

RESOLVE

Results Through Consensus

720 SW Washington Street, Suite 750
Portland, OR 97205
Ph: 503-228-6408 Fax: 503-228-6207
www.resolve.org

February 4, 2004

MEMORANDUM

TO: NMFS Willamette/Lower Columbia River TRT Members
FROM: Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE and Paul McElhany, NOAA Fisheries
SUBJECT: Action Items from the January 29, 2004 TRT Meeting

Thanks to everyone for your participation in the TRT meeting on January 29. This memo includes a brief summary of the conversations and the action items discussed during the meeting. Note that there are some fairly tight deadlines for completion of the actions. Also, we have highlighted items all TRT members need to complete in light gray. Please feel free to contact either of us with any questions, concerns, or additional action items.

Upcoming Meeting Dates	Where	Agenda Focus
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Tuesday, February 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none">TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Discuss draft Subbasin Plan Review Framework; finalize Population Evaluation Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Tuesday, March 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none">TBD

I. WHERE WE ARE GOING: THE ESA RECOVERY PLAN

Paul McElhany presented preliminary thoughts on the role of the WLC-TRT in the recovery planning process. Specific actions were divided among the following areas: Subbasin Plan review; LCFRB recovery plan review; population evaluation; and ESU “roll up.” The TRT focused their discussion on the “roll up” item (though it is still not yet defined) as the other items had specific time on the agenda later. TRT members agreed they would like to participate in defining “roll up” as well as accomplishing the necessary specific tasks. Two specific tasks discussed were 1) technical evaluation integrating all threats at the population scale; and 2) technical consideration of single actions that would affect many populations in an ESU. With respect to the second, the TRT suggested incorporating “any expected natural events” into future analysis. Paul indicated that the next step regarding defining “roll up” involved a meeting in March of the NOAA leads for each TRT and the Regional Office staff. He noted the TRT may discuss this item again in February.

II. COMPLETING THE POPULATION EVALUATION PROCESS

Paul McElhany briefly reviewed the draft report, Status Evaluation of Salmon and Steelhead Populations in the Willamette and Lower Columbia Basins, which gives an overview of the TRT

work on evaluating Oregon and Washington populations, the methods used, and the results. He noted that the discussion portion still needed to be developed before finalizing the report. TRT members spent time discussing lessons learned from the process and how to complete the report in a timely fashion. It was noted that the exercise had served two purposes: 1) evaluating the scoring process; and 2) attempting to score the populations; and that this causes some challenges when considering how to convey the results. The group agreed the report needs to be as clear as possible about the two purposes and what the results means, and do not mean.

An issue which influenced the discussion was the relative differences between the TRT scores and some of the scoring done by the LCFRB group (for Washington populations) and also by the ODFW group (for Oregon populations). The TRT acknowledged the extensive role professional judgment plays in the process. In reflection, the group considered whether there were ways to make the process more repeatable (e.g., more quantitative metrics). Members also noted that one of the values of the process they developed was having a broad range of expertise and experience brought to the analysis and that if the analysis were too narrowly defined, that value may be diminished. The group agreed balancing these two interests will be important.

Some members suggested that as data availability and quality increases over time, inconsistencies may decrease. Members agreed creating recommendations on a monitoring and evaluation program, based on the results of the evaluations, would be very valuable. Paul agreed to work on a discussion section, incorporating comments received during the meeting, for review by the TRT. Tim and Steve agreed to develop some draft recommendations regarding the monitoring and evaluation program.

III. RESPONDING TO THE LCFRB QUESTIONS

Ray Beamsdorfer worked closely with the TRT during this portion of the agenda to clarify the questions LCFRB posed. The group spent time discussing each of the questions to give a quick response; however, individual members agreed to take the lead in drafting more detailed responses to be submitted to NOAA Fisheries and the LCFRB (after review by all TRT members). The group agreed that while the document would be a memo from the TRT to NOAA and the LCFRB, it would not be a publicly distributed TRT product. However, the memo will be part of the recovery plan development record and the answers should be drafted with the expectation that they may be publicly available.

During the course of the conversation a new question was identified: Can you give us guidance on the source for reintroduction or supplementation?

