

## ICTRT Meeting

July 18-19, 2006

Members in attendance: Casey Baldwin, Pete Hassemer, Charlie Petrosky, Fred Utter, Rich Carmichael, Phil Howell, Michelle McClure, Tom Cooney

Non-members in attendance: Damon Holzer, Don Matheson, Jeff Jorgenson

1. Current status assessments
  - a. Update bar chart for the UCMET-ch (numbers from Damon) – Don
  - b. Update viability sections in UCMET and UCENT to use productivity At 75% threshold -- Don
  - c. Need a consistent summary section for each population
  - d. Develop ESU and MPG level overviews with AP & SSD results
  - e. Atlas of assessments
    - i. Include extirpated areas memo, ESU / MPG memos (and viability document?)
  - f. Group discussion to focus on select SSD ratings
    - i. harvest effects on steelhead
    - ii. phenotypic metric (example in Tucannon or Wenatchee)
      1. difficult to separate from life history
      2. standardize approach
      3. evaluate specific examples
    - iii. selectivity
    - iv. spawner composition
      1. evaluate examples to develop consensus
    - v. estuary habitat clarification
  - g. integrating across SSD metrics
    - i. clarify rounding of decimals
      1. possible score of 0.5 in goal B
        - a. less than 0.5 round to 0
        - b. 0.67 will round up
      2. round to higher risk level
      3. if you have a high risk, cannot get to low for the metric
      4. for goal b in table, include the mean score
    - ii. Choose groups to review AP and SSD sections
  - h. Review process for making into a TRT product
    - i. Small group responsible for pulling everything into one package
    - ii. Assign two reviewers to each assessment
2. Reviewing recovery plans
  - a. Timeline for recovery plans
    - i. Upper Columbia--early august (goals, limiting factors, actions, M&E)
    - ii. Snake--late August or early September (goals, limiting factors, actions, M&E)
    - iii. Mid Columbia--draft in late September (actions, action analysis – awaiting hydro actions)

- b. Discussion on TRT Review Questions to be addressed in recovery plans—do the questions get at the bottom line?
    - i. Additions / modifications
      - 1. 2.d. Add language on threats (past, present or future)
        - a. also add this language to beginning of document
      - 2. Place for evaluating estuary or lower mainstem action proposals (7.a. and/or change question 3 to Tributary/Estuary)
      - 3. Insert ESU and/or MPG in places
      - 4. expand question 7 to include treatment of the likelihood that actions in the plan will get you to the goals (rate and magnitude)
        - a. section c should specify at the ESU level
        - b. discuss a range of plans
        - c. timeline (was it considered in the document? Was the response timeframe considered? Are the time frames realistic?)
      - 5. additional questions for plans with multiple ESUs
    - ii. rating system for the plans
      - 1. categories or continuum
        - a. describe key elements for each category
      - 2. summary paragraph with discussion of key problematic areas
        - a. discuss deficiencies or inadequacies
        - b. address successful pieces
        - c. leave the writer a sense of where the plan lies with respect to some continuum
        - d. lead off the summary with some overall language describing
          - i. or consider starting off by summarizing the plan's aim (i.e. x% recovery over x # of years)
        - e. construct a benchmark paragraph (ideal plan)
  - c. Provide a thorough and consistent review in a time-efficient manner
  - d. Inclusion of modeling results to date
  - e. Six sections for review of recovery plans (excluding status assessment)
    - i. Limiting factors
      - 1. form a small subgroup to review before other steps are addressed
    - ii. integration across H categories
3. Redrawing population boundaries – base on biological information
  - a. Tucannon
4. Update on Fall Chinook modeling
  - a. Workgroup of TRT members with Billy Conner (and passage modeling people) set up to develop life-history model for SR Fall Chinook
    - i. Zabel schematic (H.O. #2)

