PSHAAC Meeting Notes
Tuesday, April 17, 2012

Attendees

Members	WDFW
Andy Appleby – HSRG	Heather Bartlett
Lee Blankenship – HSRG	James Dixon
Frank Haw – CCA	Ron Warren
Andrew Marks – CCA	Doug Hatfield
Frank Urabeck – Sport Fish Advisor	Brodie Antipa
Roger Urbaniak - PSA, Friends of Issaquah Salmon Hatchery	Jon Anderson
	Gary Marston
	Christina Iverson

Opening Updates and General Discussion

H. Bartlett – Draft EIS Release date from NOAA has been pushed back to Dec 2012 for hatcheries. 10 Puget Sound programs have been identified as priorities to be submitted for HGMP consultation by August 2012 under Limit (6 joint Tribal-State actions) of the ESA Section 4(d) rule.

J. Dixon –Five of the Puget Sound Chinook HGMPs are from WDFW (George Adams, Soos Creek (sub-yearling and yearling) and Wallace(sub-yearling and yearling) and the other five are from the co-managers (Nisqually-Clear Creek/Kalama fall Chinook, Stillaguamish summer Chinook, Muckleshoot- Keta Creek spring Chinook, Snohomish - Bernie Kai-Kai Gobin summer Chinook and Muckleshoot/PIT -White River spring Chinook). The WDFW Soos Creek Hatchery fall Chinook HGMP is being used to cover two programs, both the yearling and sub-yearling programs. There will be a co-manager review before submission.

H. Bartlett – After co-manager review the HGMPs will undergo the public review process, and will be posted on our website for public comment.

J. Dixon – All focus will likely be on completing HGMP's before pursing HAIP's. WDFW anticipates starting on the Puget Sound Chinook Harvest Management Plan by April 2012. From talking to Pat Patillo something has to be started by this spring or early summer.

B. Antipa – What are the five tribal programs?

H. Bartlett – Nisqually, Stillaguamish, Keta/Palmer, Bernie Kai-Kai Gobin and White River.

J. Dixon – Kendall Chinook is not on the list as one of the top 10. The current harvest management plan is good through April 2014.

H. Bartlett – Budget: Nemah, Hoodsport and Samish are going to be ALEA funded and there is an interest in a capital investment to support hatcheries for an economic benefit. $66M to WDFW, with $55M to hatchery improvements. Fish passage barriers, fish ways (part of environmental compliance). Soos Creek is getting a number of improvements as is Voights Creek. The Point No Point marine access site is also on the list for improvements. List reflects 'shovel-ready' projects to be done immediately, so the money will be spent quickly. Biology is involved so some projects may have to be done in stages.

A. Marks – Seems like there would be a benefit of bidding under one contract and staging them instead of doing it separately, so that you can save on administration costs.

H. Bartlett – No PSHAAC meeting in May. In June likely will put together a draft report of the final discussions. Looking at finalizing in June or July and having a final feedback meeting. We will be sending a draft of the report to the group for review before the final feedback meeting.

1. **Review coho salmon population designation matrix and CCMP definitions of Primary and Secondary from last meeting (see coho matrix provided by J. Dixon)**

J. Dixon – Draft for review on coho designations and Wild Salmonid Management Zone (WSMZ) table contains a bit of HAIP status info. The green comments mean the HAIP is currently in agreement with the group recommendations. Red does not line up with the group's recommendations at this time. Primary/ secondary apply to both wild only populations, and populations with hatchery influence. Secondary designation in the Comprehensive Coho Management Plan (CCMP) means that natural escapement is secondary to harvest goals. Primary means that the natural escapement is met before harvest is allowed.

Dungeness:

L. Blankenship – Dungeness coho is primary but is stabilizing under the HAIP, this seems in conflict, but is the only one that appears to be out of line.

J. Dixon - This reflects that escapement is managed as a priority before harvest is allowed.

L. Blankenship – The Dungeness has a segregated stock with straying issues and it seems like it should be secondary.

J. Anderson – These designations come from the CCMP, which was written in the 1980's.

F. Urabeck– Do they fish non-selectively on the Dungeness?

J. Dixon – Yes there are tribal and non-tribal non-selective fisheries

L. Blankenship – Seems like it would be a great place for a seine fishery

North Puget Sound tributary coho:

J. Dixon – WSMZ candidates: North Puget Sound tributary coho – CCMP (secondary) Population Designation (Primary) WSMZ (Yes). Currently there is no hatchery production and it hasn't been formally listed in the HAIP as a WSMZ.

