

Interior Columbia Technical Recovery Team Meeting
9:00 am, Portland, OR

October 1st, 2001

In attendance:

TRT Members:

Dr. Theodore Bjornn, Richard Carmichael, Thomas Cooney, co-chair, Dr. Fred Utter, Peter Hassemer, Dr. Dale McCullough, Dr. Charles Petrosky, Dr. Howard Schaller, Dr. Paul Spruell, Dr. Michelle McClure, co-chair

Non-TRT Members:

Dr. Robin Waples, Elizabeth Gaar, Philip Howell, Henry Carson

Part I – Introductory Presentations

- Introduction: Robin Waples, Recovery planning overview
 - Outline of 25 Pacific Northwest ESUs and the domains of the TRTs
 - Description of phases (1.Goal setting; 2.Recovery plan/action evaluation; 3.Implementation)
 - ESA requirements and narrow vs. broad-sense (societal) goals
- Administrative concerns
 - Integration between technical team and policy
 - Compliance with FACA, open vs. closed meetings
 - NOAA guidelines: TRT members do not represent any organization, but rather serve as scientists.
 - Balance of time management/external input and requests/scientific rigor
 - Balance of accomplishing ESA objectives/minimizing NMFS' top-down role

Technical/Policy Interface: Elizabeth Gaar

- Elizabeth is the interior TRTs NMFS policy liaison
- Policy involvement for Phase 2 likely to come from different processes/groups for each TRT – state and jurisdiction dependent.
- Providing a good administrative record of proceedings

Discussion of Hogan Ruling: Robin Waples

- In general captive populations are considered a tool for recovery of wild populations, not an end solution (populations must be naturally self-sustaining)
- Deciding whether or not to list hatchery populations under the ESA when the wild populations are listed
 - Step 1: Are the populations part of the ESU?
 - Category One: Hatchery used local brood stock exclusively; conservation hatcheries
 - Category Three: Brood stock mostly native but partially mixed, population has been isolated for some time, significant run time shift
 - Category Two: Conditions in between that of one and three

- Step 2: are the hatchery populations critical to wild survival? If not, populations are not listed to avoid regulatory headaches, since purpose of many hatcheries not recovery to begin with.
- Implications of a previous court case, Oregon Coast Coho
 - Ruling: Hatchery fish cannot be part of an ESU and then not listed. The ESA provides for species, subspecies or distinct population segments (ESUs are distinct population segments), but no smaller units.
 - Discussion with all members on the effects of the decision on TRT work. When delisting criteria are defined by “naturally self-sustaining populations”, including hatchery populations in the risk assessment has little effect on decision to list
- Recovery Science Review Panel: One independent panel to oversee all TRTs and verify scientific validity

Outline of Tasks for the Interior TRT to Complete: Michelle McClure and Tom Cooney

Task 1: Define individual populations within each ESU – historical and current

Task 2: Determine viability criteria for each population, following Viable Salmonid Population (VSP) guidelines (considering abundance, trend, diversity and spatial structure)

Task 3: Monitoring and Evaluation Recommendations – TRT will produce annual report with recommendations for population/ESU/environmental status monitoring and for project-specific monitoring

Task 4: Alternative delisting scenarios report – determine viability at the ESU level

Task 5: Habitat Characteristics Assessment Report – current and historic characteristics throughout the basin – will contribute to viability goals (capacity estimates) and limiting factors analyses (below)
Note possibility of forming a workgroup with the Willamette/Lower Columbia TRT to address estuarine issues.

Task 6: Factors for Decline/Limiting Factors – analyses to determine ESU and population-specific factors for decline.
Funding for an evaluation report by population is under negotiation

Potential Resources to support TRT tasks:

- Potentially as many as 25+ Sub-basin planning teams addressing Columbia Basin listed runs. Hopefully TRT can interact with a few Sub regional teams instead of with each Sub basin team
- Workshops (Climate Change, Harvest, etc.)
- Subcontracting

Scheduling of the 6 tasks over 2 years was proposed, along with the coordination of the schedule with other organizations such as the Power Planning Council and sub basin planning teams.

Part II – TRT meeting/ discussion of administrative and organizational issues.

Administrative Questions: Discussion among all members, led by Michelle McClure

Topic 1: Open vs. Closed Meetings.

Consensus: Meetings should be open to the public. As a general rule, opportunities for public input will be provided at the end of the monthly TRT meetings. However, most TRT meetings are expected to be work sessions with relatively few non-members in attendance. In many cases those attendees may be able to contribute positively to TRT discussions. Therefore the general rule will not be enforced unless the members come to a consensus during the meeting that the attendees are slowing progress.

Topic 2: Note taking

Consensus: Meeting notes should be taken by a non-member administrator (Henry Carson) and should include the topic of discussion with key questions, a summary of the discussion, and the decisions reached including justification and any assignments. To the extent practicable, the TRT should try to summarize key points during the meetings on white boards, etc. The notes will be posted on an internal website for review for one week, with an e-mail sent out as a reminder. After this the notes will be finalized, barring any major objections, and posted publicly.

