

PUGET SOUND RECREATIONAL FISHERIES ENHANCEMENT OVERSIGHT
COMMITTEE MINUTES

May 3, 2011

MEETING CALLED BY	Steve Thiesfeld
TYPE OF MEETING	Oversight Committee
FACILITATOR	Clint Muns
NOTE TAKER	Colleen Desselle
ATTENDEES	Dave Puki, Peter Naylor, Rich Eltrich, Mike Wilson, Jim Jenkins, Doug Hatfield, Rahmi Aiken, Norm Reinhardt, Dorothy Reinhardt, Matt Parnel, Mike Gilchrist, Dan Ayers, Don Freeman, Dave Knutzen, Clint Muns, Tara Livingood, Colleen Desselle, Steve Thiesfeld.

Agenda Topics		
DISCUSSION	Introductions	
	As there was a new member present, everyone introduced themselves.	
CONCLUSIONS		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

DISCUSSION	Current Budget Update
<p>Starting with the black and white print out¹. On the left is the plan that someone else put together. There are two bienniums; the last one 09/11 and the current one 11/13. We started with about \$300,000 in the biennium. The folks (it is unknown who this is) that put this together (I have not figured out how they do it) estimated that we would take in about \$3 million of revenue (that is the \$3,010,000 figure). Our expenditures that we planned are different than what they planned also. They planned expenditures of \$3.16 million. Know that it is over there, but we did not use it when we made our budgets. In terms of our budget to date, they had about \$2.58 million; \$5 million is what they predicted we would take in in terms of revenue. Under the actual, you can see that we are at \$2.39 million. We were more conservative in predicting what we would take in. Our spending plan, which we will get to in a little bit, is \$2.86 million. We have taken in \$2.3 million through March. I think we are going to be close to what we planned for expenditures rather than the \$3.3 million that they planned. That is kind of the big picture. At the bottom right you can see the expected fund balance through March was \$81,000; our actual fund balance was about \$11,000, which means we are pretty darn close to where we wanted to be. It's a good thing we did not take their revenue forecast.</p> <p>Over on the color print out², the only thing I really want to talk about on this one is the revenue (green) versus the fund balance (purple). Under the planned in the first fiscal year which is the FY10, they planned \$1.7 million in revenue and we got \$1.55 million. In FY11 they predicted \$1.3 million, and we are sitting at \$500,000. So we really need a big push here in the last three months of April, May, and June to get up that other \$800,000. The total for the biennium is \$3 million projected and we are at \$2 million right now. If we look at what we did in FY10, I think it is right around \$800,000 or so. Hopefully, we will be right at our spending plan. In the odd years, we sell more licenses. The pink salmon are part of this trend. People say that we push pink salmon, but we don't have to push it. Anglers want to fish for pink salmon. Under fund balance – you can see the planned versus the actual; we made an effort last year to put aside some funding (\$150,000) to keep balances on an even keel as OFM does not like our dedicated account going into a negative balance. In March, we did have a negative amount. I am thinking that we are going to be okay in 2011. When building budgets for each of the program, we have to stipulate who is getting paid when they are buying feed, etc., which can fluctuate from month-to-month. It is looking like license sales are down a little bit, but that is to be expected. Funding has been stable or slightly decreasing for our revenue for this fund, but our purchasing power is diminishing which is putting us in a</p>	

¹ Recreational Fisheries Enhancement Account – Fund 04M.

² Balance as of FM21 – March 2011.

bit of a bind with the fund. This funding is from the license sales and we received \$10 per recreational license sales.

It was asked if there has been any further discussion of changing the \$10 flat fee per license to a percentage. Has there been any discussion in the agency where we can address this in the future? No, last that was heard that the commitment (discussed at Mill Creek) was that Phil was not wanting to tie any more agency funds up in dedicated accounts and it was his preference that we not push for that, but he could see that if we were successful in achieving our fee packages, that he might make a decision that he would kick more money into this fund. It is unknown what he is thinking, or when he would do it, but I think it would be worthwhile to remind him of that commitment. Clint would like to revisit this with him, in the hopes that this decision was driven primarily by the difficulty of other issues, and him not wanting to get side-tracked. Maybe at some point, he would be more receptive as to how we would build in a cost of living increase into the program. I don't think the long-term of this program is well-served by a flat-rate funding.

