
 - SWCD’s and Watershed Councils need to be delineated as entities: their functions, funding and purposes. Don’t lump them together and simply state a ‘need for additional funding’. This infrastructure will carry the ball so needs more attention. Help solve the funding issues and communication linkages from these groups to state agencies.
- Early warning system:
 - Could learn sooner than 12 years that a problem is on the horizon. Intent here was to be looking at real time, not based on the desired status gauge. Make this clearer in the document.
 - Will the early warning system be included in formal annual reporting as part of the accountability piece? Yes. Will there be opportunity for assessment by others for early warning, not just the State? And will they be population by population or strata, or...? Clarify this section
 - A suggestion was made to include a framework for problem solving with regards to the early warning system.
- Fish Status
 - Include reasons for the downturns in numbers, why we got to the low numbers that we did that prompted the use of hatcheries.
 - Add more detail to ‘future threats’ in addition to limiting factors.
- Funding:
 - Be more explicit that new funding is needed to achieve the new mission described in the Plan.
 - Include additional actions and funding commitments. Status quo on funding is not good enough.

- Genetics:
 - Support the section addressing life history genetics.

- Habitat:
 - Restoring the functions of the ecosystem, page 99. Restoration of habitat means supporting its diversity. Cabling large wood as a management action is appropriate and affordable. The Plan must serve to restore ecosystems, not just individual habitat areas. Move ‘restoring ecological processes’ higher up as a priority.
 - **Feedback Requested: Habitat Criteria:** Please include written suggestions on how to develop these. ODFW will share draft thinking on this as soon as it is ready.
 - Suggest using Gordie Reeves’ presentation on stream complexity as a tool for setting habitat criteria.

- Habitat Monitoring:
 - Support the addition of habitat monitoring. Metrics are different for beaver than for habitat. Each impacts the other so be clear in linking the two.

- Hatchery Mitigation:
 - Hatchery Research Center findings will impact this document. Be clearer that knowledge gleaned from these findings will be used to *achieve desired status* of the ESU.
 - ‘Overstocking’ of fish--What does this mean? Relative to naturally-produced fish, too many hatchery fish have caused some naturally produced to decline *in some populations*, including the Salmon River. ODFW continues to look at how to address this issue.
 - Noted a perceived bias against hatchery fish throughout the document. Clarify that this isn’t so and that the new Hatchery Research Center will provide better understanding.

- Leadership and Accountability:
 - Including a section on accountability and leadership is a positive addition to the Plan.
 - What are the consequences for a state agency NOT meeting its obligations? Will lack of funding be an excuse to not implement actions? Sue Knapp responded that the state supports this plan and will work to move forward with necessary funding changes/restructuring if needed to accomplish the Plan’s goals.
 - Keep in perspective that at the end of the process there will be a plan for every ESU. Suggest a policy/leadership committee for all ESU’s, rather than one for each. Cautioned, given time and funding resource constraints, not to put all focus on this ESU at cost to the others that will follow. Fit this into the broader program.

- Risks and threats: Each agency should understand this in the context of its own authority, and all should be shared in a memo to the Governor’s office. Do not lose ground and, then, enforce accountability. Address risks and identify threats sooner than later.
- Multi Species:
 - To what extent is the Plan compatible to other species? Actions included in the plan for coho will not adversely affect other species, and could be beneficial for other species, e.g. stream complexity improving water quality overall. Suggest including more on this as a ‘selling point’ marketing tool for buy-in.
 - As an ‘outgrowth of the Oregon Plan’, emphasize that this is just the coho piece of the Oregon Plan, that it builds on elements of the Oregon Plan, and is NOT a replacement to the Oregon Plan.
 - Include the ODFW Strategic Wildlife Plan to the regulatory framework list.
- Over-wintering habitat
 - Improvement suggestion, (as expressed before): Help landowners volunteer their wood by providing technical support from ODFW and financial support from NOAA for those that need it.
 - Addressing over-wintering habitat will produce the fastest results, and we need to make improvements soon to keep public buy-in.
- Predators
 - Happy to see attention to this. Appreciate efforts in moving this forward.
- Prioritization:
 - Do not support the scale used, nor prioritizing between populations. Drop the priority of one area over another; instead look to improvement in all populations and look to the best work that can be done in individual areas. ODFW can provide better articulation of this prioritization. ODFW noted the intent with this prioritization was to look for greatest opportunity.
 - The potential gains with improving the Lakes are high so do not ignore these populations. Rethink prioritization to look at potentials.
 - Prioritization, as listed, will pit one local group against another. This is counter-productive for a whole system that needs assistance.
- Private Lands Initiative:
 - Look at Watershed Council successes to help shape this initiative. Psychology and sociology are as important as fish biology and both should be addressed in the details of the Initiative.
 - Focused guidance is needed on the Private Lands Initiative, page 88. Do not be too forceful in guidance if you want landowner buy-in and ownership. Give the appropriate level of guidance and types of tools but don’t tell landowners *how* to do it.