Nooksack:

The Nooksack HAIP identifies two stocks, an upper river primary and lower river stabilizing. Likely in the long term the co-managers would like to re-initiate the Kendall Creek program that was discontinued in 2009 due to budget issues. Thus, it will not be listed as a WSMZ candidate.

Samish:

The group gave Samish coho a primary designation, and recommended it as a WSMZ candidate.

L. Blankenship – Even though it is secondary CCMP, Samish seems to have good escapement (Thompson coho escapement appears to benefit this stock)

R. Warren – It is protected due to trans-boundary fisheries practices.

Skagit:

J. Dixon – Skagit coho are currently managed as a single stock, although cursory WDFW genetic work shows distinct spawning aggregates. Any WSMZ designation would be dependent on differentiating sub-basin populations.

L. Blankenship – Where do fish come from for the Marblemount Hatchery program?

J. Dixon – They are volunteers to the hatchery from the Cascade River, the program is well integrated. Discussions with the co-managers about the discontinuation of the Marblemount program were not received favorably. It provides a popular terminal sport fishery. Skagit fisheries could likely be sustained on wild production only. It is also an important Pacific Salmon Treaty (PST) stock.

J. Dixon – With the Baker River are we separating fish out for the Skagit?

B. Antipa – Just taking what comes into the trap, the fish are earlier at Baker River due to the hydrograph.

L. Blankenship – Fish come back in very early at Baker and spawn very late, historically there was a Baker origin stock incorporated into the Marblemount stock.

F. Haw – The Baker coho life history is unique and the hatchery operation should preserve their genetic legacy.

A. Appleby – Were used at Minter Creek as well and returned in July, the adults were a bit smaller due to their early return timing.

J. Dixon – What added info is needed?

A. Appleby – Would like to see the uniqueness of the stock reflected.

F. Urabeck– What should be done to the hatchery program?

A. Appleby – If the hatchery is integrated it should be based on timing (early arrival) and later spawn timing.

F. Urabeck– There is natural spawning, can B. Antipa expand, what would you do different unmarked only or both released in the lake?

B. Antipa – Smolt production shows natural production, most of the brood is unmarked but it s a small release (50k) both are released

L. Blankenship – Is the brood at Skagit down to 150k? Is the DIT group reflected (1/3 of the fish unmarked)

J. Dixon – Yes and Yes

B. Antipa – 190k, there is a somewhat protracted spawn timing at Marblemount into December and January

L. Blankenship – It feels likely that the stock is homogenized with Skagit and Baker in the Cascade/ Marblemount Hatchery (reflected in the spawn timing)

B. Antipa – As other programs go, the Oak Harbor Net Pens have been discontinued.

Stillaguamish/Snohomish:
J. Dixon – Nick Gayeski, of the Wild Fish Conservancy absent from this meeting, felt that all productive wild stocks should be at least a candidate to become a WSMZ even if there is a hatchery.

B. Antipa – It is a 50k program and some are tagged.

H. Bartlett – It is also integrated.

F. Urabeck– What are the consequences of a WSMZ here?

L. Blankenship – Possible closing of the hatchery. If it is a productive program and the co-managers agree, let it remain the same.

F. Haw – How productive is the program?

J. Dixon – It is a tribal program so we don't know. Should we remove the Stillaguamish as a WSMZ candidate and consider the Snoqualmie as primary, and a WSMZ candidate?

Group – Yes.

B. Antipa – The Snohomish is already broken out into populations for the Snoqualmie, North Fork Skykomish, South Fork Skykomish and Snohomish.

Cedar:
R. Urbaniak – I feel a primary designation is wrong for the Cedar. There is a different set of rules for urban areas. There are lots of small streams with water quality issues. Salmon, either wild or hatchery from RSI's, are still good indicators of water quality. Several streams do not get any returns. People like to have salmon returning to these streams and more people get to enjoy them then in remote areas. A primary designation will have long range impacts on how the area is managed, in particular the RSI programs, the fisheries (sport/ tribal) and water quality monitoring. We are not going to use wild fish to monitor water quality data and we need hatchery fish from Issaquah to do this. Classroom education is also important, and is a future investment in the next generation. Other releases from RSIs may also allow for a buffer if an emergency situation arises at Issaquah. Fish passage is being added to small streams due to public interest. Cedar River stray issues are a big part of the designation issues (Kelsey Cr.) (passage and high release issues likely part of the problem), releases from RSI programs could be reduced to help address the straying issue. There would be a loss of research if a primary designation goes through.