Go to the next black and white hand out³. Down the second column on the left is the actual programs that we are funding, and the one that gets everyone uptight right away is the indirect; it is kind of a tax that the agency takes on the program in order to pay administration for the program. Went through the other programs. The third column under allotment for the biennium is how much we allotted for each of these programs. Allotments were not broken up equally between the two fiscal years so there is a separate fiscal year allocation or allotment for each program. Then the amount we spent in fiscal year 2010, and then the term variance is the difference between what you planned to spend and what you did spend. So going down the list you see that we did not pay as much indirect as we thought we were going to have to, we overspent Chambers yearlings and Lakewood yearlings, underspent at Garrison, underspent quite a bit at Minter/Gorst zeros, quite a bit in the coordinator's fund, the lingcod enhancement we did not spend all that we had allocated for the first year, Glenwood Springs shows a variance of \$23,000 – all that means is they got their billing in late and it came off the next fiscal year. Rick's Pond is the same thing, they did not get their billing in on time. I see that I have an error on here – Lake Washington sockeye was an error on my part and we spent \$4000 more than we were going to. We spent \$10,000 extra on CWT work. That is for the whole fiscal year, and then the next column over is how we had planned up to through the end of April. The third column in that set is the expenditures to date. If you go over the gray bar you will see the variance of what we planned to date versus what we spent to date. So we planned \$172,000 in the indirect, spent \$143,000 to date, so we are 51,000 to the positive, and so on. Glenwood variance of \$40,000 in the hole is because it has been encumbered. We have a contract to spend it. For the biennium, we are quite a bit on indirect but I know that at least 80% of it will be billed. Icy and Soos should be at zero. Chambers at -\$6,000 will probably receive some savings from other programs. We can roll this money into the next biennium, which we cannot do with the general fund. The one error – we had been billed \$15,000 for Rick's Pond (for current brood), but have not been able to contact him to sign the contract and take the money. So we should be at zero for this one. Only extra dollars I am seeing is the coordinator position and at Wallace which is going to have some feed bills coming in.

CONCLUSIONS

No bottom line of where we may be at the end of the biennium, but believe that we will have a positive balance to carry into next year.

ACTION ITEMS

PERSON RESPONSIBLE

DEADLINE

DISCUSSION

Lingcod Update

The egg mass collection was completed last month. Collected from about 20 masses and are rearing larvae.

CONCLUSIONS

Proceeding

ACTION ITEMS

PERSON RESPONSIBLE

DEADLINE

³ Expenditures through 043011.

	Jon Lee	
DISCUSSION	Next Biennial Budget Update	
At the last meeting the group recommended that we have a series of reductions. The agency reviewed and approved all of it with the exception of some questions the Fish Program had for Soos Creek. We have not completed discussions.		
CONCLUSIONS	Significant review of programs in Region 6 and looking to see if there is a way they can gain efficiencies. Agency is still evaluating. Involves a much more comprehensive look at the programs in Region 6.	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

DISCUSSION	PSRFE Coordinator Position Update	
This position was reviewed, rejected, resubmitted, and approved. We flew the position and hired Tara Livingood. She will do six months' in PSRFE OC and six months' in Puget Sound Recreational Fisheries Management. Hopefully she will be able to bring us up to speed and keep it up. Not just look into PSRE, but look at other programs such as hatchery production.		
Synopsis of Tara's background : she has been in stock assessment doing spawner surveys, 3 years on the coast doing recreational surveys, and two years on CWT analysis. Should be very strong in hatchery evaluation. We will probably need to help her understand our fisheries. Provide opportunities for her to go along on trips for learning purposes.		
Tara stated she has been working on Hatchery reform for last two years, doing a lot of HSRG recommendations, writing up portions of HGMP (Hatchery Genetic Management Plans), coordinating with co-managers on HAIP (Hatchery Action and Implementation Plan); plans to operate hatcheries in a manner that does not impede wild fish (conservation issue), been doing a lot of CWT analysis, and brood stock management making sure that our facilities are integrating at levels which are sufficient with our HAIP process. HAIP determines which of our populations are primary, which tells us which facilities need to work under a certain process of stability; overview of each hatchery and how they are affecting the wild populations.		
CONCLUSIONS	Suggestion is to contact both Steve and Tara at the same time, so she can fit into her schedule and see whether this is something she can keep up with. Official start date is May 16. She will look over the logistics as well as working on other tasks.	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Coordination assistance	Tara Livingood	