- Concern with Private Lands Initiative. The state should build on good relationships already formed between landowners, local fish biologists and Watershed Councils to implement this.
- Public Reaction and Outreach:
 - Page 25 in Appendix. Strategy does not include WHAT will be provided in the outreach program. Will it make links to goals that will be achieved, impacts, and the resulting benefits if desired status is achieved? Page 69: Need to market this to all affected public and inform the public about costs and consequences. Develop a business plan.
- Timeframe:
 - In the January 2008 timeframe, also include coordination on actions with points of contact from federal agencies.
 - Page 80, mapping. Is the expectation for January 2008 that the recommended *schedule* for accomplishing actions will be completed, or actual actions will be *carried out*? Clarify.
- Uncertainty:
 - ‘We believe’ and ‘we think’ statements are not satisfactory for a complete recovery plan. Use specific data and offer a range of alternatives. Give a choice on which direction to go with regards to regulatory and funding structures, incentives, etc. With practical limitations, a policy choice needs to be made. Give us some options to buy into, while also including ODFW’s position on what should be done.

Thank you for acknowledging our concerns – now the state needs to address them!

Agency Commitments and Contributions

Multi-agency Commitments: Kelly Moore, ODFW, presented information about the **Private Lands Restoration Initiative**, and provided a handout. He described this as a Winter High Intrinsic Potential landscape scale conservation action, noting that identifying these high intrinsic potential areas does not preclude or substitute for also looking at spawning areas. The two are linked and considered together. Much of the work is not new, but the state’s focus on private landowners is new. The initiative involves using local planning teams, identifying the best project locations, getting landowner buy-in with incentives and funding, providing regulatory assistance, doing project construction and maintenance, and incorporating RM&E.

Partners in this initiative include landowners, Watershed Councils, SWCD’s, OFIC, Agricultural organizations, OWEB, ODFW, ODA, ODF, USFW, BLM, OSU Extension, NRCS and others.

Ecosystem partners include salmon, beaver, large wood, trees and shrubs – this was emphasized to show an expansion of activities beyond just the traditional use of large wood. Kelly offered four concepts that serve as the basis for the Initiative.

- 1) Sustained agricultural and forest uses can help support salmon.
- 2) Agricultural and forest and land use practices are compatible with recovery goals.
- 3) Non-regulatory (and non-prescriptive) management approaches can be effective at accelerating recovery.
- 4) Active projects that address near term limiting factors will contribute to long term success of the Plan.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions and Comments That Need Clarification in the Plan

- How will #3 happen? Through incentives and ownership. There is movement toward supporting more non-regulatory actions.
- Given the many local planning teams which are already in place, change language to read “utilize existing and, where needed, form local planning teams”. Too many planning processes result in dilution.
- Make sure existing partnerships are clearly acknowledged.
- Not clear how what’s been highlighted is different/new.
- How can these projects be done as pilots? An example from the Siuslaw Forest was provided, which involved three different treatments to three tributaries and asked local landowners which alternative was best based on the limiting factors.
- The best we can do is accelerate our natural processes, by connecting streams and taking advantage of geological processes. This takes time! 50 years is an appropriate timeframe for expecting to reach desired status.
- How will this address stream complexity, the overall biggest limiting factor?
- Suggest refining the WHIP percentage to better reflect the actual area.
- Who would be in charge of coordinating this initiative? Likely co-leadership from ODA, ODF, ODFW and OWEB. This needs to be better thought out and explained, and fine tuned for accountability. (Folks were encouraged to look to Appendix I for more details on the Initiative.)

Multi-agency Commitments: Kevin Goodson, ODFW, presented information on **Interagency Data Sharing** as a multi-agency action. The ultimate goal is to ensure compatibility, improve storing and sharing capabilities, and incorporate the annual review. A suggestion was made to involve federal agencies in the interagency cooperation list.

ODFW Commitments: Changes include **Habitat Protection:** Through collaboration, keep staff up to date on latest techniques and processes; **RM&E:** Implement modifications and collaborate with other groups; **Conservation Plan Outreach:** Utilize communications positions to do outreach on the Oregon Plan and market the Coho Conservation Plan.

Stakeholder Team Questions and Comments that Need Clarification in the Plan

- Look at non-coho hatcheries for potential changes to hatchery practices. (ODFW responded that this is lower in importance than other actions but will be considered for the future).

- Suggest proposing additional funding/administrative support for Western Streams Restoration Practices.
- Beaver: Need to clarify ‘carrying capacity’ statement. Intent was to find the best locations for placing beaver. This would provide, potentially, a qualitative change to the way beavers are impacting streams and less toward supporting stream complexity, in some areas. Is this happening everywhere? ODFW responded that it depends on how much we ultimately rely on beavers in high intrinsic potential areas. Also, it was clarified (and will be clarified in the document) that ‘carrying capacity’ references beaver dams, NOT beaver populations.

