

**PSHAAC Meeting Notes
Thursday February 2, 2012**

Attendees

Members

Norman Baker – Sierra Club
Lee Blankenship – HSRG
Andy Appleby – HSRG
Frank Haw – CCA
Michael Schmidt – Long Live the Kings
Al Senyohl – Steelhead Trout Club

WDFW

Heather Bartlett
Sara LaBorde
James Dixon
Annette Hoffmann
Christina Iverson

1. Review initial draft of the PSHAAC recommendations for Chinook utilized in our Co-manager (HAIP) planning.

J. Dixon – As the group has requested that they wish to see where/how recommendations have been used w/co-manager planning and HAIP process he created a tracking matrix for PS Chinook, steelhead and coho. Started group the discussion/review with the PS Chinook matrix. At this time WDFW has discussed the WSMZ concept with co-managers in some watersheds, and will introduce the concept later in others. This introduction is based upon where we currently are in negotiations with the co-managers. (See 3 matrices provided by J. Dixon).

M. Schmidt - Suggested matrix be updated with column or footnotes designating where we are in the relation to both short and long term goals (i.e. 2015, 2020).

• **Georgia Strait Geo-region**

- *NF Nooksack* – primary & currently aligned with HAIP
- *SF Nooksack* – primary & currently aligned with HAIP
Alan Chapman (Lummi Tribe) plans to implement selective gear soon.

• **Whidbey Basin Geo-region**

- *Upper Skagit - summer* – primary & currently aligned with HAIP
- *Lower Skagit – fall* – primary & currently aligned with HAIP
- *Cascade – spring* – primary & currently aligned with HAIP
- *Suiattle – spring* – primary & aligned with designation, WSMZ designation not yet formalized in HAIP
- *Upper Sauk – spring* – primary & aligned with designation, WSMZ designation not yet formalized in HAIP
- *Lower Sauk – summer* – primary & aligned with designation, WSMZ designation not yet formalized in HAIP

- *NF Stillaguamish – summer* – primary & currently aligned with HAIP
- *Skykomish – summer* – aligned with long term HAIP objective as primary, but currently a contributing designation, and not a 2015 priority - need identifiable & quantifiable benchmarks
- *Snoqualmie – fall* – primary & aligned with designation, WSMZ designation not yet formalized in HAIP
- **Central/South Basin Geo-region**
 - *N. Lk Washington* – stabilizing & aligned with designation, WSMZ designation not formalized in HAIP but likely
 - *Sammamish* – aligned
 - *Cedar* – contributing & not aligned (no agreement with MIT. WDFW has taken the designation recommendations to the tribe, WSMZ discussion has not taken place yet), possible as it can be managed above the weir for pHOS
 - *Green* – contributing & not aligned (no agreement with MIT. WDFW has taken the designation, stabilizing in short-term, contributing in long-term, has been recommended to the tribe) edit stabilizing box
 - *White – spring* – primary & currently aligned with HAIP
F. Haw - would like to see data on the natural component of the White River SpChin.
L. Blankenship - White River is now past colonization and into local adaptation phase, MIT & WDFW agree on primary designation and conservation informally, now when do we start managing pHOS? Acclimation ponds put a wrinkle in how it could be managed. J. Jording did begin to address the topic of when do we start managing for pHOS.
 - *Puyallup* – stabilizing & currently aligned with HAIP
 - *Nisqually* – primary & tentatively aligned with the HAIP
WDFW would like to see more distinct timelines in tribes plan to start managing pHOS
- **Hood Canal Geo-region**
 - *Skokomish* – primary & moving towards agreement in the HAIP
Tribe would like to see re-introduction of spring Chinook, however fall Chinook is naturally productive, not sure how to move forward
 - *Mid-Hood Canal* – primary & moving towards agreement in the HAIP
Small, non-self sustaining Chinook population? Comprised of strays?
- **Strait of Juan de Fuca Geo-region**
 - *Dungeness* – primary in the draft HAIP
 - *Elwha* – agreement for primary designation, WSMZ is not in HAIP yet, but should be agreed to by co-managers

There is currently a chum hatchery on Jimmycomelately Creek, it is for sale and the Jamestown Tribe might purchase it and open JCL creek

For the Elwha the long term goal is a self-sustaining Chinook population

- *N. Baker* – The group should really push for a WSMZ, there is some concern there may be continued coho harvest from the hatchery in the Lower Elwha

General Group Discussion

J. Dixon solicited feedback from group about how to revise/edit PS Chin matrix to make it as useful as possible

L. Blankenship & M. Schmidt would like to see revision of the wording for footnote 6, from “would like to see” to “recommends rise to WSMZ over long term”.

Group would like to see more clarification of the “alignment” column. Aligned with what with respect to the program and agreement with co-managers (the group’s recommendations or the HAIP goal, or both?)