DISCUSSION	Oversight Sub-Committee	
We would like to propose an oversight sub-committee to analyze our programs. Have a group to look at the nuts and bolts of the programs to help put together a more cohesive understanding of how the program works and what some of the problems are with each of the programs. Identify the strengths and weaknesses within the oversight committee. How can the OC help the programs to contact the department? Does the OC want to do this?		
There was some concern that what we want is not to have a sub-committee, but to have the coordinator do this. It was explained that this was seen as a framework – not to incur more time for all. A small group can visit all the facilities rather than the whole committee making the rounds of one or two a year. There was much discussion on this. It was stated that we need more information in order to base the decisions we make: how fish are being released, what size they are at release, health of fish, etc. Hatchery managers can relay problems that we can bring up the department. Where can we push the envelope to maximize production at the facilities? What can we do differently? Bring it into focus. Figure out the questions we need to ask. This is to better our knowledge so we have an understanding of how we want our budget to go. We would like a core of at least three, but open to all on the committee to join where they can. The department is also assigning tasks to the group. There are time commitments. We would		

like a six-month commitment to the sub-committee.		
There was no opposition to establishing a sub-committee as long as it was open to all members.		
CONCLUSIONS	A sub-committee was established with the core being held by Dave Knutzen, Rich Eltrich, Norn Rinehardt. Don Freeman was also asked to be on this committee. He agreed.	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Look at the current available data, look at the start to be around July 1. Get together and build a framework. Provide a fundamental description of what each hatchery does...already something out there on this through Hatchery Reform. Review of all the programs, what is the funding, etc. Ensure the data provided is relevant.	Sub-committee	

DISCUSSION	Legislative Update	
This has passed without changes, so as we submitted. It is at the Governor's Office since April 19. We do have some obligations that are encompassed here. Perhaps we need another sub-committee for this? Provide an outline. Set goals and objectives – do on a FY or wait until we know what the budget is. Look at providing goals and objectives in October. Need to have before the egg take in August. When does the setting to goals and objectives make sense. Probably don't want to tweak too much between bienniums. Vent through upper level as to when they think these need to occur.		
CONCLUSIONS	Next meeting we need to scope out what we need to do, at least an outline.	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Put together a proposal to send out.	Steve Thiesfeld	Before next meeting.

DISCUSSION	Production Update	
We would like to get updates from the various facilities. Wallace - releases actually occurring at. Goal is 250,000 release. We should be at or above that. Fish released at 7.5 fish/pound CV. Think this year was around 9 fish/pound. Fish health was pretty good. Frequently we will see bacterial kidney disease (bkd) in the spring. This year not so much. Icy Creek – no bkd with volitional release of about half the fish have left. Started seeing fish about 8 hours after release, which is good. Fence has reduced predators about 80%. Quit feeding about a week ago. Will drop water levels in about a week. Size is about 10 fish/pound. Soos Creek – 3.2 million zero Chinook started marking; been a good year. No major diseases. Hoping it will stay cold for a few more days to a week. Additional stress to fish as we mark. Double index about 4,000 fish and then release. Hopefully most leave on their own. Size of fish at release varies mainly to the timing of releases. There are many factors which indicate when to release the fish including environmental factors and what federal mandates allow. ⁴ Jim distributed a template he uses annually in the brood program statistics. Brood Year. This is for 2009. Actually occurred in February/March 2010 for Steilacoom Lake. All released in 2010 except the 2009 yearlings. 200,000 of 850,000 were tagged. Released in increments with each portion having		

⁴ 2009 Brood Program Stats.

some amount of tags.

Gorst Creek – Releasing in about 2 weeks. None are volitional due to the Gorst flats. Trying to get them out on an evening tide. Hoping for earlier release from Minter to extend the fishing season.

Glenwood Springs – decent return in adults. Moved from yearlings to zeros. Zeros released now are mass-marked and have CWTs. When stating the fish are about this big and cannot acoustic tag referral is about 2-3 inches.

CONCLUSIONS		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
OBSERVERS	None	
RESOURCE PERSONS	Colleen Desselle	
SPECIAL NOTES	Next meeting to be June 6-10 or June 20-30. Will Doodle Poll to set.	
Adjourned	8:23 p.m.	