F. Haw – Are any of the RSI streams Cedar River tributaries?

R. Urbaniak– No

L. Blankenship – What makes you think Kelsey Cr. fish are returning to the Cedar River?

R. Urbaniak– The proximity to the Cedar River, and the water quality issues. At times Issaquah fish (hatchery) are taken from the Cedar due to water quality issues.

F. Urabeck– Since passage has been opened up at Landsburg, returns have been greatly increased and UW studies show that natural production is occurring above Landsburg. Are strays even going to be from the RSI's? The Cedar coho run has been building since 2003 and I would like the designation to reflect this for the Cedar. I support R. Urbaniak and want to see his programs continue. Currently only 1 to 3% of the fish returning to Landsburg are marked.

L. Blankenship – I want to applaud R. Urbaniak for his work and I don't see it in conflict with a primary designation. Strays are likely to spawn in the lower river, and not above Landsburg.

J. Dixon – At this point two discussions need to take place: First should it be a WSMZ? This doesn't mean it has to be primary automatically. If either primary or contributing are chosen, a higher level of monitoring is going to be needed for strays. The RSI fish could be thermally marked, this would help to reinforce the RSI work to show that the fish in RSI streams are actually of RSI origin. I would suggest that it is difficult to separate the system into segments, for instance more than half of the Chinook production occurs below Landsburg. I don't see a conflict with the two. The primary designation will bring a permanency to the management of the system.

F. Haw – Issaquah Hatchery is likely to have more of an impact on pHOS than the RSIs.

L. Blankenship – Realistically there is a backup on otolith reading right now and may make this type of monitoring difficult.

J. Dixon – With a contributing population requiring less than 10% pHOS and less than 5% with primary, Issaquah Hatchery pHOS is 2-3% right now. The RSI contributions to pHOS based on just based on release numbers are likely to be much less than this.

F. Urabeck– Could we put a caveat to protect Roger's work?

R. Urbaniak– I see the potential for a bad water quality year to lead to a high proportion of strays, which could close the programs down.

A. Appleby – I agree, but for different reasons. RSI contribution rates are typically rather low, doesn't see inconsistency due to this.

R. Warren – If a monitoring program showed evidence that an impact from straying occurs, then a reduction in the numbers of RSI programs could then be proposed, and thus they would not likely be eliminated completely.

J. Dixon – Roger's RSI production is the state's program and has to be brought to the commission for a decision, as well as it is subject to HSRG standards.

F. Urabeck- Could the designation be set as 'conditional' as to not impact Roger's program?

J. Dixon – Remember this is a management area that currently has with no primary coho population designations.

F. Urabeck – Currently the tribal fishery is confined to the ship canal and Lake Union to protect the sockeye, I do not want to see a new Cedar River directed fishery.

A. Appleby – Have comments eased Roger's concerns?

R. Urbaniak– Wants WDFW and the group to at least understand the uniqueness of the urban study and wants the designation to bear this in mind.

A. Appleby – Is Roger OK with this moving ahead, if the group understands he wants in 'black and white' that program is not jeopardized by a primary designation?

R. Urbaniak– Yes, I do not agree with primary and still see issues. I would like to have this noted.

L. Blankenship – How about a primary designation with a caveat that if RSI stray contributions are found to violate pHOS goals, it would go to contributing?

J. Dixon – Why doesn't it just go to contributing?

F. Urabeck– I suggest we sample unmarked fish first. There are some safeguards in place to protect the RSI's.

J. Dixon – Final suggestion is a primary designation but caveated that based on issues with the RSI strays and the group agrees that if it violates primary stray standards it would then go to contributing.

F. Urabeck– This is different than the Skagit where there was a complete standoff

R. Urbaniak– The RSI releases could be reduced to ensure it is not in violation.

H. Bartlett – Don't start with RSI reductions, if monitoring shows 5-6% pHOS then reduce.

J. Dixon – Is this a monitoring priority for WDFW, or do we go with the assumption that RSI stray rates are low?

B. Antipa – Traditionally a lot of strays have been from the Elliot Bay Net Pens, no carcass surveys have been done in the lower river. Why do we want primary so bad?

