TRT Meeting, February 21, 2006.
Members in attendance: Howard Schaller, Charlie Petrosky, Tom Cooney, Phil Howell, Casey Baldwin, Michelle McClure, Rich Charmichael.
Non-members in attendance: Damon Holzer, Rich Zabel, Don Matheson

1. Fall Chiook modeling effort
2. Spring/Summer Chinook
    a. SAR discrepancy for GR fish
        i. Length/weight measurements at Goose (compare GR fish) at smolt outmigrant stage
        ii. Look at smolt datasets
        iii. Get updated parr/spawner data from Rich C
        iv. Compare SAR series
        v. Evaluate migration timing
        vi. Egg to smolt data
    b. Get Catherine Creek data to Rich Z.. Come up with a consistent dataset
    c. S3
        i. Need most updated harvest rates (2004-2005)
        ii. Paragraph on methods for S3 calculations (Howard)
        iii. In-river survival and variable d – Howard to update and send to Rich (this week)
        iv. Charlie to write upriver survival paragraph
    d. S3 for Steelhead
        i. Rich to attempt and get results to TRT members
            1. Charlie/Howard to get updated Steelhead SARs to Rich
                a. Composite A and B runs
            2. age composition
                a. tables 2&3 in sthd6201.xls (earlier years from PATH)
                    i. uses size to determine A vs. B
    e. Rich's current modeling effort (upwelling, PDO, year combinations)
        i. PDO analysis
            1. examined which years to use
                a. all years available
                b. 1978-2000 (differential latent effects to reflect completion of hydro system)
                c. magnitude of regressions fairly similar
            2. 1985-1991 – no estimates of wild smolt counts used Bev-Holt to estimate
            3. **use 1966-2000 and eliminating years with extrapolated data**
        ii. comparison of alternate environmental indices
            1. try combinations of PDO and upwelling (no sea-surface) and evaluate fits (compare with #3 above)
3. Base scenario for calculating gaps – linking empirical gap with modeling work
    a. What is the appropriate in-river survival to adjust for (current hydro)?

b. What are the appropriate years to use?
c. How do we account for delayed mortality?
d. Updated set with variable d for Rich
    i. Rich to update S3 analysis (retrospective only)
e. 1980-2001 (base period)
    i. update Wenatchee analysis
f. hydro adjustment (average since 95, excluding 2001)

4. Two workgroups:
    a. Steelhead expansions
        i. GR expansions – Rich's dataset
        ii. SR expansions – lack of population trend data, lower granite counts
        iii. Shortcoming in criteria – lower Joseph creek inflates numbers (confined, but not confined enough to be caught with criteria)
5. Lower Snake – recovery planning meeting – March 15th and 1:00
    a. Need example of SSD criteria with respect to hatchery operations
    b. Meeting takes place during March TRT meeting
    c. Policy person from NMFS salmon recovery division
    d. At Plaza Suites (Cole Rd.) – meet from 3-4
6. Remand process
    a. Integrate remand discussions with local recovery planning workshops (3 meetings to encourage regional participation)
        i. Describe relationship between remand & recovery
        ii. Current status of ESUs – goals & criteria
            1. compare current status with criteria
        iii. Discuss recovery strategies by ESU
        iv. Work up SSD examples (simplify table) and purpose of criteria
        v. Utilize existing presentations and construct gaps presentation (circulate to TRT members)
7. Section 7 Consultations in Idaho
    a. Consider suggesting steps to take for evaluating proposed actions (determine occupancy, proportion of total spawning area, etc.)
    b. Viability criteria should not be used to validate actions that are counter to restoration.
    c. Develop region-wide guidance on using viability criteria in section 7 consultations
8. MPG scenarios for ESU viability memo
    a. Mid-Columbia
        i. Klickitat mandatory (summer/winter)
        ii. Rock Cr. cannot contribute to viability
    b. GR Steelhead
        i. Consider using Joseph as an intermediate
        ii. Drop Wallowa—use GR & Joseph
    c. Change language to "extant" where applicable
    d. Change Asotin River to Asotin Creek
    e. Functionally extirpated language

i. Do not call Yankee fork extirpated

f. Designate size-category based on anadromous component only
   i. Change Crab Creek to a “basic” size category
   ii. Change life history
   iii. Okanogan – change to “basic” US portion only
      1. ensure
   iv. Life history of extirpated populations – best guess where information is available or unknown
   v. Check Hells Canyon size category

g. Functionally extirpated vs. extirpated language
   i. Extirpated – clearly and totally cut off
   ii. Need list of populations that a extirpated and functionally extirpated as well as definitions

h. Fall Chinook
   i. Used “small” so as not to be confused with 500 spawners in a “basic” category
   ii. Tom to get language to Michelle
   iii. Modify language about the upcoming memo: information on considering extirpated areas on recovery planning
   iv. Which populations should be required?
   v. Add more explicit language about forthcoming language concerning blocked areas. TRT recognizes significant blocks currently exist. Parenthetical remark about the lower reach receiving priority.

i. Candidates for high viability
   i. Restricted identification of these populations to most obvious scenarios. Otherwise, leave to planners

j. Little Salmon question
   i. South Fork MPG has 4 populations, need 2
      1. according to criteria, the little salmon must be viable because of its different life history, which leaves the south fork requiring just one population to be viable
      2. it makes more sense to have 2 populations in the south fork since summer Chinook are the main driver for the MPG
      3. Little Salmon has genetic and ecoregion linkage more in line with the Grande Ronde, so it shouldn’t drive the diversity of the South Fork MPG.
      4. Treat as an exception in this case

k. Maintained language
   i. Make consistent

l. “overall productivity for the MPG” language
   i. change out with replacement language

9. Extirpated areas memo
   a. Clarify two bullets on the first page
   b. Examples of appropriate scoping and planning
   c. Replace plusses with highs, mediums, and lows

d. Correct table labels
e. SR Fall Chinook language to match other memo
f. Change Wenatchee/Methow MPG, to East Cascade MPG

10. viability update
    a. age structure
        i. check steelhead age data
            1. low proportion of age 3 fish (1-1)
        ii. consider using rapid river dataset (1978-) for steelhead
11. Gaps analysis
    a. Different sections? (i.e. current data, hydro improvements, climate, hatchery effectiveness, etc.)
        i. Consider this for the TRT report
    b. Keep a main table by ESU that elucidates the impact of each effect
    c. Drop 30% effectiveness table, but keep some of the numbers in the text
        i. Using gap analysis as an exploratory tool to examine hatchery effectiveness
    d. Fall Chinook gaps
        i. Add column with hatchery fraction
        ii. Leave the three scenarios but with more explicit description of the adjusted scenario
    e. Gaps tables
        i. Add hatchery fraction and productivity columns (first table)
        ii. Recent ocean – 25 years of data to match Zabel's analysis
        iii. In Recent Ocean section (tbl. 2), change header to "Recent vs. Base"
        iv. Add narrative to tables before handing out
        v. Consider presenting gaps in graphical format (MPG on the x-axis with groups of pops, and gap on the y-axis) – label pop name next to points?
12. Viability Criteria – presentation of an overview
    a. Scenarios map Map of populations/MPGs with recommended populations highlighted.
    b. Examples of current status, then map with current status highlighted. Provide examples where AP and SSD ratings are highly relevant.
    c. Assessing the gap
    d.