IV. REVIEWING SUBBASIN PLANS

In considering their review role, the TRT identified questions they would like answered including:

- What are the evaluative criteria (or the review framework) for reviewing plans?
- How will subbasin plans not completed by May 28, 2004 (e.g., Sandy River) be addressed?
- If funding for development of the plans runs out on May 28, 2004, will the plans be revised based on the comments? If so, who will do the revisions?
- What is the relationship between the ISRP review and the TRT review, if any?
- Who do TRT comments get submitted to? How?

During the conversation, Patty Dornbusch clarified that review of the LCFRB recovery plan and the Subbasin Plans would be different. As such, she suggested the group develop a review framework for the LCFRB recovery plan first given that it includes both a subbasin plan and a “roll up” effort. She reminded the TRT that the Technical Guide, already developed, would be useful in setting up the scope of the review. It was also suggested that other existing “review frameworks” (e.g., ISRP, Puget Sound) be considered in developing guidance for TRT review. In thinking further about the LCFRB review, a member indicated it would be necessary to determine how the TRT is going to evaluate the capacity of proposed actions to achieve the criteria (i.e., how well was it done). At the conclusion, Patty agreed to work with Paul McElhany to answer these questions. Paul agreed to work with Cleve Steward to develop a first draft of the LCFRB Recovery Plan review framework.

V. ACTION ITEMS

Action Items – Population Evaluations	Who	Completed by
1. Develop ‘Discussion’ section of the report and distribute for review.	Paul McElhany	Tuesday, February 10
2. Develop Monitoring and Evaluation proposal.	Tim Whitesel and Steve Kolmes	Thursday, February 12
3. Review Appendix A of draft Report and send comments to Jim Myers	All TRT members	Thursday, February 12
4. Review ‘Discussion’ section and send comments to Paul McElhany.	All TRT members	Tuesday, February 17
5. Update report in preparation for next TRT meeting.	Paul McElhany	Friday, February 20
Action Items – LCFRB Questions	Who	Completed by
6. Develop and distribute ‘quick’ comments regarding all questions (e.g., Ashley’s comments) to entire TRT.	All TRT members	Friday, February 6
7. Develop preliminary in-depth answers and distribute for review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 16 • 2, 4, 5, 8, 17 • 9 • 11, 13, 14, 15 	Primary authors as Assigned at Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul McElhany • Jim Myers (with Craig on 8 and 17) • Cleve Steward • Tim Whitesel 	Thursday, February 12
8. Review preliminary in-depth answers and send comments to full TRT.	All TRT members	Tuesday, February 17

9. Finalize answers and send to Paul McElhany.	Primary authors as Assigned at Meeting	Thursday, February 19
10. Send final answers to NOAA and LCFRB.	Paul McElhany	Friday, February 20
Action Items – Subbasin Plan Review	Who	Completed by
11. Obtain and share various technical guidance documents to help inform development of the LCFRB Recovery Plan Review Framework.	Patty Dornbusch	ASAP
12. Develop draft LCFRB Recovery Plan Review Framework for distribution to TRT for review in advance of next meeting.	Paul McElhany (with assistance from Cleve Steward)	Tuesday, February 17
13. Clarify role of TRT in review of Oregon Subbasin Plans and LCFRB Recovery Plan.	Patty Dornbusch	Prior to February 24 TRT meeting

Documents Distributed at the Meeting

1. Draft Agenda (January 22, 2004)
2. Memo: Update on Recovery Planning and the WLC-TRT (January 28, 2004)
3. Status Evaluation of Salmon and Steelhead Populations in the Willamette and Lower Columbia Basins (January 25, 2004)
4. Questions for TRT Regarding Interpretation and Application of Recovery Criteria (December 29, 2003)
5. Comments from Ashley Steel on various pieces (January 28, 2004)
6. Checklist for Reviewing Subbasin Plans (Draft Internal Guidance Document)
7. Proposed Criteria Application Rules – Guideline Criteria (LCFRB)

TRT Members in Attendance:

- Craig Busack (by phone – early only)
- Steve Kolmes
- Paul McElhany
- Jim Myers
- Cleve Steward
- Tim Whitesel
- Chuck Willis

Others in Attendance:

- Ray Beamsdorfer, S.P. Cramer & Associates, Inc.
- Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE
- Patty Dornbusch, NOAA Fisheries (afternoon only)