F. Urabeck– Primary would heighten public awareness on the importance of the system and that it is a priority, a lot of things are being done in the Cedar and a lot of money is being spent on it in comparison to other systems.

L. Blankenship – Primary is there to state that we like what WDFW is doing and want it to continue.

R. Urbaniak– I feel that I have been heard and appropriate action has been taken to document that.

Break until 12pm

Re-initiate coho salmon population designation discussions

Green:

J. Dixon – Green River/ Soos; tribal and net pens (NPs). Does B. Antipa feel that a draft of Stabilizing has been reached with the tribes, thus this not a WSMZ candidate?

B. Antipa – Yes.

J. Dixon – Have some issues with Chinook HAIP and policies. We are working to bring everyone back to the table. Currently there are is some disagreement with the tribes over adult management. There are policy level negotiations that need to take place.

F. Urabeck– The HAAC had recommended that this watershed be designated as a "Contributing" population, so why was this recommendation not followed?

J. Dixon – This was based on the coho having a moderately-sized wild production.

A. Appleby – Also due to straying from Crisp Cr. & the Elliot Bay Net Pens, pHOS levels would not allow a Primary or Contributing designation.

L. Blankenship – Was a good production area, but is intensively harvested in tribal fisheries

J. Dixon – When HAIP discussions resume, WDFW can discuss the coho designation with co-managers. Soos gets substantial wild coho back each year, approximately 1,000.

F. Urabeck– Wants management discussed with the tribes and a greater priority to wild coho production given. The HAAC should be arguing for a higher standard, rather than the status quo, and retain their recommendation for a Contributing designation.

B. Antipa – We get some years with high unmarked fish at the hatchery. The net pen program could potentially do better if there were enough naturally-produced fish to use an integrated stock.

Group – Stay with stabilizing designation.

J. Dixon – Des Moines Net Pens – could be associated with the Green, because there aren't significant production streams in the area.

E. Kitsap:
J. Dixon - E. Kitsap coho is contributing and there are stray issues from the Agate Pass net pens. Need HAIP agreement with Agate Pass NP and M&E.

J. Anderson – Need sufficient stream surveys to look at mark rates on the spawning grounds, program was just restarted recently.

A. Appleby – The Agate Pass NP performance historically mimicked that of the South Sound Net Pens – was good in the past and dropped off until it was eventually cut.

L. Blankenship – Assumes there should be a tag group, along with stray monitoring, for the net pen program.

Puyallup:
J. Dixon - Stabilizing designation.

Voights:
J. Dixon - Voights Creek coho is an integrated program. It has had rather high coho hatchery rack escapement numbers, averages 5,609 adults over last four years.

J. Anderson – During El Nino years the coho were rather small in size

A. Appleby – Overall they have not typically been small fish, and have averaged the same size as in 1972

White:
J. Dixon - The White River population is currently listed as contributing in the HAIP, and the PSHAAC group has suggested a Primary designation.

J. Anderson – Tribes want to retain a hatchery option on the White River

J. Dixon – The tribes have been adverse to adult management for Chinook and steelhead at the Buckley trap and it is likely that contributing may be all that we can get an agreement on.

J. Anderson – The tribe does monitor for hatchery fish at the trap.

B. Antipa – In non-pink years they have recorded high levels of natural fish, and very low rates of marked fish.

J. Dixon – The HAAC group recommends a Primary designation and yes for a WSMZ.

South Sound – Chambers:
J. Dixon – Chambers is not mentioned in the HAIP as the system has not been managed for wild production.

J. Anderson – Nothing to note of a wild coho population at this time.

A. Appleby and F. Haw – Chambers once had a unique early stock of coho.

J. Dixon – So there is no designation, but it is listed as a candidate for a WSMZ, this does not interfere with adults or juveniles. However there is no acknowledgement of an existing natural stock by co-managers.

R. Warren – This fall will be the first year that adult passage is not monitored, and we will be passing everything upstream and the tribes agreed with WDFW on this.

J. Dixon – Would it be possible to monitor marked/unmarked fish?

R. Warren – We are not going to have the ability to get our hands on all of the fish and at this point could only look for marks.