Agency Commitments: Oregon Dept. of Forestry

Jo Morgan, ODF, highlighted current and future actions that support coastal coho conservation. They included: Continuing support for landowner involvement in the Oregon Plan, with a specific emphasis and focus on needs for stream complexity; ongoing adaptive management (rather than just maintaining the status quo); and considering new ideas such as directly falling large wood, improving or changing culvert maintenance practices, etc.

Jo also discussed ODF’s regulatory and voluntary paths. Out of the Water Protection Rule development processes, 18 concepts resulted from analysis, task force and other committee work. Of the 18 concepts, four concepts are undergoing the Board of Forestry process & may ultimately take either a regulatory or voluntary path; while seven concepts are being considered by private forest landowners as part of their non-regulatory Oregon Plan measures. Work on all other concepts has been completed. All remaining concepts, whether regulatory or non-regulatory, are intended to increase large wood for both short- and long-term aquatic and riparian function. Concepts that contribute large wood delivery via debris torrents and that require RMAs above artificial fish passage barriers will come before the Board in September. The Board continues to work on the concept of basal area target increase for medium and small Type F’s and small Type N streams – input from stakeholders is helpful in shaping those recommendations. The intent is to place more large wood in streams and find the best way to do so through this process.

Comment: Concern was raised that the process is perceived as foot dragging and maintaining the status quo. ODF believes the process has been anything but status quo. New rules have been adopted, others are currently being considered by the Board of Forestry and some are being considered by landowners to include in their Oregon Plan Non-regulatory measures. By participating in the Board process, stakeholders can better understand and appreciate the degree to which the Board has moved forward and continues to find the best means of accomplishing the desired outcomes.

Rule concept #8: An alternative proposal has not been finalized or fully defined yet and is in progress with the Board of Forestry. Again, ODF encourages participation and input on this.

Jo shared the High Aquatic Potential project (HAP) handout, which also speaks to ODF’s intent to put more large wood in streams.

Next steps: Complete the adaptive management process for the remaining concepts and update the Oregon Plan Measures for Private Forestlands To address the need for communications improvements, a field handbook will be developed that discusses project work that can be done, and how to do it. It includes a communications plan and training component.

Question: Which incentives motivate private forest land owners? Economics is usually the most effective incentive. It was suggested that ODF find additional incentives that will motivate landowners to do the work – compensation is one option.

State Forests Policy:

Ross Holloway, ODF, spoke to the State Forests Policy actions. In the Elliot State Forest, ODF is implementing existing or revised Habitat Conservation Plans. A proposed revision would shift to Northwest Forest Management Plan aquatic standards, which are multi-species. For North and Central Coast State Forests, ODF will implement landscape level and site specific approaches. Key planning elements include watershed assessment and analysis and transportation planning, and monitoring and adaptive management (a new project in that area includes pursuing watershed scale effectiveness monitoring, a paired watershed study with OSU). ODF also funds an ODFW fish biologist.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions and Comments that Need Clarification in the Plan

- How optimistic are you that these management plans will withstand political movement with high levels of harvest? Would inclusion of these plans in the Coho Plan positively impact their ‘survivability’? Certainly it would be another factor to consider by the Board of Forestry. It would require amending an Administrative Rule. Many factors are at play.
- What NEW actions are you considering and/or planning to implement? More wood in streams is the goal so ODF is on a trajectory to do that, though the details are not worked out yet. A recovery plan will tell a landowner that certain types of projects are needed, and will support and guide stewardship efforts. Overall, ODF will take action to streamline the process and re-focus its efforts.
- Has a sufficiency analysis of these actions been done? ODF has worked closely with ODFW along the way, but no formal analysis of these actions has been done. (One perspective is that it is not nor should be an obligation to do so.)

Agency Commitments: Oregon Dept. of Agriculture

Sheila Ault and Deputy Director Lisa Hanson provided information on ODA on-going actions to address water quality, including the Livestock WQ Plan, Agricultural Water Quality Plan, Pesticide Program, Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species Program, and partnership work with SWCD’s. Biannual reviews look at how and how often conservation actions are being taken and compliances met. These reviews assess the potential for water quality improvements, through a variety of options of voluntary measures. If no action has been taken to meet water quality standards, a tiered approach for enforcement provisions is in place. The ODA approach is to work with landowners to do conservation practices and meet standards through landowner buy-in. Riparian

protocol rules include stream stability support and temperature. Anticipated benefits to coho include reduced sediment loads, temperature improvements, and habitat.

