

Thursday, July 21, 2011

Attendees

WDFW

Heather Bartlett

Sara LaBorde

James Dixon

Jeromy Jording

Attendees

Public

Michael Schmidt - LLTK

Clint Muns - PSA/Rec fish Alliance/chair PSRE

Al Senyohl- Steelhead Trout Club

Dick Burge - Wild Steelhead Coalition

Nick Gayeski - Wild Fish Conservancy

Norm Baker - Sierra Club/PSA/CCA

Andrew Marks - CCA

Frank Haw - CCA/NWMT

Roger Urbaniak - PSA/Issaquah hatchery advisor board

Thursday, July 21, 2011

9:00 AM

Heather starts off with: Meeting Objectives

- Define role of Puget Sound Hatchery Action Advisors

- Review Commission policy - true north about getting the Puget Sound Hatcheries set in line with the policy

- Review the HAIPs as we work with comanagers in development of these plans

- Foundational understanding of science and tools available to assist in work

Heather goes over timeline: NEPA EIS for Puget Sound is slated to be completed by Feb 2012. These documents will secure our ESA plans, valid HGMPS, for approval. Tribal interest is completion of the PSSMP (1985) as it relates to the EBD.

Al - Pretty aggressive meeting schedule, Friday's are somewhat problematic.

Heather - We'll have to work through that. Frequency is driven by timeline of completion of process. We need to be constant contact to get feedback on where we're at and then have staff take that and evaluate to determine feasibility.

Nick G - Thursdays are better for me.

Heather - the 1st two meetings are more foundational and by the 3rd meeting we'd get into species.

Dick - Will there be a way of getting information of what happened during a meeting or providing written input back.

Sara - We will be having an opportunity to do that.

Nick - would it be okay to have someone sit in our place if we can't attend

Heather - These are public meetings, not under the rules of the public meeting act, but yeah that's more than fine to have others attend. We'll create a link on our website to look at online if you can't attend a meeting. We'll try to upload notes for folks debriefing or for refreshing topical items.

Andrew M - So will these notes be distributed

Heather - absolutely and we'll try to get a contact informational sheet distributed.

Clint - I'm in concurrence with others that a late afternoon/early schedule would be more beneficial.

Sara - how long are these meetings?

Heather - they'll be fairly topic driven

Nick G - starting at 3 or 4 would be more beneficial

Heather - Okay, that start time with Thursdays being the day we shoot for. Also have not thought about them outside of Olympia.

Al S - So will the meeting change for next week? As I'm coming from Winthrop.

Heather - We'll confirm during a break. I will look to see if we can change the 29th and the 12th. We're thinking the next meeting won't be near as long.

Dick - Are we thinking of setting dates for a few weeks out?

Heather - Yes. We just needed to get some dates out there to get things started. Onto the Hatchery Committee's Role: Concept is population designations. I don't know if that concept is new or old. That will be an important piece, especially once we get beyond Chinook. We'll be looking for advisement on those, as well as the speed on which we achieve the HSRG standards by 2015. It's possible that we be able to identify alternative paths to achieve this goal. We'll be looking for recommendations on Wild Salmonid Zones (areas absent hatchery production) and it encompasses a large spawning area. We'll be looking for recommendations on priority actions on programs or natural populations, from broodstock management to capital improvements. We do have an ambitious goal to bring our hatchery system up to environmental compliance by 2025. Questions?

Nick - With the capital requirements what do you mean?

Heather - NPDS permitting is in place, but the environmental standards have changed quite a bit, and passage is a major concern. We've outlined a priority system to address culverts. Our HAIPs are including capital investment prioritization and could use

James - Clean Water Act, Screening & Passage criteria, blockage, impingement and pollution are also pointed out in the policy.

Dick B - since the HSRG has published its findings, there has been quite a bit new science published that I hope encourages our recommendations and decisions. It is very different than what the HSRG had at the time.

Heather - I think the HSRGs thinking has become even more refined, implementing broodstock management, from what happened in the Puget Sound vs. Columbia R is very different.

Dick B - I have talked with at least one member and I believe they are reviewing contemporary findings to review what they think.

James - I understand where you are coming from. One dramatic difference you'll notice from Puget Sound vs. Columbia R is more focus to maximize the benefit of the hatchery system as an economic driver. I think what's shifted is the timeframe for the risks, and threshold of effects of integration and segregation may have changed, but not the basic concept. I don't think new research is indicating a counter to the basic fundamentals.

Dick B - I think of some of the papers for Steelhead, under further review, may change things for steelhead. And you've answered my question.

Heather - And we expect to have some members of the HSRG present.

Nick G - Is Todd Seammons going to be involved in that.

Heather - I don't know, why?

Nick G - Well since he's a new hire on staff with you it makes sense to bring him in.

Andy M - When would that take place?

Sara - the 3rd meeting we're going to dive into this species by species.

Nick G - Are we going to be discussing or making recommendations on scales of hatchery programs?

Sara - every one of them

James - Heather alluded to the HAIPs, but basically those are these comanager production agreements at a watershed level. This group is to inform our side of this process. To present what our logic is, driven by our policy, we will bounce our ideas off of you to determine the route we take.

Andrew M - When I hear advisor group, I tend to think more along the lines of policy level. Ron W and Jim S, and what you just said seems to indicate more of an implementation level, and these don't seem to fit. We've discussed achieving broodstock management goals by 2015, but that's pretty darn difficult when you're constrained to hatcheries alone.