J. Dixon – 'Primary' means that if the population didn't exist other populations in the geo-region would destabilize.

A. Appleby – I would suggest Stabilizing and No WSMZ.

L. Blankenship – The only way we should designate this as a WSMZ if we are going to monitor and manage adults.

R. Warren – Also it should be noted that the hatcheries in the system are shifting more towards trout and kokanee production, the dam may come out in the future. There has been lots of conservation work done in Chambers/Clover Creek watershed (Al Schmauder, head of the Chambers Bay Estuary Restoration Team and Director of the Clover Creek Council), $12M in habitat improvements as well as a local push to take the dam out. There is a water rights issue with the golf course though.

J. Dixon – Final recommendation is Stabilizing and no WSMZ.

Nisqually:
J. Dixon - The Tribe has been moving production between Clear Creek and Kalama Creek. The tribal coho program is not currently designated in the HAIP. However Nisqually tribe has been active on hatchery reform and may be willing to work with a designation.

J. Anderson – The weir is in for Chinook but is removed due to high flows as the coho start arriving.

A. Appleby – Production has been very low recently and is assumed to be due to poor South Sound coho yearling survival.

J. Dixon – So we are looking at a contributing or higher designation based on pHOS levels.

R. Urbaniak– Would this mean more monitoring than a stabilizing designation?

J. Dixon – Not necessarily, this may just mean that we continue with current level of monitoring.

J. Anderson – There is a lot of monitoring going on right now.

L. Blankenship – Habitat restoration has been paying off lately.

R. Warren – Ohop Creek has been a great producer of coho.

Deep South Sound Coho – Deschutes, Mill Creek, Goldsborough, Sherwood, Minter:
J. Dixon – For Deschutes River; no WSMZ? Other options include Mill, Goldsborough, Sherwood, and Minter Creeks. In the South Sound, pHOS has been managed at under 30%. Minter should be managed for conservation, as production needs are being met and it has fairly good natural coho production.

F. Haw – What is being done at Goldsborough?

J. Dixon – There have been some spawning ground surveys, they are showing the same trend that all South Sound tributaries susceptible to the current downswing in production.

L. Blankenship – Mill Creek was the biggest producer in the area

F. Urabeck– There used to be a weir on Mill Creek.

J. Dixon – Goldsborough and Mill could be a WSMZ, but they would likely have to be managed as a primary population. Other than any RSI coho all fish are marked and/or tagged.

L. Blankenship – Mill and Goldsborough had high pHOS from the South Sound Net Pens, but Deschutes did not show this same trend. Might be hard to get to primary.

Group – Is the dam coming down at Coulter with the budget package funding?

R. Warren – Money for Coulter Creek is a culvert replacement at the head of the old adult trap and spawning pond and not dam removal.

J. Dixon – There are no current primary populations for coho identified in the South Sound. It would be hard to do anything higher, some pNOB back filling on low abundance years occurs at Minter. South Sound coho have had spawner abundance monitored more for the purpose of

harvest abundance and not adult management. Work on a framework to bring conservation into the area.

A. Appleby – Anything that makes a primary designation should be considered as a WSMZ.

L. Blankenship – Bringing harvest into things (if we can't get to primary due to stray rates) why is there a fishery selective if the area is managed for harvest? The Squaxin Tribe is doing some mark-selective beach seining for coho.

J. Anderson – They haven't been requiring this for their fisherman, merely suggesting it.

R. Warren – They still have to ensure that there is some spawning escapement and there is also a Chinook bycatch issue.

L. Blankenship – I would like to see some more harvest management and hatchery interaction talks.

A. Appleby – This area has 90% tribal harvest and 10% sport harvest, which may be the main reason for the mark-selective fishery.

R. Warren – Beach Seining by the Nisqually Tribe has also been fishing mark-selectively in recent years.

J. Anderson- I will get pHOS and total abundance estimates from Larry Phillips, WDFW District 11 Biologist, for Deep South Sound coho.

Hood Canal:
J. Dixon – Hood Canal – Port Gamble Net Pens and Dabob Bay, mainstem Hood Canal HAAC recommends a primary designation, since it has no hatchery production, and yes on a WSMZ. We still do need to check into coho stray rates.