Recreational Fisheries Enhancement Account - Fund 04M

Department of Fish and Wildlife
 Balance as of FM21 - March 2011
 Last Updated: April 15, 2011

	Biennial Plan		Budget To Date - 0911 Biennium		Variance \$
	2009-11 Biennium	2011-13 Biennium	Allotments	Actual	
Beginning Fund Balance	245,463	298,411	245,463	245,463	
Revenue					
Licenses, Permits, and Fees	3,000,000	3,010,000	2,340,000	2,073,821	(266,179)
Total Revenue	3,000,000	3,010,000	2,340,000	2,073,821	88.62%
Fund Balance + Total Revenue	3,245,463	3,308,411	2,585,463	2,319,284	(266,179)
Expenditures					
Operating Budget	3,640,000	3,472,000	2,504,137	2,251,510	252,627
Carry-Forward Maintenance Level		34,000			
First Year Supplemental	(168,000)				
Second Year Supplemental	0				
Sub-Total Operating Budget	3,472,000	3,160,000			
Unallotted Authority	524,948				
Total Operating Budget	2,947,052	3,160,000	2,504,137	2,251,510	252,627
Capital Budget			0	0	0
Total Operating and Capital Budget	2,947,052	3,160,000	2,504,137	2,251,510	89.91%
Encumbrances				57,000	
Total Operating and Capital Budget w/Encumbrance	2,947,052	3,160,000	2,504,137	2,308,510	
Estimated Fund Balance	298,411	148,411	81,326	10,774	(70,551)
Two month Cash Reserve	245,588	263,333			
Estimated Fund Balance Less Cash Reserve	52,823	(114,922)			

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

FUND 04M - 09-11 BIENNIUM

Recreational Fisheries Enhancement

Balance as of FM21 - March 2011

MANAGER: Steve Thiesfeld (360-902-2715) - Olympia

Prepared by: Diane Hagen (360-902-2216) - Olympia

	Revenue	
	Planned	Actual
97-99 Biennium	2,946,908	2,445,340
99-01 Biennium	2,791,760	3,136,841
01-03 Biennium	3,231,317	2,907,117
03-05 Biennium	3,110,988	3,067,218
05-07 Biennium	3,177,633	2,885,982
07-09 Biennium	3,340,000	2,769,954
09-11 Biennium (To Date)	2,340,000	2,073,821

Expenditures							
Operating		Capital		Administrative Cost		Total	
Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
2,787,000	2,786,998	2,078,314	6,238	0	0	4,865,314	2,793,236
2,822,171	2,509,919	515,000	163,371	325,000	275,174	3,662,171	2,948,464
3,007,590	2,851,475	351,627	136,173	342,806	313,112	3,702,023	3,300,760
3,365,097	3,155,455	0	0	354,931	337,749	3,720,028	3,493,204
3,384,077	3,052,408	334,551	143,053	368,923	338,040	4,087,551	3,533,501
3,238,469	2,630,438	0	0	336,160	308,594	3,574,629	2,939,032
2,177,415	1,999,204			326,722	252,306	2,504,137	2,251,510

Fund Balance	
Planned	Actual
97,350	1,670,686
800,275	1,873,708
1,403,002	1,488,047
879,007	1,062,061
152,143	414,541
179,912	245,463
81,326	67,774

	Revenue	
	Licenses, Permits, and Fees	
	Recovery of Prior App Exp	
	02-45 / 04-86	
	Planned	Actual
Beginning Balance		
FY10 Adjustment		
Corrected Balance		
Jul-09	205,000	176,958.58
Aug-09	180,000	198,470.08
Sep-09	120,000	141,440.65
Oct-09	32,000	26,934.69
Nov-09	13,000	123,039.20
Dec-09	10,000	9,131.28
Jan-10	10,000	8,104.21
Feb-10	15,000	12,054.16
Mar-10	70,000	60,978.09
Apr-10	370,000	319,207.18
May-10	275,000	261,542.33
Jun-10	400,000	215,619.36
	1,700,000	1,553,479.81
FY11 Adjustment		
Corrected Balance		
Jul-10	215,000	182,510.36
Aug-10	170,000	174,427.79
Sep-10	110,000	64,290.06
Oct-10	30,000	23,301.71
Nov-10	15,000	8,457.50
Dec-10	10,000	5,518.74
Jan-11	10,000	5,945.78
Feb-11	15,000	8,426.07
Mar-11	65,000	47,463.64
Apr-11	200,000	
May-11	235,000	
Jun-11	225,000	
	1,300,000	520,341.65
Biennial Total	3,000,000	2,073,821.46