What is new? ODA is working on implementation. More positions are available to work with private and local landowners, and a position is now available to focus specifically on high intrinsic potential areas.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions and Comments that Need Clarification in the Plan

- There is a disconnect of the agricultural component to salmon habitat restoration. ODA responded that traditionally their regulatory approach has focused on certainty of water quality, and now an agency shift to focus more on salmon habitat will ensure a better connection. A challenge is that ODA's water quality plans are outcomes-based and not prescriptive so the agency has little regulatory authority to get involved, e.g., in setting buffer widths. From ODA's perspective, a bigger concern is landowner non-participation in an available cost-share program.
- There is also a disconnect between ODA's lack of regulatory authority and enforcement vs. all other agencies that *do* have regulatory provisions in place. If a riparian area needs to be protected, e.g., ODA should take measures to protect it. Not seeing this type of action specified in the plan. (ODA responded that one way to provide enforcement is through their 'zero degradation' mandate.)
- Are there active programs for landowners to link with to support over-wintering habitat? Clarify language on this in the document.
- How can you better link the water quality perspective to salmon habitat? A new position at ODA will soon be filled to do this. Suggestion: Specifically state what ODA is doing to address limiting factors such as over-wintering habitat. Cooperation and integration with other agencies will be beneficial as well.
- How are you ensuring achievement of outcomes? Soil lots and additional funding for monitoring of high agriculture impacts.
- We will not get to our desired stream complexity under the current regime. Many reports are out there that can assist ODA as the agency moves toward this.
- Update Pesticide Use Reporting data. What is the scope/parameter for Pesticide Use Reporting? Beginning in January 2007, it involves household use data collection for one year. Rural/urban, and 4th field watershed scope.
- What is ODA doing to measure effectiveness of Senate Bill 1010/Water Quality Plans?
- From some perspectives, there is a need for additional incentives, monitoring, and enforcement from ODA. What is the response from the Governor's Office? Some assessment and dialogue is still needed, and if a need is identified, some course of action may be taken. Give ODA credit for the new actions the agency is taking, and wait to see whether these actions work well and if NOT, legislative action might be taken. We will likely have a good assessment on how well agency actions are working through the annual and 6-year reviews.

Agency Commitments: Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality

Eric Nigg provided information on DEQ's commitments to the Coho Conservation Plan, suggesting that they are the same as those in the Oregon Plan. DEQ will continue to

implement its conservation activities. A handout was provided that listed those actions, including: Coordinate monitoring with other agencies, establish water quality standards to protect salmon, regulate point source discharges from industries and sewage treatment plants, coordinate with non point source pollution prevention programs, develop TMDL's (mostly temperature, and much front-loading on the coast vs. anywhere else) and provide technical and financial assistance to watershed councils, municipalities, industries, and government agencies in support of water quality improvement efforts. The challenge for DEQ, Eric noted, will be to address future conditions since typically the agency looks at legacy issues.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions and Comments that Need Clarification in the Plan:

- Are mixing zones an issue on the coast? Yes. Most discharges are fairly small but still an issue. Mixing zones are under discussion.
- Is it possible to re-establish a temperature that meets the standard? Thermal potential sets the standard.
- Is DEQ on board with the Plan's focus on beaver and its role in addressing coho? The agency does not have a position on the issue. Suggestion: ODFW get specific buy-in from DEQ on beaver actions, recognizing the potential impacts to water quality with introduced beaver. (This was identified as an overall need: to connect agencies on issues to then get buy-in from the public on the Plan.)
- Do we need an analysis of anti-degradation measures as a separate determination when setting standards? Further exploration by DEQ is needed on this.

Agency Commitments: Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board

Ken Bierly reported on OWEB actions, in the context of statewide implementation obligations. Additional lottery funds will be available for revenues to hire displaced fishers for habitat restoration project work and to hire fishers to field check HIP areas. OWEB is soliciting for research and using conservation plan priorities to decide funding. About \$2 million is set aside for that. OWEB is working with ODFW and others on the Private Lands Initiative and will work to ensure funding for this. The agency is committed to doing what it can to increase funding for local groups, as a highest funding priority. The agency also supports Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program technical assistance in cooperation with ODA and SWCD's and will help prioritize where to put the assistance.

Stakeholder Team Member Questions and Comments

- OWEB was commended on the relief offered to coastal communities with harvest cuts.
- No mention of stratum level prioritization from OWEB, good.
- OWEB has been responsive to our concerns, thank you. Need help on the North Coast in finding willing landowners to do restoration projects. Full time local coordinators are not enough.

Agency Commitments: DOGAMI, ODOT, WRD, DSL

Questions from Stakeholder Team Members:

- Local work has shown coho living in gravel beds, suggesting this could be part of stream complexity. This may be a DSL issue that can be addressed through permitting. Off-channel opportunities are part of DOGAMI's interest.
- WRD: Include municipal sources and their potential for impacting habitat quality for coho in the WRD section.

Next Steps/Timeframe

A timeline was provided setting out next steps on the Plan and for the Stakeholder Team.