F. Haw – The number of unique populations in this area is surprising.

George Adams:
J. Dixon – This program is managed as secondary in the CCMP. The HAAC agrees with a Contributing population designation, as the draft HAIP discussions have suggested. It has been validated as operating as a properly segregated program (2-3% pHOS).

East Strait of Juan de Fuca:
J. Dixon – The populations is a Primary stock in the CCMP. The HAAC recommends it have a Primary population designation, and yes as a candidate for a WSMZ.

Dungeness:
J. Dixon – Designated as primary in the CCMP, HAAC recommends stabilizing as a population designation and no on a WSMZ.

Elwha:
J. Dixon -Currently an integrated conservation program is operating in the basin, but would go to a WSMZ when it sunsets, currently the Co-Managers are undergoing consultation on their programs and recovery plans.

L. Blankenship – Will the tribe have to list their long term plans?

R. Warren – Will not have to list plans after 10 years out. In the long term the Tribe wants to decrease production as natural production increases until the runs are self sustaining at harvestable levels. At this point the hatchery program will end.

L. Blankenship – Have there been talks on the Chinook program with the Tribe?

R. Warren – Yes, the agency did not want to co-run the hatchery at this time but may jointly use their facilities in the future, as this would limit out of basin rearing.

L. Blankenship – No on a WSMZ.

J. Dixon – Agreed, no on a WSMZ for Elwha coho. Does everyone want to review again?

F. Urabeck and H. Bartlett – Yes, good idea to review again.

J. Anderson – I will provide the group with Deep SS coho pHOS estimates in a week or two.

H. Bartlett – WDFW will send out a revised coho table to the group.

2. Discuss sockeye salmon population designations

Baker Lake :

F. Urabeck– Baker Lake used zero for the natural escapement goal at North of Falcon this year, does this mean the program is running with no natural spawning goal?

B. Antipa – WDFW is in negotiations right now with the co-managers over escapement, hatchery practices etc.

F. Urabeck– What do we want to do? We need to establish natural production goals for the system. We cannot establish that until all hatchery fish are marked. Puget Sound Energy needs to put a chiller in to otolith mark fish. Production could be expanded at the hatchery, there was historically natural production and there should be a natural escapement goal. We need to know what that is. It should be scientifically derived and not politically. Need to get to a defensible natural escapement goal for Baker.

J. Dixon – There is no ESA requirement for recovery. I see this as a potential issue if we don't prioritize goals for either harvest or for conservation. They are the only sockeye population left in Puget Sound, South of Lake Ozette.

F. Urabeck– It is predominately a hatchery system now but doesn't necessarily need to be.

A. Appleby – Hatchery-origin fish released into the reservoir is what is driving natural production. It is not going to be possible to manage the system for pHOS and PNI, and as such we are going to have to base things on naturally spawning hatchery fish.

J. Dixon – We are likely to end up with an aggregated escapement goal and can't have a mark-selective fishery in the area. Fisheries management is logistically going to rely on hatchery production, so there is little need to invest in an extensive monitoring program.

B. Antipa – If there is a 100k run there is no way to catch 90%, thus higher escapement will occur.

F. Urabeck– 50% of the sockeye released into Baker Lake last year were harvested by sports anglers.

J. Dixon – The utility will figure out how to mitigate for this, if there is a natural escapement that will come off of hatchery production. We need to look at how the hatchery is run so that there is conservation in consideration. We can go forward with an argument that conservation is not a primary goal for Baker. If the program is robust enough to support a fishery, we should set this as a Stabilizing population. If conservation is the main focus, it would require a Primary or Contributing population designation and require both management and monitoring.

A. Appleby – The escapement goal is for both hatchery and wild and it is surprising that there is not a conservation goal due to the genetic legacy of this stock. However, if you want to place a conservation goal on the population, the hatchery program is going to have to be altered.

B. Antipa – Releases include those from the spawning beach, 2 week feed fry and fall fingerlings.

F. Urabeck– I would still like to see a spawner escapement goal.

L. Blankenship – At what level?

L. Blankenship and A. Appleby – Should be stabilizing, but should still have an escapement goal.

J. Anderson – This is a unique population compared to Fraser fish, and has an earlier timing.

L. Blankenship – Do we want a hatchery or a legacy population?

B. Antipa – As it sits, the population wouldn't exist without the hatchery

F. Urabeck– Managed as a hatchery population (No WSMZ)

A. Appleby – No PS ESU for sockeye, it has to be linked to Fraser genetically and biologically. Do not need primary necessarily. Group should go with stabilizing today.