2. Review initial draft of the PSHAAC recommendations for steelhead utilized in our Co-manager (HAIP) planning

J. Dixon clarified that this matrix contains information for PSHAAC, not intended to represent a product from PSHAAC

H. Bartlett – we may or may not have total agreement w/ co-managers on term “WSMZ”

A. Senyohl – Skagit is one that has been talked about and talked about and seems like there may not be a consensus reached within the group

A. Appleby – Yes, Skagit is one we may not be able to reach a consensus on

• North Sound Geo-region

- *Nooksack winter* – Not a WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC
- *SF Nooksack summer* – **WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC**, not formalized in HAIP, Regional staff believes it will be formalized
- *Samish winter* – **WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC**, not formalized in HAIP, co-managers agreed to the discontinuation of hatchery releases into the Samish, likely to be formalized
- *Skagit s/w* – no current consensus with PSHAAC
- *Baker s/w* – Not a WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC
- *Sauk s/w* – **WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC, not formalized in HAIP**, as Skagit is still under discussion the WSMZ concept will be brought into the technical discussions, still in initial phases
- *Stillaguamish winter* – Identified as PSHAAC candidate, but not final recommendation

- *Deer Creek summer* – Identified as a PSHAAC candidate, but not final recommendation Weir was there before so we would have to change program and consider location of White Horse Ponds
- *Canyon Creek summer* - Identified as a PSHAAC candidate, but not final recommendation
- *Snohomish/Skykomish winter* - Identified as a PSHAAC candidate, but not final recommendation, haven't formalized future production in this system
- *Pilchuck winter* – **WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC, not currently aligned with HAIP** although there is no formalized production planted in this system
- *Snoqualmie winter* – Not a WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC
- *NF Skykomish summer* – Not a WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC, no formalized production planted in this system
- *Tolt summer* – **WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC, not currently aligned with HAIP** although there is no formalized production planted in this system
- **South Central Geo-region**
 - *Lk Wash. winter* – Not a WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC
 - *Cedar* – Not a WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC
 - *Green* – Not a WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC
 - *Puyallup/Carbon winter* – **WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC, not in HAIP**
 - *White winter* – **WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC** once supplementation program is sunset
 - *Nisqually* – **WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC**
 - *South Sound Tribs* - Not a WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC
 - *East Kitsap winter* - Not a WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC
- **Olympic Geo-region**
 - *Skokomish winter* – **WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC** once supplementation program is sunset, McKernan program?
 - *East-Hood Canal winter* – **WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC** once supplementation program is sunset, Dewatto on-going program & **HAIP is missing sunset date**
 - *West-Hood Canal winter* – **WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC** once supplementation program is sunset
 - *Sequim Bay winter* – **WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC**
 - *Dungeness winter* – Not a WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC

- *Strait Independent winter* – Not a WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC, needs further discussion for final recommendation
- *Elwha* - **WSMZ candidate for PSHAAC** once Chambers supplementation program is sunset

General Group Discussion

J. Dixon – We are working in WSMZ as we can, but it is not likely that it will make it into HAIP’s before this round of submissions

Group concern about limiting harvest in all small tributaries of the Straits, thus the group put forward no WSMZ designation. N. Baker & M. Schmidt – suggested leaving Straits open for production to protect the Elwha in the future

3. Go over draft Puget Sound coho table and start population-level discussion on conservation designations, WSMZ, and programs to focus hatchery reform actions by 2015. Coho matrix in production (J. Dixon)

J. Dixon – There is no coho TRT & we have discovered some difficulty in tracking coho programs through the FBD

F. Haw – Do we have much coho stray info? Is it pretty limited?

J. Dixon – Yes, this can be limiting, we do have Region 6 wild brood stock trapping data

Cowlitz coho tend to have lower stray rates, could be location (big river, small nearby tribs)

For coho carcass data we have to assess how relevant the subsample is, index area surveys are done for most programs

N. Baker – Is it fair to say coho lack life history variability that Chinook display?

M. Schmidt – pHOS / PNI – fisheries value? Data available? Would like to see coho escapement data from SaSI. What was net pen policy? L. Blankenship – Managed to stray location

A. Appleby – Do we need a Hatchery Program Associated column?

M. Schmidt – Could include associated hatchery programs and lump together to address all possible stray risks?

Group would like to see more clarification of column five of matrix & how to capture wild/harvest management plans with coho, designations of primary-managed for natural escapement and secondary-managed for harvest with respect to prior species designations.

WDFW has data of recent program and performance “Sara’s tables”. Summary of stationary release sites and cost/adult produced as of 2009. Helps assess value of catch and surplus.

F. Haw – How does WDFW track strays from net pen programs?

A. Appleby – BRAP process, biological impact is assessed

J. Dixon – All things being equal the burden is on WDFW to prove we are not causing a risk

J. Dixon – Think about off-station planting impacts from coho (fosters public involvement).

H. Bartlett - Coho have been thermally marked as a past practice, we have allowed off-station plants happen to connect with the public, we value that connection, but in light of new conservation objectives we may have large programs (i.e. Issaquah) go away? Perhaps we will have to scale down programs for educational purposes in light of potential impacts

M. Schmidt – Would like to see in the steelhead discussion at the next meeting A.) What is the policy for the group making decisions for WSMZs and B.) How to frame the discussion on the Skagit?

Can Release Site Incubators (RSI) be reconciled with WSMZ's? (S. LaBorde, H. Bartlett, N. Baker, J. Dixon) Yes, that is the goal. This can help us consider the level of risk

BREAK 1:00pm – 1:40pm

Closing Discussion/ Standing Questions:

Next meeting – Revising Steelhead WSMZ Candidates & Continue Coho

– March 8, 2012@ 10 am – 4 pm, NRB Room 537 (Directors Conference Room).