

RESOLVE

Results Through Consensus

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

January 27, 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: NMFS Willamette/Lower Columbia River TRT Members

FROM: Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE and Paul McElhany, NMFS

SUBJECT: Brief Summary and Action Items from the January 23 TRT Meeting

Thank you for your participation and efforts at the NMFS Willamette/Lower Columbia River Technical Recovery Team meeting held on Thursday, January 23, 2003. This memo includes a brief summary of items discussed during the meeting including:

- I. Lewis River Watershed Case Study
- II. Debrief December Ex Com Meeting
- III. Viability Document Review
- IV. Timeline
- V. Broad Sense Recovery Document
- VI. Subgroup Deliberations
 - a. Attribute Integration
 - b. Growth and Abundance Criteria
- VII. Agreed-upon Action Items

In addition, a list of the agreed-upon action items can be found at the end of the memo. Please feel free to contact either of us with any questions, concerns, or additional next steps.

Given the TRT's goal of finalizing the substantive work on the body of the Viability document by the end of February, **the group reconfirmed the need to meet on February 6-7 and February 24-25.** The focus of the first meeting will be on reaching closure on the outstanding conceptual issues (i.e., growth and abundance, habitat, and attribute integration) and the focus of the second will be on walking page by page through the document to address outstanding questions and comments.

I. Lewis River Watershed Case Study

Paul McElhany began by describing the proposal for proceeding developed by the Case Study Subgroup. In particular, he indicated the proposed approach would have individuals or organizations both inside and outside the TRT work on these products and then give them to the

TRT to utilize in the development of a synthesis document. He added that the products on specific components that are not developed by the entire TRT would not be TRT consensus documents. Before agreeing with the approach, TRT members indicated they would like to better understand the products or analyses that needed to be completed as well as what funding sources and additional resources might be tapped.

The group spent a few minutes identifying a number of the probable products including:

- 1) Population descriptions
- 2) Freshwater habitat analyses (including physical, fish/habitat, EDT)
- 3) Prototype 'Recovery Plan' focused on the technical analyses needed for identifying problems/threats, prioritizing among those, and describing possible actions
- 4) Guidance on what's likely to be acceptable
- 5) Hatchery issues
- 6) Harvest
- 7) Estuary function
- 8) Life Cycle Model

In a couple of instances there were suggestions for possible funding sources or potential collaborators who might assist. In addition, there were questions raised about whether or not all of these were appropriate products, specifically the estuary function analysis, given the focus on the Lewis River watershed and the time and resource constraints.

At the conclusion, the group agreed with the general approach (i.e., the TRT works toward consensus on a synthesis document, but individually authored components are not TRT consensus documents) proposed by the subgroup, however, the group also asked that the Subgroup develop a more 'concrete' proposal, which would include a list of the expected products, potential funding opportunities for each, and potential authors or sources for each, prior to reaching closure.

A rough time line for the case study was also discussed. It was proposed that the individual component drafts be completed this spring and that the TRT synthesis document draft be completed by late summer/early fall.

Craig Busack expressed interest in working on the hatchery component and Dan Rawding expressed interest in working on the harvest component of the case study.

Paul agreed to contact Cleve and Ashley to convey the results of the meeting and to work with them to develop a proposal for discussion at the next TRT meeting.

II. Debrief December Ex Com Meeting

The group briefly assessed the results of the Ex Com meeting in December and identified a few issues heard that would need to be addressed by the TRT in the future.

First, the Chum presentation was very successful and having 'Populations Descriptions' for all populations in the ESUs would be helpful. The TRT agreed this was something that needed to

be developed for the Ex Com. Given the Lewis River Case Study, the members suggested focusing efforts on those approximately eight populations first and then going on to others. Craig Busack suggested some of his colleagues in the SASSI project could be helpful in developing these. It was suggested that these descriptions not be initiated until the group had agreed upon the attribute integration system as it would be necessary to understand how to apply the TRT risk characterization approach.

The second issue revolved around the potential, or at least perception of, double scoring between the spatial structure criteria and the habitat criteria. While the question of whether or not this was happening was unclear, the TRT did agree that it would likely be helpful to integrate the spatial structure section into the habitat section. In addition, it was suggested that the title for the section be called Habitat Quality and Spatial Structure Criteria to acknowledge there are additional components to the habitat issues than just spatial structure. The members raised concerns with how the integration of the two sections would take place and asked Paul McElhany and Paul De Morgan to talk with the Habitat Subgroup to work on next steps.

The third issue related to the need to present information to the Ex Com, and others, in an understandable way. Everyone in attendance agreed the presentation would ultimately be very important when the final document is disseminated, but that for the next month and a half the focus should be first and foremost on settling outstanding issues related to the content. The group agreed to revisit this issue at the February 24-25 meeting.

Finally, a number of members noted Ex Com concerns about the attribute integration efforts. In particular, it seemed that Ex Com members raised questions about developing one final persistence probability “score”. In addition, it was noted that ODFW had expressed interest in speaking with the TRT to express their concerns about this issue. The TRT members agreed Paul McElhany and any other members, especially those on the Attribute Integration Subgroup, should schedule a conversation with ODFW staff and convey the results to the rest of the TRT.

III. Viability Document Review

Comments from the TRT members, and others, on the Viability Report were expected to be completed and distributed by January 17, however the group agreed to extend the date for comments until Monday, February 3 to allow time for all expected comments. In addition to the major issues raised by the Ex Com, the group agreed that any other ‘conceptual’ issues raised in these comments would be considered at the February 6-7 meeting and other comments (e.g., wordsmithing) would be addressed at the February 24-25 meeting.