Lake Washington:

A. Appleby - Lake WA tributaries are unique according to Ken Warheit, WDFW Geneticist. Fish from the Cedar River program are expected to stray in low levels (<5%? <10%?) into north Lake Washington.

R. Urbaniak– There was a survey showing that only 25% of the fish were originally from the Cedar.

J. Dixon – The program will likely violate the primary designation if the size increases.

A. Appleby – When was the most recent sampling?

B. Antipa – Fishery was usually close to the north end of the lake to protect these tributary fish.

A. Appleby – Only 65% of the fish at the Ballard Locks are not accounted for again in the Cedar River. The program is managed for a contributing population, but is running at a higher pHOS (30%-50%) 40% for the last 5 years. The Adaptive Management Plan requires operation of the program relative to a Stabilizing population designation. Do we go with stabilizing, or just adjust pHOS and PNI?

F. Urabeck– I am fine with all hatchery fish if it's to reach a level that a fishery can occur.

B. Antipa – No discussions with the co-managers on this, we will have to work with the city/ utility. A stabilizing designation just means no worse than current.

F. Haw and L. Blankenship – Should put in a comment about the current Lake Washington sockeye escapement goal being unrealistically high at 350,000 before a fishery can open.

3. Discuss chum salmon population designations

The table provided (See chum table posted on WDFW website) does not include all pink and chum populations, only those with hatchery programs associated with them.

Nooksack:
B. Antipa – There is currently an integrated chum program on the Nooksack using brood from the North Fork. As it sits this is a one year program to be negotiated further. The River has an 80k escapement and the HAIP was contributing. The NF and SF Nooksack chum are not split in the HAIP.

Samish/Independents:
Samish fall chum is contributing in the HAIP. 2M segregated harvest program at Whatcom.

D. Hatfield – Whatcom Creek has had survival issues (pre-spawn mortality) and is derived from the N.F. Nooksack stock. Kendall/ Whatcom chum currently have less than a 10% stray rate. We may need more stock information to categorize.

Gig Harbor-Ollala/Carr Inlet:
J. Dixon – No HAIP designation, and a 2 million release size on the chum program at Minter Creek. Currently don't actively pass chum into Minter.

R. Warren – Would have to double check on the amount fish that are passed up stream.

J. Anderson – Would likely violate pHOS standards.

A. Appleby – Might meet pHOS if other tributaries are included.

Hood Canal / Skokmish:
J. Dixon – McKernan Fall Chum (Weaver Creek) nothing to base pHOS on, poorly segregated.

H. Bartlett – Ponds are in the creek with no passage above.

J. Dixon – Big money makers in the treaty and commercial fisheries

Michael Schmidt should perhaps review the info on the Hood Canal fall chum populations, Tahuya, Dewatto, Hamma Hamma late, Duckabush, etc.

4. Discuss pink salmon population designations

General question to the group: Can anyone think of pink hatchery management currently going on? The Nisqually, the Green? They have had large pink runs lately. There is a 500K pink program at Hoodsport Hatchery. WDFW is marking pink in the Dungeness system and can estimate pHOS and use wild brood. This table (See WDFW website for pink table provided) should be expanded to include all pink populations. We will follow-up with and updated table via

email. We don't have to balance harvest on pinks like other species. Perhaps we can start by identifying places we would not start a pink hatchery program.

L. Blankenship– It is important to flesh out guidelines for pink populations now. Look at chum before programs were dropped and now are being brought back. Look at the average of multiple cycles with good abundance and performance, these would be good indicators to focus on for pinks, use regional groups.

L. Blankenship – I would like to thank the department for taking this advisory group on. It feels like we will have a real outcome.

H. Bartlett – I appreciate how we have all continued to plow forward and make some really great progress.

F. Haw – This has been an open discussion and productive testimony is possible from the group to the Fish and Wildlife Commission.

The group would like to see the department conduct a harvest advisory group in a similar forum.

H. Bartlett – Yes, this process paid off in the legislative session with a show of support from our constituents. I will follow-up with Pat Patillo regarding a harvest committee.

Closing:
PSHAAC Draft Report to be sent to the group for review in the following few months. (Possibly late July 2012?)