- ii. Many data gaps exist
  - iii. Deschutes as a surrogate population (good vs. poor abundance years)
  - iv. Over-wintering behavior from Clearwater fish
    - 1. Casey to find proportion of over-wintering fall chinook from Hanford reach
    - 2. Productivity issue vs. diversity issue (there still exists a significant component of sub-yearling type fish) – both patterns are showing positive returns
  - v. Current timing of migration is later, but moving back toward historic trends
5. phenotype & selectivity discussion
- a. selective effects must affect 25% of a significant segment of the population
  - b. look for evidence of selective harvest
    - i. start with b-run steelhead (Tom and Don) (Howard Birge can run data) [www.rmmpc.org](http://www.rmmpc.org)
      - 1. not enough info for SRSS
  - c. does the fact that b-run fish are harvested at a higher rate imply selectivity
    - i. no a & b populations, so not at the population level
  - d. appendix at the ESU level with relevant ratings across populations (lit. review and interpretation)
  - e. Michelle, Charlie and Jeff to pull together recent selectivity work from the science center (hydropower, etc.)
    - i. Describe “significant component”
    - ii. Evaluate UC as well (differential mortality of juveniles)
6. Questions to Guide Review of Recovery Plans (workgroup)
- a. Components of a biologically robust plan
    - i. Logical flow including a statement of desired status and a current status assessment AND identification of limiting factors, threats, actions and biological considerations for prioritization of actions
    - ii. Treatment or consideration of impacts across the entire life-cycle
    - iii. Empirical/analytical basis for identifying limiting factors and estimating response to recovery actions consider
    - iv. Implementation strategy including consideration of time frame (for implementation and realization of effects)
    - v. Adaptive management framework including monitoring, evaluation as well as mechanisms to incorporate information gained into management decisions
  - b. Modification of questions for review
    - i. Question #1
      - 1. Added ESU, MPG
    - ii. Question #2
      - 1. Combined modeling and analysis into the same heading
      - 2. Added limited factors and threats
    - iii. Question #3 (Habitat)

1. Added language at the top to describe habitat elements (tributary, estuary, lake, mainstem)
    2. Changed e and f to be more specific
  - iv. Question #7 (Integration)
    1. Is the likely magnitude and rate of improvement consistent with the extinction risk of the population, MPG and ESU?
  - v. Question #8 (Monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management)
    1. how well does the proposed monitoring and evaluation program address identified areas of uncertainty?
    2. are specific check-ins identified, either in time, or at the acquisition of particular endpoints?
  - vi. question #9 (Michelle's email)
7. Update to the extirpated areas memo
  - a. Benefit of reintroduction
    - i. Potential to develop local adaptation
    - ii. Added ecological function
    - iii. Gained protection against catastrophic events
  - b. Five key points
    - i. Discuss reasoning for keeping options open
    - ii. Added brief discussion of stray vs. remnant (historic) hatchery fish
    - iii. Added discussion of chinook currently in the Clearwater and context in reintroduction (within SRSS section)
      1. opportunity to evaluate local adaptations
      2. reintroduction strategies
      3. connectivity between lower SR and GR
    - iv. clarification of introduction
    - v. added paragraph describing rationale for using an adaptive management approach (short and long-term risks)
      1. AP and SSD benefits from local adaptation
8. Steelhead intrinsic potential analysis
  - a. Treatment of wide mainstem areas (important to 1/3 of the populations)
    - i. Lack of data on spawning in tributaries >35 meters
    - ii. Concern regarding influence of habitat on overall numbers
    - iii. Look for a way to discount width
      1. margin or depth range of wide mainstem areas
    - iv. need information on depth of steelhead spawning
      1. 0.41 to 1.51 meters (initial range)
    - v. review study that references redd distances from shore
    - vi. need average channel profiles for various stream widths
      1. tendency not to survey wide areas
      2. possible data in the Deschutes
9. Changes to the viability document
  - a. Distribute revised draft with changes highlighted
  - b. Leave extirpated areas draft as an attachment