Expenditures							
Operating		Capital		Administrative Cost		Total	
Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	15.91%		Planned	Actual
				Planned	Actual		
51,447	57,064.11			0	0.00	51,447	57,064.11
48,238	90,379.41			0	0.00	48,238	90,379.41
139,792	105,650.72			15,860	26,201.08	155,652	131,851.80
83,856	91,250.10			22,241	3,607.62	106,097	94,857.72
105,978	133,557.62			13,341	20,771.55	119,319	154,329.17
144,955	92,915.38			16,861	27,025.45	161,816	119,940.83
100,919	108,872.09			23,062	0.00	123,981	108,872.09
93,286	98,581.03			16,056	14,398.84	109,342	112,979.87
141,925	140,995.72			14,842	14,544.37	156,767	155,540.09
115,266	53,066.48			22,580	15,103.40	137,846	68,169.88
38,917	98,371.28			18,339	7,710.91	57,256	106,082.19
249,140	95,102.19			45,010	31,183.65	294,150	126,285.84
1,313,719	1,165,806.13	0	0	208,192	160,546.87	1,521,911	1,326,353.00
41,832	41,284.60			0	0.00	41,832	41,284.60
64,018	82,205.08			0	0.00	64,018	82,205.08
106,364	86,501.59			16,841	0.00	123,205	86,501.59
79,746	76,947.30			16,923	30,648.40	96,669	107,595.70
100,007	74,356.00			12,688	11,098.30	112,695	85,454.30
156,349	84,360.39			15,911	9,847.67	172,260	94,208.06
99,415	137,629.01			24,875	12,310.87	124,290	149,939.88
97,269	95,485.05			15,817	13,532.39	113,086	109,017.44
118,696	154,628.62			15,475	14,321.68	134,171	168,950.30
80,066				18,885		98,951	0.00
118,097				12,739		130,836	0.00
175,836				37,292		213,128	0.00
1,237,695	833,397.64	0	0	187,446	91,759.31	1,425,141	925,156.95
2,551,414	1,999,203.77	0	0.00	395,638	252,306.18	2,947,052	2,251,509.95

Fund Balance	
Planned	Actual
	245,462.99
	245,462.99
399,016	365,357.46
530,778	473,448.13
495,126	483,036.98
421,029	415,113.95
314,710	383,823.98
162,894	273,014.43
48,913	172,246.55
(45,429)	71,320.84
(132,196)	(23,241.16)
99,958	227,796.14
317,702	383,256.28
423,552	472,589.80
	472,589.80
596,720	613,815.56
702,702	706,038.27
689,497	683,826.74
622,828	599,532.75
525,133	522,535.95
362,873	433,846.63
248,583	289,852.53
150,497	189,261.16
81,326	67,774.50
182,375	67,774.50
286,539	67,774.50
298,411	67,774.50
298,411	67,774.50

