

WLC-TRT Meeting Summary
August 8, 2005 (9:00-4:00)
Portland, Oregon

TRT Member Attendance: Craig Busack, Steve Kolmes, Paul McElhany, Dan Rawding, Cleve Steward, Chuck Willis

Other Attendance: John Payne, Mike Maher, Aimee Fullerton, Evan Haas, Patty Dornbusch, Dave Ward, Bruce McIntosh, Rick Kruger

Agenda

9:00 – 9:30 Recovery Planning Updates (Paul and Patty)
9:30 – 10:30 Spatial structure criteria revisited (Dan)
10:30 – 11:15 Diversity criteria revisited (Craig)
11:15 – 12:00 Habitat criteria revisited (Steve and Chuck)
12:00 – 12:30 Lunch
12:30 Joined by ODFW for exchange of information on recovery planning efforts
12:30 – 1:00 Salmon Life-cycle Analysis Modules (SLAM) project (Paul)
1:00 – 1:30 Lewis River Case Study (Aimee Fullerton)
1:30 – 1:50 Habitat Recovery Atlas project (Mike Maher)
1:50 – 2:10 Overview of WLC-TRT viability report revision (Paul and John Payne)
2:10 – 3:30 ODFW viability curves (ODFW)
3:30 – 4:00 EDT Sensitivity Analysis (Paul and Craig)
4:00 adjourn

Meeting Summary

State of Salmon Inventory

Cleve described a salmon data inventory project that he (Steward and Associates) is working on with EcoTrust. The project involves collecting salmon data in a consistent fashion throughout the entire Pacific Rim. They are considering an initial case study in the Lower Columbia and there is potential collaboration with TRT projects

Next steps:

- Coordinate EcoTrust members at TRT meeting to discussion collaboration opportunities (Paul & Cleve)

TRT Viability Report Revision

The TRT discussed plans for a revision of the WLC-TRT viability report. Paul described the main impetus for the revision was the need to develop abundance and productivity goals agreeable to both the WLC-TRT and ODFW for application to recovery planning in Oregon. Although motivated by the need to revise only the abundance and productivity criteria, the TRT agreed that it would be useful to revise other aspects of the criteria as time allowed. The time line for the revision (or at least a well reviewed draft) is December 2005. The revision deadline is based on the NOAA/Oregon schedule for recovery planning in Oregon. Paul provided a rough annotated draft outline for the

revision that included revisions to all aspects of the criteria. The revision would be published as a TRT report (or perhaps some portions joint with ODFW?). The morning discussion at the TRT meeting focused on habitat, spatial structure and diversity criteria.

Next steps:

- Further develop revision outline (Paul)
- Develop revision project schedule (Paul)

Habitat Criteria

After some discussion, the TRT agreed to try and develop more specific habitat criteria than are contained in the 2003 viability report. Similar to the other criteria, the habitat criteria will provide indicators and metrics that aid in the assessment of the extinction risk for salmon populations. The TRT had a discussion of the scale and level of specificity of the criteria. The criteria need to be specific enough that they provide some real guidance in the evaluation of risk, but can not be so specific that they lose general applicability. The TRT discussed the value of direction indicators (e.g. is habitat continuing to degrade) and generally agreed that these could be a useful starting point for criteria. The criteria also involve addressing the question of what is “good” habitat (i.e. habitat associated with a low risk of extinction) and the TRT discussed several efforts that have already work on this problem and different scales (e.g. Kolmes temperature thresholds paper, EDT “rules”). Steve and Chuck agreed to work on developing a draft of the revised criteria.

Next Steps:

- Draft a revised habitat criteria section (at least a start) before next TRT meeting (Steve & Chuck)

Diversity Criteria

Craig lead a discussion comparing the diversity criteria in the recent draft interior Columbia viability criteria with the WLC-TRTs 2003 viability report criteria. The IC-TRT criteria are more specific (and complex) than the WLC-TRT 2003 criteria. It was noted that many of the thresholds (e.g. % hatchery risk levels) were arbitrary and more support could be possible for specific thresholds. Including more specific diversity criteria in the revised WLC-TRT report could be helpful.

Next Steps:

- Draft a revised diversity criteria section (at least a start) before the next TRT meeting (Craig???)

Spatial Structure Criteria

Dan presented some examples of spatial structure for some Washington WLC populations. These examples indicated the dynamic nature of spatial structure and the need to understand context and quality in evaluating spatial structure. Dan also described some of the monitoring issues involved in setting a spatial structure metric. Dan agreed to incorporate ideas from the discussion into a draft criteria revision.

Next Steps:

- Draft a revised spatial structure criteria section (at least a start) before the next TRT meeting (Dan)

Joint meeting with ODFW on recovery planning research (Afternoon session)

In the afternoon session, the WLC-TRT meet jointly with member of ODFW to exchange information about ongoing research related to recovery planning. This consisted mainly of a series of presentations with brief discussion.

SLAM

Paul described the Salmon Life-cycle Analysis Modules (SLAM) project that he and Jim have been working on. The project involves developing a set of lifecycle models for Oregon WLC populations to explore “what if” scenarios of changes in lifestage specific productivities and capacities.

Next Steps:

- Finish a draft of the analysis for one population as a pilot then see where to go next (Paul & Jim)

Lewis River Case Study

Aimee Fullerton presented a brief overview of the Lewis River case study freshwater habitat decision support framework.

Next Steps:

- Complete case study papers and reports (Steel et al)
- Decide what components of the case study process can be readily transferred to developing recovery plans in Oregon. (Aimee & Patty?)

WLC-TRT Viability Report Revision

Paul provided a brief overview of the WLC-TRT viability report revision project. In particular the strategy being discussed for abundance and productivity involve a data dependent evaluation process (some description included with the draft revision outline).

Next steps:

- Draft a revised abundance and productive section on data dependent analysis (at least a start) before the next TRT meeting (Paul)

Viability Modeling at NWFSC

John Payne presented some updates to the SPAZ program that allow visualization of the joint probability distribution for a populations abundance and productivity for comparison to a viability curve.

- Complete SPAZ revisions and post new version on FTP site (John)
- Incorporate new analysis into viability criteria (John, Paul, ODFW)

Viability Curve Analysis and ODFW

Rick Kruger presented the results of some viability curve analysis conducted at ODFW. They have been exploring a number of models for generating viability curves, including the autocorrelation model of the IC-TRT. The goal is to have criteria that the TRT, NWFSC and ODFW can all support.

Next Steps:

- Coordinate sharing of common abundance data base for curve estimation (Paul & Rick)

- Coordinate development of viability curves and agreement on metrics for evaluating current population status (Paul & Rick)

EDT Sensitivity Analyses

Paul presented some preliminary results of the NWFSC's EDT sensitivity analysis and Craig presented some preliminary results of WDFW's EDT sensitivity analysis. The collaborative projects are ongoing and results will be published as completed. A first round of results should be done by December 2005.

Next steps:

- Complete and publish analysis (Paul and Craig et al.)
- EDT sensitivity analysis general workshop [February?] (EDT sensitivity analysis collaboration group)