Topic 3: Locations and Dates of Meetings

Consensus: Meetings will rotate between cities of easiest access for all members, namely Seattle, Portland, Boise and Tri-Cities, with occasional sites elsewhere depending on the meeting's focus. The team will meet approximately once a month, tentatively on the first Tuesday of the month. The next meeting will be in Seattle on November 6th, to facilitate a briefing by members of already established TRT's. Further meetings are tentatively scheduled for December 4th, in Boise, and January 8th, 2002, in the Tri-cities.

Topic 4: Meeting rules/Decision-making process

Consensus: Consensus is not necessarily needed. Where there are apparent conflicting views on a topic, the TRT will rigorously review the basis for the alternative opinions. If disagreements remain the TRT may generate, if appropriate, majority and minority opinions including documentation and scientific evidence for each perspective.

Topic 5: Formation of workgroups

Preface: Review of structure used by other TRT's, and new alternatives

Debate: 2 major alternatives:

- a) Dividing “vertically” into groups to work on population ID's (task 1) Viability goals (task 2) and habitat (task 5, started according to proposed schedule).
- b) Dividing “horizontally” to investigate trends/abundance, diversity, and spatial structure/habitat and then having each group contribute to the completion of the tasks.

Consensus: Work as one group on task 1, the population ID's, due to its fundamental importance to all other tasks, and subdivide later as necessary.

Topic 6: Assignments for next meeting

Goals: - Collection of data and databases relevant and available.

- Collection of previous attempts to delineate Upper Columbia populations

Assignments: Members will divide up and review individually a number of known documents on population structure and will summarize each document's:

-Type of information in the categories of abundance, genetics, habitat, and historical populations.

- Definition of population used

- Rationale

- Portion of area addressed

- Species addressed

Members agreed to include data for non-listed ESUs

Document, with authors if known (TRT Member responsible)

1. Upper Columbia River Steelhead and Spring Chinook biological requirements Committee. 2001. Upper Columbia River Steelhead and Spring Chinook biological requirements, Final report, March 2001 NMFS-NWFSC (Cooney)
2. Bevan, Donald, and six others. 1994. Snake River Salmon Recovery Team: Final Recommendations to the National Marine Fisheries Service. National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, Washington. (Bjornn)
3. Chilcote, M. W. In Prep. Conservation of steelhead populations in Oregon. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Portland. (Carmichael)
4. Northwest Power Planning Council. 2001. Draft Oregon Sub-basin Summaries (Various). Prepared for the Northwest Power Planning Council (Carmichael)
5. Northwest Power Planning Council. 2001. Draft Idaho Sub-basin Summaries (Various). Prepared for the Northwest Power Planning Council (Hassemer)
6. Kostow K. (1995) Biennial report on the status of wild fish in Oregon. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Portland (Spruell)
7. Biological Requirements Work Group. 1994. Analytical methods for determining requirements of listed Snake River salmon relative to survival and recovery. Progress Report of the Biological Requirements Work Group. October 13, 1994. IDFG et al. v. NMFS et al. (Petrosky)
8. Waples, R.S., O.W. Johnson, P.B Aebersold, C.K. Shiflett, D.M. VanDoornik, D.J. Teel and A.E. Cook. 1993. A genetic monitoring and evaluation program for supplemented populations of salmon and steelhead in the Snake River basin. Annual Report 1992. CZES Division, NFSC HMFS, Seattle, WA. Prepared for: U.S.D.E. Bonneville Power Administration. Div. Fish and Wildlife Proj. #89-096 Contract Number DE-AI79-89BP00911. (Utter)
9. Chapman, D., and ten others. 1991. Status of Snake River chinook salmon. For Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee by Don Chapman Consultants, Inc., Boise, Idaho. (Bjornn)

10. Washington Departments of Fisheries and Wildlife. 1993. 1992 Washington State Salmon and Steelhead Stock Inventory. Olympia, WA. 580 p.(Cooney and McClure)
11. Idaho Fish and Game Steelhead, in progress (Hassemer)
12. Busby, P.J., T.C. Wainwright, G.J. Bryant, L. Lierheimer, R.S. Waples, F.W. Waknitz, and I.V. Lagomarsino. 1996. Status review of west coast steelhead from Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-27, 261 p. (McClure)
13. Myers, J.M., R.G. Kope, G.J. Braynt, D. Teel, L.J. Lierheirmer, T.C. Wainwright, W.S. Grant, F.W. Waknitz, K. Neely, S.T. Lindley, and R.S. Waples. 1998. Status review of chinook salmon from Washington, Idaho, regon, and California. U.S. Dept. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-35, 443 p. (Utter)
14. Washington Steelhead, Studerberg, Schreck (McClure)

Additional unassigned documents:

Pre-dam reports by the BPA (Howell et al) and Fulton

TASK: Members will send Henry Carson a full reference to the document reviewed immediately, and send Michelle McClure the completed summaries by the 26th of October.

Adjourn