- Direct all questions to Kevin Goodson and Jay Nicholas until August 25. Written comments are due August 25. Please send them sooner if possible. Send comments directly to Kevin Goodson
- The next Stakeholder Team meeting will be held on September 26/27.
- The draft will then be released to the public (early October). Town hall meetings will be held in October.
- Final draft to ODFW Commission in December and adoption anticipated in January 2007.
- **ACTION**: ODFW requested that the stakeholder team review the 'uncertainties and issues' section and provide written feedback on whether or not their issues were fairly characterized. Direct questions to Kevin and Jay throughout comment period.

Wrap-Up Phase

Thanks to the State agencies for attending today's meeting and for your comments and questions. We'll see everyone in September and look forward to reading the comments sent in by August 25, 2006!

PLEASE NOTE NEXT MEETING DATE: September 26 at Adair Village. This will be the final opportunity to comment on the pre-public draft. Public meetings and comment period will be in October.

OREGON COASTAL COHO RECOVERY PROJECT
Stakeholder Team Meeting
ODFW South Willamette Watershed Division Office
Adair Village
Facilitator's Meeting Summary
September 26, 2006

Attendees for all or part of the meeting:

Stakeholder Team Members: Paul Engelmeyer (Audubon Society/Public), Tom Forgatsch (Agriculture), Paul Heikkila (OSU Extension/Sea Grant; Oregon Salmon Commission), Les Helgeson (Native Fish Society), Cindy Heller (STEP), Wayne Hoffman (Mid-Coast Watershed Council), Tom Kartrude (Ports), Dennis Richey (Oregon Anglers), Blake Rowe (Longview Fibre Company), Johnny Sundstrom (Assoc. of Soil and Watershed Conservation Districts), Stan van de Wetering (Tribes of the Siletz Indians)

Resource Advisors:

Ed Bowles (ODFW), Rosemary Furfey (NOAA), Sue Knapp (GNRO)

Alternates and Technical Resources: Sheila Ault (ODA), Ken Bierly (OWEB), Bob Buckman (ODFW), Mike Cafferata (ODF), Larry Cooper (ODFW), Dan Delany (Coquille Tribe), Kevin Goodson (ODFW), Mike Gray (ODFW), Rick Hafele (DEQ), Bridgette Lohrman (NOAA), Bruce McIntosh (ODFW), Joe Moreau (BLM), Jo Morgan (ODF), Mark Nebeker (ODFW), Kelly Moore (ODFW), Jay Nicholas (ODFW), Tom Shafer (OWEB), Joe Sheahan (ODFW), Heather Stout (NOAA-TRT), Ray Wilkeson (OFIC)

Other Interested Parties: Mary Scurlock (Pacific Rivers Council)

Facilitation Team: Donna Silverberg, Robin Harkless, and Erin Halton

Action Items

Action	Who	By When
Revised Draft Facilitator Report to Stakeholder Team	DS Consulting	September 27: done
Edits to DRAFT Conservation Plan to Stakeholder Team	ODFW / DS Consulting to Stakeholder Team	October 6
Public DRAFT Plan Released	ODFW	October 6
Public Meetings – Tillamook, Florence, Newport, Coquille, locations TBD	All Interested Parties	Mid-November
Presentation of Plan to the Commission	All Interested Parties	January 12
Plan Approval by Commission	State of Oregon	March 16

Introductions/Housekeeping

After a round of introductions, Donna Silverberg shared a Coho Stakeholder Team process review table, noting the amount of time and effort that has gone into this process, and offered that the resulting plan, getting the ‘team response’ together, and draft facilitator report review/refinement were the goals for today’s meeting. Also noted were upcoming opportunities for comment on the plan: public meetings in Newport, Tillamook, Coquille and Florence; and the two Commission meetings in January and March 2007. Comments can also be sent to the following email address: cohoplan@state.or.us, effective October 3rd.

Announcement: Ed Bowles announced that Jay Nicholas was recently honored as an inductee to the Wild Salmon Hall of Fame. Congratulations Jay!

Comments on August 4 Notes:

- Page 10: ‘moving culvert parts’ - change to ‘improving or changing culvert maintenance practices.’

Overview of New or Revised Sections of the Draft Coastal Coho Conservation Plan

Kevin Goodson, ODFW, reported that the public draft of the plan will be released on October 3rd at the Tillamook public meeting. (Update: The public meetings were postponed to later dates; see above ‘Action Items’ table.) Goodson then shared a power point presentation on new and revised pieces to the plan, including Desired Status, Prioritization, Private Lands Initiative, Site Specific Actions and Costs, Implementation Section, Assessment of Conservation Plan, Governance, and Draft OAR’s.