IV. Timeline

Building off the previous discussions, the group confirmed their interest in completing the substantive deliberations regarding the document by the end of February. The group also discussed the issue of what to call the document when finalized. Paul M. and Patty indicated their conversation with other NOAA staff had resulted in the suggestion of ‘Interim Viability Report of the TRT’ as opposed to the ‘NOAA Technical Memo’ suggested at the previous meeting. Some TRT members questioned why the idea of a Technical Memo was not acceptable.

Patty indicated there was some concern regarding the ‘stability’ of the document. The group requested that Paul and Patty revisit the issue within NOAA. The group also agreed to postpone any final decisions on what to call the document until the February 24-25 meeting.

V. Broad Sense Recovery Document

Patty began the conversation about the Broad Sense Recovery Document by giving the history of the document and where it fits into the Ex Com deliberations. Then Craig, Dan, and Paul M. gave the rest of the TRT a brief overview of their efforts since the Ex Com meeting. Craig described five key agreements reached when the three of them met on January 22:

- a. BSRG’s are good
- b. A range from viability to healthy harvestable is needed.
- c. The “clouds” (i.e. uncertainty) need to be addressed in both PCC and HPVA.
- d. The approach needs to be displayed in data rich examples
- e. Issue of measurement of for healthy and harvestable goals is important.

Craig indicated the group would be discussing this further with the Ex Com BSRG Subgroup when they meet on February 4. Other TRT members indicated they appreciated the work and were interested in hearing how the conversation evolved. It was agreed that anyone interested in participating in the next BSRG meeting should contact Paul M. for additional information.

VI. Subgroup Deliberations

For the second half of the day, the TRT broke into two subgroups to assist in setting the stage for substantive deliberations at the next TRT meeting. At the end of the afternoon, the groups gave brief overviews of their progress and intended next steps which are described below.

A. Attribute Integration

Selina Heppell, Jim Myers, and Tim Whitesel comprised this group. They first spent time identifying and analyzing the issues in front of the TRT and then began developing a new system, beyond the ones in the latest draft of the Viability Report. Jim Myers briefly described the new system but indicated they were going to need to do additional work prior to the next meeting. After his presentation, other TRT members raised additional issues for the group to consider including how to address quality of the data, and whether the revisions being made are giving the system too much flexibility. Jim agreed the group should consider these issues. He also indicated they hoped to have an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of each option available at the next meeting.

B. Growth and Abundance Criteria

Craig Busack, Paul McElhany, and Dan Rawding comprised this group. They indicated their work on the BSRG was also assisting in the development of a revised approach to propose to the full TRT in advance of the next meeting. During the session, the group agreed that PCC is a range which was a useful step forward for the group. In order to develop the proposed approach, Paul M. agreed to look at the data with the idea of a range in mind. In addition, Dan agreed to

examine stock recruitment data and Craig agreed to assist by looking at EDT data. Further, they indicated the meeting with the ODFW regarding BSRG would give them an opportunity to further discuss these issues.

VII. Agreed Upon Action Items

Action Items – Revising Document/ Setting Stage for Next Meeting	Who	When
1. Hold conference call to discuss next steps on the Habitat Quality and Spatial Structure Criteria section. <i>(Note: new title for the section was discussed at the meeting)</i>	Paul De Morgan, Paul McElhany with the Habitat Subgroup (Tom, Steve, and Cleve)	ASAP
2. Develop and distribute the Habitat Quality and Spatial Structure Criteria section for review.	Tom Backman, Steve Kolmes, and Cleve Steward	Monday, February 3
3. Develop revised Growth and Abundance Criteria section.	Craig Busack, Paul McElhany, and Dan Rawding	Monday, February 3
4. Discuss and develop a document to help frame TRT discussions regarding attribute integration.	Selina Heppell, Jim Myers, and Tim Whitesel	Monday, February 3 <i>(Note: product may not be available until day of meeting)</i>
5. Submit written comments on the Viability document.	All TRT members	Monday, February 3 <i>(Note: this is an extension and given the deadline, no further extensions will be possible)</i>
6. Review all written comments on the Viability document.	All TRT members	Prior to February 6 <i>(Note: please assess the comments for 'conceptual' issues in advance of the 6-7 meeting, other issues will be addressed at the next meeting)</i>
7. Meet with ODFW staff to discuss comments on the Viability document.	Paul McElhany (lead) <i>(Note: others including a member of the Attribute Integration Subgroup are encouraged to attend)</i>	Prior to February 6 <i>(Note: Paul will let the TRT know once the meeting is set)</i>
8. Develop tentative agenda and send out logistics for February 6-7 TRT meeting.	Paul De Morgan and Paul McElhany	Friday, January 31

9. Investigate process for publishing a NOAA Tech Memo.	Patty Dornbusch and Paul McElhany	Prior to February 24
10. Attend Broad Sense Recovery Goal meeting with the Ex Com Sub Group <i>(Note: if you are interested in attending, let Paul M. know)</i>	Craig Busack, Paul McElhany, and Dan Rawding	February 4
Action Item – Case Study	Who	When
11. Develop ‘concrete’ proposal including topics/products, funding options, and possible sources or authors.	Paul McElhany, Ashley Steel, Cleve Steward	Wednesday, February 5
12. Circulate: a) Kramer Conceptual Framework and b) Puget Sound technical guidance.	Paul McElhany/JJ Westfall	ASAP
13. Circulate Status Review documents.	Paul McElhany	Tuesday, February 4

TRT Members in Attendance:

- Craig Busack
- Selina Heppell
- Paul McElhany
- Jim Myers
- Dan Rawding
- Ashley Steel (by phone for portion)
- Tim Whitesel

Others in Attendance:

- Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE
- Patty Dornbusch, NOAA
- J.J. Westfall, NOAA