

**Interior Columbia Technical Recovery Team Meeting #2, November 8th, 2001
Northwest Fisheries Science Center, Seattle, WA**

In Attendance:

Members:

Tom Cooney and Michelle McClure, Co-chairs, Paul Spruell, Fred Utter, Rich Carmichael, Charles Petrosky, Dale McCullough, Pete Hassemer, and Howard Schaller.

Non-Members:

Mary Ruckelshaus, Mike Ford, Paul McElhany, Jim Myers, Ann Marshall, Phillip Howell, Al Giorgi, Henry Carson, Damon Holzer, Robin Waples, Cory Ruedebusch.

I. Introductory Presentations

1. Overview of Methods of Population Identification in the Puget Sound and Willamette/Lower Columbia Technical Recovery Teams – Paul McElhany
2. Population Identification Methods in the Puget Sound TRT– Mary Ruckleshaus
3. Population Identification Methods in the Willamette/Lower Columbia TRT– Jim Myers
4. Population Identification Importance and Context – Robin Waples
5. Population Identification in the Upper Columbia QAR– Mike Ford

II. Decisions and Tasks

Topic 1: Discussion of Approaches to Population Identification in the Interior Columbia

Debate: Ideas for a starting point:

- 1) Start by determining criteria for judging demographic independence.
- 2) Start by reconstructing historic populations
- 3) Start with Geography, asking:
 - First: Should major drainages be linked?
 - Second: How should major drainages be subdivided?
- 4) Start by assessing the extent/quality of current genetic information
 - Updating SASSI
 - Idaho's ESU evaluation
 - Update literature review table, created since last meeting
- 5) Start by dividing task along lines of expertise, independent assessment
 - Demographic modeling group
 - Genetic analysis group, etc.

Topic 2: The Role of Habitat in Population Identification

- Debate:**
- 1) Other TRT's have considered habitat, and it has not yielded much useful population information
 - 2) Habitat information is something to fall back on when other data (Genetic or Life history) are absent
 - 3) Habitat information helps support a defensible population structure within a hierarchy of data

Consensus: Habitat data should be considered, in absence of other data

Topic 3: Discussion of Gaps in Genetic Data, particularly in the John Day and Deschutes

Consensus: Members of the USFW and Katherine Costow may have further data. Pete Hassemer will contact IDFG colleagues about Steelhead Genetic data in progress. Utter, Spruell and Marshall will assess data availability (see tasks).

Topic 4: Discussion of Approach to Interior Columbia Basin

Debate: 1) Select a “test” sub basin and species to explore in detail and use as a model
2) Divide up and start on entire basin

Consensus: Option 1, Select a test sub basin

Debate: Which sub basin should be used?

- 1) Use the Upper Columbia because it has been done by QAR. Analysis can be critiqued and used as a starting point
- 2) Use the Snake River Spring/Summer Chinook because it is relatively data-rich
- 3) Use the Mid-Columbia Steelhead because it is a more discreet basin and there is less information (start data gathering sooner)

Consensus: Snake River Spring/Summer Chinook will be started first

TASKS: 1. Upgrade Literature Review Data Table for entire basin-McClure and NWFSC team
2. Amass Genetic Data for entire basin- Utter, Spruell, and Marshall
3. Start on Snake River Spring/Summer Chinook- Rest of the team will gather data of the following types

- 1) Adult Runtime
- 2) Juvenile Outmigration timing
- 3) Age Structure
- 4) Length at Age
- 5) Escapement Trends
- 6) Hatchery Influence
- 7) Demographics (Recruitment, Eggs/Spawner, etc.)

Petrosky and Schaller will pursue data sets from run reconstruction projects

Next Meetings: The next meeting, previously scheduled for the 4th of December, will now be held on the 10th of December, in Boise, ID. The following meeting, previously scheduled for the 8th of January, will be held on February 7th, in Pasco, WA.