Desired Status: Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments:

- Q: Will ODFW use a productivity curve instead of trying to anticipate ocean productivity using a predictor model and historical numbers?
 - Answer: The model predictor will not be needed, but will still be used for the ocean fisheries.
- Q: Will ODFW make a higher priority of sharpening the model to make better harvest predictions?
 - Answer: The model has been fairly accurate, erring on the conservative side, so it is successful in protecting naturally-produced fish. If it erred on the other side, it would quickly become a higher priority! The intent to refine the model is a high priority.
 - *Comment:* The model tends to over-predict hatchery fish and under-predict wilds, which impacts the fishery. PFMC will be monitoring the model.
- Q: Regarding density of habitat, what factors does it take into account?
 - Answer: Only fish density. Kelly Moore, ODFW, noted that as information is gathered, the model will be refined with the help of many partners, including NOAA-TRT.
 - *Suggestion:* as you gather data over time, given the long timeline, identify what criteria were used when you generated information. Procedures may change as you do estimates, thereby comparing apples and oranges. ODFW agreed and will include criteria.
- Q: Regarding modeling - are punch tags used?
 - Answer: No, but the model does give information on in-river numbers, particularly hatchery fish. ODFW will also do ‘real surveys’ in the future and compare them to the punch cards to see how well the two match up.
 - Are there any rule changes on the horizon to improve the system? ODFW is looking into proposals, yes.
- Q: Will coho in the system later in the summer be included in the distribution criterion?
 - Answer: The desired status does look at whether distribution is skewed across the season, but more information is needed for both independent and dependent populations – this will be part of the early warning system data set that will be analyzed.
- Q: Several criteria have long analysis periods. Do you have any indication about how long it will take to see signs that the criteria are/are not being met?

- Answer: Population-based criteria only go back to 1990. Data runs have not yet been done on a larger scale, but could be. ODFW is hopeful that the tools it has will provide useful triggers.
- *Stakeholder suggestion:* Be clear about how these criteria will be used. Also, there is disagreement with using a 50-year timeframe.
- Q: High quality habitat definition of smolts/mile: does that number get translated to show what exactly you are measuring?
 - Answer: ODFW has not yet defined how the information will be used, just identified it as a research need. No single set of parameters will be used to define and analyze high quality habitat, but combinations of different characteristics based on real habitat data and measurements of smolts.
 - **ACTION:** ODFW will better describe the features of high quality habitat in the Plan, including what those combinations might look like. It will also identify an RM&E need to look for new combinations of high quality habitat for mainstems, connected floodplains, etc.

Additional Stakeholder Suggestions:

- Include quantifiable data and benchmarks for high quality habitat. Use existing data in similar landscapes in other parts of the world to better understand habitat issues and how to create habitat criteria.
 - The habitat criteria could become part of administrative rule and could be setting a precedent to others for use, so do it right.
- Describe the historic landscape to show where we came from, NOT necessarily to be looked to as a desired future.
- It is important to capture ecosystem function, i.e. restoring the processes that create and re-create habitat for coho. This is key - we already know what we need but the means of evaluating the function is missing.
 - *Note:* ODFW agreed that restoring processes is important; and, that reaching desired status for coho cannot be done in all parts at once - will need to find alternative ways to meet the needs of coho by working to integrate and support local work.
- Clearly identify evaluating ecosystem function as an RME need since many stakeholders agree that it is important.

Priority Guidance: Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments

- Question: Water storage did not make a high research priority – why? It was identified as a primary limiting factor in the Umpqua. Answer: The WRD committed to doing research in this area. At this time, water storage is not a high priority across the state.
- Question: Any movement in Administrative Rule to allow, more easily and properly, placement of carcasses as a nutrient source? ODFW will look into localized concerns with this complex issue but it is not focused in the Plan as a specific issue.
 - **General Comment:** Need more specifics in the Plan!
- Support was shared for the change with prioritization – no longer at the population level. Likewise, ODFW thanked the stakeholder team members for the pointed critique, since their intent was to make improvements in prioritization, not cause

conflict. ODFW also noted they will review local prioritization processes to ensure they are moving toward reaching desired status, and will make changes as necessary. The goal is to empower locals to prioritize in a way that addresses factors limiting coho.

- Expanding development into high intrinsic potential areas will require outreach from the Governor’s Office and Legislature to the federal government for protection.

Private Lands Initiative: Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments

- When will the State develop a comprehensive approach to private lands? And then parcel out work to already existing programs? There is already too much multiplicity confronting landowners. Answer: ODFW does NOT intend to get NEW people to do this outreach, but instead it intends to work through already existing groups and to support existing work.
 - ODFW asked for help better articulating their intent with the Private Lands Initiative as stated above. One suggestion was to change the name, note that this is a long term process and clarify that the ‘comprehensive approach’ is to provide better coordination amongst state agencies. In addition, this initiative could explain what programs are available.
- Comment: Adding impositions to the landowner has caused many to back out of participating – too much paper work, lack of control, etc. There is a negative perception to participating so you need to improve the program at the delivery system level to better serve the landowner and get buy-in. It was suggested that federal entities (e.g. NRCS and USDA) need to be involved in this process as well. Trust is key. Build relationships amongst local, state, and federal agencies/organizations. Include a training program that includes choosing the right person for the job and then doing it right!
- With a new Governor how do we ensure coordination continuity for the long term? Response: This plan and the Oregon Plan are written to be strong at all levels – grass roots and state agency. They institutionalize an approach to habitat restoration and salmon conservation. So even if the Governor changes hands, the public will stand behind it. (Stakeholder response: Coordination is still a risk and needs to be addressed. Set up a safeguard against losing coordination. ODFW noted that this was considered and there was a conscious policy move to put accountability at the agency level – across agencies.)
- Concern was raised that there has been no detection of habitat changes since the Oregon Plan was adopted. No ‘Lowlands’ or other reports from the IMST out of the Oregon Plan were presented throughout the process. Concern that continuity/accountability may fall off so we need to rely on science as the backbone of Oregon Plan. Response: The IMST will be doing a technical review of the Plan.
- Suggestion: More explicitly note that ODFW is making contact with landowners through the existing SWCD’s and Watershed Councils to remove any fear that there is yet another layer to go through. Also, fold in use of STEP volunteers to the process.
- Comment: Representative talking with landowners are often viewed as ‘ODFW’ even if they are not; as part of training, teach folks how to talk to landowners to reduce intimidation, real or perceived. ODFW encouraged everyone to look at the narrative

of the Private Lands Initiative in Appendix 3 and provide language suggestions for this section.

- Comment: funding from OWEB will be divided amongst other conservation plans. We need to provide an active unified front so gubernatorial changes will not impact our progress with salmon recovery.
- Set up an educational program for landowners to explain options, benefits to participating, etc. And, accept that many landowners will not be supportive and therefore this initiative and this group should not be the centerpiece of the Plan. It needs regulatory policy support in addition to voluntary efforts. Response: At this time, the state is not looking at new regulations.
- OFIC will provide language suggestions to remove any notion that more will be required with regards to regulations. That said, OFIC remains committed to the Oregon Plan and will continue its current practices (and make improvements/enhancements as needed).
- Ultimately, the goal is to get landowners to pursue watershed councils and SWCD's for help – rather than local groups doing the outreach.
- Many available water storage programs are available. Water storage should be a key management component.

Site Specific Actions and Costs

This was a new section in the Draft Plan. It included existing high quality habitat available and habitat needed (and where) for individual populations. This section also included different scenarios for time and cost: at 17 years, 33 years, and 50 years to achieve desired status. When results of the habitat surveys are known, ODFW will better understand how long it will take us to get to desired status. Cost *estimates* were done per mile of restoration needed.

Site Specific Actions and Costs: Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments

- If the expectation to reach desired status is 50 years, choose shorter term interim goals. A long term goal of two generations is not realistic without also including mileposts.
- The curve included in this section may not match up as expected for a number of reasons, including the cost effective strategy. ODFW agreed that many assumptions went into this. One stakeholder member shared support for this section of the Plan in its transparency about assumptions that went into the estimate.
- Provide examples of success for the public - -this will aid in continued funding support.
 - *Suggestion:* Use the Sixes River as a research project area. And, measure tributaries as stand alone projects. Green River for example was shown to double smolt production. This is a good 'poster child' area.
- A significant portion of funding in the past has gone to improving culverts and roads and there has been no proof of a positive impact from this work. Instead, focus on in-stream restoration which would not necessarily mean reducing funding for roads, since much of the road and culvert work came from voluntary efforts and federal and county contributions.

Governance

Sue Knapp, Governor’s Office, noted that there is a framework in place with the Oregon Plan Core Team to lead the governance effort for implementation of this Plan, at the policy level. The Implementation Team will be reinvigorated and will serve as a science/technical team working in concert with the Core Team to implement the Plan. This group will provide annual reports tracking and assessing progress. Team charters will be revised to include this aspect. Both teams will be chaired by a Governor’s Natural Resources Office representative.

Governance: Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments:

- Have there been substantive discussions with the current gubernatorial candidates on their commitments to salmon recovery? One stakeholder team member noted that both candidates are committed but have different approaches.
- The Core Team can work with and guide the WRD to look into water storage and quality specifically as it relates to coho conservation. It was clarified that improving temperature and other conditions for coho could be achieved through water storage.
- Watershed restoration will only happen if there is a coordinated effort that energizes people to define the vision and participate in achieving it together, rather than a group of state agency folks. We need a movement and process that is efficient and effective. The state groups (Core Team and Implementation Team) could create an ecosystem and productivity index, help set priorities and allocation of resources, and coordinate the ‘delivery system’.