Encumbrance

57,000.00

10,774.50

Expenditures through 043011

05/02/11

MI	Activity Description	Allotment		Expenditures	Variances	Planned	Planned	Expenditures	Variances	Variances	Variances
		Biennium	FY 10	FY 10	FY 10	FY11	FY11 to Date	FY 11 to Date	FY 11 to Date	FY 11	BN
13720	Indirect	\$ 344,596	\$ 172,298	\$ 160,547 x	\$ 11,751	\$ 172,298	\$ 143,582	\$ 91,759	\$ 51,823	\$ 80,539	\$ 92,290
53404	Glenwood Springs Egg Take	\$ 1,500	\$ 750	\$ 747	\$ 3 x	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ -	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ 753
53455	Wallace Yearlings	\$ 327,000	\$ 139,777	\$ 136,087	\$ 3,690 x	\$ 187,223	\$ 151,282	\$ 121,274	\$ 30,008	\$ 65,949	\$ 69,639
53465	Icy Creek Yearlings	\$ 176,000	\$ 88,000	\$ 87,585	\$ 415 x	\$ 88,000	\$ 83,614	\$ 73,224	\$ 10,390	\$ 14,776	\$ 15,191
53475	Soos Creek Zeros	\$ 471,500	\$ 234,125	\$ 233,330	\$ 795 x	\$ 237,375	\$ 194,128	\$ 184,398	\$ 9,730	\$ 52,977	\$ 53,772
53607	Chambers Creek Yearlings	\$ 116,000	\$ 67,369	\$ 68,703	\$ (1,334) x	\$ 48,631	\$ 6,127	\$ 53,109	\$ (46,982)	\$ (4,478)	\$ (5,812)
53602	Lakewood Yearlings	\$ 398,500	\$ 199,250	\$ 202,480	\$ (3,230) x	\$ 199,250	\$ 166,077	\$ 156,309	\$ 9,768	\$ 42,941	\$ 39,711
53604	Garrison Springs Zeros	\$ 129,164	\$ 63,272	\$ 60,935	\$ 2,337 x	\$ 65,892	\$ 54,910	\$ 45,024	\$ 9,886	\$ 20,868	\$ 23,205
53630	George Adams (Rick's Pond early rec)	\$ 31,500	\$ 15,750	\$ 15,643	\$ 107 x	\$ 15,750	\$ 15,450	\$ 15,742	\$ (292)	\$ 8	\$ 115
53636	Hoodsport Yearlings	\$ 172,836	\$ 87,728	\$ 83,583	\$ 4,145 x	\$ 85,108	\$ 54,944	\$ 37,085	\$ 17,859	\$ 48,023	\$ 52,168
53675	Minter Creek/Gorst Creek Zeros	\$ 66,000	\$ 33,000	\$ 9,374	\$ 23,626 x	\$ 33,000	\$ 33,000	\$ 35,595	\$ (2,595)	\$ (2,595)	\$ 21,031
53674	Minter Creek Yearlings	\$ 52,000	\$ 26,000	\$ 24,321	\$ 1,679 x	\$ 26,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 21,532	\$ (1,532)	\$ 4,468	\$ 6,147
52132	Fish Health	\$ 85,000	\$ 42,500	\$ 42,494	\$ 6 x	\$ 42,500	\$ 42,200	\$ 24,354	\$ 17,846	\$ 18,146	\$ 18,152
54910	Coordinator	\$ 92,000	\$ 46,000	\$ 25,087	\$ 20,913 x	\$ 46,000	\$ 26,430	\$ (3,887)	\$ 30,317	\$ 49,887	\$ 70,800
54917	Marine Fish Enhancement/Lingcod	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 15,443	\$ 29,557 x	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 29,557
54911	Glenwood Springs (LLTK) Zeros	\$ 210,000	\$ 115,000	\$ 92,000	\$ 23,000 x	\$ 95,000	\$ 78,750	\$ 118,000	\$ (39,250)	\$ (23,000)	\$ -
54913	Rick's Pond Zeros	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ 15,000 x	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,000
54914	Lk Washington Sockeye	\$ 15,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 11,398	\$ (3,898) x	\$ 7,500	\$ 3,350	\$ 3,350	\$ -	\$ 4,150	\$ 252
54915	CWT Fish Marking	\$ 114,500	\$ 66,200	\$ 56,596	\$ 9,604 x	\$ 48,300	\$ 16,100	\$ -	\$ 16,100	\$ 48,300	\$ 57,904
BN 09-11	Projected Activity Expenditure	\$ 2,863,096	\$ 1,464,519	\$ 1,326,353	\$ 138,166	\$ 1,398,577	\$ 1,090,694	\$ 976,868	\$ 113,826	\$ 421,709	\$ 559,875

2009 Brood Program Stats

	Planted	Pounds	Avg Size Fish / Lb	Size Range Fish / Lb	% + or -	CV	K Factor	C Factor	Tag Code
09 Chambers Stock Steilacoom Lake	22,429	118	188	188	-27%				
09 Chambers ^{Deschutes} Stock Steilacoom Lake	197,218	1,218	162	155 / 184	-27%				
09 Deschutes Stock Sub Yearlings	851,584	17,897	47.58	45 / 50	+ .9%				63 / 50-86
09 Deschutes June Jumbo	99,728	5,391	18.5	18.5	-0.10%				
09 Deschutes Sept Jumbo	96,431	5,040	19.1		-3.60%				
09 Deschutes Yearlings	127,500	28,333	4.5	4.5	-2%	9.47	0.942	3.4	
Program Totals	1,394,890	57,997			-6.40%				
Program Goal	1,490,000	54,500							

Eggs Taken

Chambers Stock	37,942	2.24%
Deschutes Stock	1,656,418	97.76%
	1,694,360	

Trapped Tribal Harvest Sport

391		
-----	--	--