Public Comment:

- Mary Scurlock, Pacific Rivers Council. We are planning to review the public draft. We will look at these key questions:
 - Are identified threats addressed through the Plan.
 - Whether biological resource goals and de-listing criteria are scientifically defensible, and reasonable/relevant to other species.
 - Does the plan establish metrics of planning and practice sufficient for local recovery? E.g., high quality habitat relative to field data.
 - Does the plan establish criteria for water use and management?
 - Reasonable forecasts. Assumptions about demographic trends, etc.
 - Scientific justification for habitat variables, and room for testing those assumptions in the Plan.
 - Adequacy of protected areas and distribution of those areas.

Implementation: Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments:

- There is ongoing debate about the merits of ‘improving the best’ vs. ‘focusing on the worst’. With respect to coho, bringing up those that failed is a good priority but not more than improving every independent population, in the short term. ODFW responded that coho across the landscape are all a high priority.
 - *Suggestion:* Wayne Hoffman will share suggested language to make this point, as it is the intent of ODFW not to prioritize those worst populations before others.
- Regarding the time frame: ODFW welcomes suggestions for rephrasing this piece.

Assessment of Plan: Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Comments

- What is the timeframe for monitoring? What will be the process for changing course, if necessary? Habitat monitoring will begin this summer. An assessment will be done five years from then, of current and needed high quality habitat. Sue Knapp added that discussion and/or the need for changing course will start at the Cabinet level and be discussed by all agencies.

Draft OAR's:

The Commission will approve the Plan and as a result, Administrative Rules will be adopted *for the ODFW portion* of the Plan. Draft language was included in this draft, and will be finalized at a later time. The OAR's identified key elements in the Plan and paraphrased five categories: ESU description, desired status, management strategies, trigger for modifications to the plan and the adaptive management process. The draft language in the OAR's, as well as in the overall Plan, seeks to strike a balance between providing specific direction and maintaining enough flexibility to allow for adaptive management.

Draft OAR's: Stakeholder Team Member Questions/Answers

- Why not add these to the OAR's in the Native Fish Conservation Policy? If OAR's are in many different places and take different directions, ODFW's legal liability goes up. ODFW responded that in identifying the need for the Fish and Wildlife Commission to adopt the Plan, OAR's are needed, and the NFCP does not provide specific direction for coho conservation.
- It was suggested that more discussion is needed about what elements of the Plan should go in to the OAR's.
 - *Stakeholder member suggestion:* Include specifically those actions that need public process instead of those that allow ODFW to take action for adaptive management. Include more on desired status – criterion, metric and evaluation thresholds since these should not be changed without public process.
- ODFW added that basin plans, e.g. Salmon River Plan, will be revised to be consistent with the adopted coho plan. These revisions will be part of the Commission packet and available to the public.
- Is providing technical support to locals really a short term strategy? Yes, by 2008.
- Page 18 states that '1993-99 were poor years' but this is not, and should be, stated in the first paragraph of the OAR's.
- Thanks to ODFW for your tremendous efforts!

Facilitators' Report

Donna Silverberg gave a brief overview of the Facilitators' Report, or 'Appendix One' to the Plan. The group then went through a page-by-page review, with specific edits made directly into the report. (*NOTE: based on those edits, a revised draft was emailed to the Stakeholder Team on 9/27.*) General Stakeholder Team comments on the report shared during the meeting are summarized below:

- Emphasize that one objective of the Plan is to underscore that community groups are vital to the success of Coastal coho.

- Include language that speaks to the lack of influence the stakeholder team actually had on what ended up in the Plan.
 - The Stakeholder Team expectation was that the assessment would be more objective; there was a promise of a different process than what we ended up with – consensus was not reached on the Plan yet some stakeholder team members believed that the State was looking for input and sign-off on the Plan.
 - Some Stakeholder Team member concerns repeated during several meetings were not ultimately included in the Plan.
- Although whether and how the “no-list” decision influenced the process was heavily debated, it is important to clarify in the Facilitators’ Report that the decision at least delayed the process.
- All of the Coho Stakeholder team meetings should have been held somewhere in the ESU to provide public participation opportunities and economic boost to local areas. Not all meetings were held in the ESU.
- Suggestion: State agencies should do a cost analysis of the Stakeholder Team process to better inform future planning.

Future Opportunities for Input

A notice was sent out announcing the dates and times for public meetings: October 3rd in Tillamook and October 4th in Florence. (**NOTE:** Following today’s meeting, the public meetings were postponed to mid-November.) The state provided an email address to send in comments on the public draft: cohoplan@sate.or.us

The Plan will be presented at the January 12th Commission meeting (*later changed to January 11th), and adopted at the March 16th meeting. There will be opportunities for written and oral comments at both.

ODFW thanked all the stakeholder team members for their input and energy that helped shape the development of the Plan. A letter of appreciation was presented from the Governor. The facilitation team also thanked the group for their diligence and patience throughout the process.

All meeting summaries put together by the DS Consulting Facilitation Team. DS Consulting would like to thank everyone for their participation in this process!