Sara - welcome to my world, the intersection of policy vs. implementation. That's just what we have, as we move forward our policy piece is the FWC policy. When we look at meeting HSRG standards its going to be either reduce programs or increase harvest, it comes down to how we are going to protect wild fish. Anyone who wants to get a tape of the shouting match between the Nez Pierce and Norm Dicks we

can provide that for reference as folks that still don't think hatchery fish are problems. What's dealt with here is pHOS, not selective fishing. What are the hatchery effects on the spawning grounds. We have to be able how we are going to deal with the hatchery fish on the spawning grounds.

Andrew M - You are drawing a picture that scares me.

(a little discussion on why Agency feels that the RMP and this process are completely different)

James - we can't affect a future harvest regime that hasn't been designed. There aren't places where you can't put a bunch of harvestable fish, but the role here is to help find those places. The recognition of selective fisheries is not going to be covered in a hatchery plan.

Andrew M - to affect pHOS you either take fish out of the system by reducing production or kill them.

Heather - we could say we have to harvest fish at a higher rate, or cut the program, or put in weir. We may be able to get at those fish, but the plan that's in place will get reviewed and adjusted. The work we're doing here today will either come up with a plan to address these issues by 2015, or things will get reduced.

Andrew M - well that goes the farthest I've heard for identifying our work here.

James - That encapsulates it in somewhat of a negative role. This is a dramatic departure from the role we used to have, generate the fishery then create the fish to feed that fishery. The role has changed and the outcome will be dramatic.

Heather - absolutely. We are looking at transforming one of the largest hatchery systems in the world to fit ecologically into the system.

Sara - Our challenge is that we have a hatchery system that was developed for a fishing regime that no longer exists. We are putting a large number of fish on the hatchery grounds, and there are too many limits overall. NOAA has been clear that they are going to start addressing this with us. I think we're lucky that the commission has laid out a policy that clears up where we are headed. Is there anyone that doesn't have a copy. So the purpose is to advance the conservation and recovery of wild salmon and steelhead. (Sara reads through the policy; refer to policy). Key piece in final sentence of General Policy Statement component about comanagement.

Andrew M - so it seems like a one way street with comanager. What is your expectations for that part of the process. We currently have a true north for the public side of the equation, but the other half, at least we don't what that is.

Sara - we'll talk about that, and how the tribes fit into this. It will go watershed by watershed.

Nick - one way to read that last sentence, is that what we don't want to be constrained by US v WA if we want to make changes.

James - in essence the 1985 PSSMP EBD is the agreement that will be adjusted. In US v OR we have less adjustable criteria.

Andrew M - in the last meeting we had about the tribal relationship it would be nice to know where we already have tribal agreements.

James - we have developed MOUs with tribes, and some are in term or since expired. MOUs aren't in perpetuity.

Nick - Another value to doing that is NOAA's EIS on the RMP should provide the take limits. Some provisions of the PSSMP aren't in our mind relevant to the ESA.

Heather - Tim Tynan may participate in some of this.

Andrew - When we made the suggestion that the members of this group have a constituency, and hopefully you identify that when you go into the negotiations. I think that creates a need or good idea so that the communication come back.

Sara - ok back to the policy. The Harvest Programs component is a big paradigm shift, as we didn't really think about the population goals when first constructing things.

Norm - when you say spatial structure what do you mean?

James - when you enact a recovery plan you want that stock of fish to be able to fully utilize that habitat where it was historically. The VSP criteria would have high marks in all four of these categories.

Norm - what about areas where we have poor habitat that is restorable?

Sara - the recovery complex has people in each watershed doing just that. We probably have \$5 billion worth of projects going on right now.

Al S - The other 1/2 of the equation is we didn't have any agreements on the steelhead side with the tribes until last year. Finally we got agreements with 9 or maybe 10. In those agreements we allow Indians to fish on wild stocks when we are off the rivers, and the harvestable fish are supposed to be the hatchery fish. I fully expected someone to be here representing the Indians.

Sara - We don't allow the Indians to do anything, they get to. The statement that hatchery fish are only the harvestable fish they will disagree with us on that.

Frank - NMFS did recommend that the tribes evaluate selective gear.

Al S - In Puget Sound we put 34,000 in acoustic tagging on the Green. We still have depressed stocks, but we can't reach agreement. Will we get to work individual tribes.

Dick B - Twice under you've said the need is to rebuild the VSP, and the problem we have is you're not listing the parameters of each of those characteristics. Will we do that.

Sara - we won't be establishing the goals

Nick - Well the TRT should have done that

Heather - right, and for the other species there is less information to go on.

Al S - I hope you understand that I'm not characterizing the tribes as our adversaries, as they should be our partners.

Sara - So page two of the policy, our harvest will increasing focus on abundant hatchery fish and not wild fish. We will implement selective fisheries unless the population is not being effected negatively. (Continues reading through policy). With the prioritization of broodstock management they mean wild fish on the spawning grounds and fish in the hatchery. We don't really know how to deal with ecological impacts yet, but we have tools to track a progression.

Andrew - Are there places we know where we have HSRG and ecological conflicts.

James - Yeah, the commission has some timelines for us to come to them and give them updates and tracking of program progression towards HSRG standard. We have a method for tracking where we are and how we are changing things, and it allows us to get that data.

Sara - There is a then a HAIP definition, and timelines for implementation, and strategies for funding. They call out for marking of all hatchery fish. That means in some places

Norm - What is the rationale why tribes wont get behind marking all the fish?

Heather - culturally the tribe see no difference between a fish. As we look to implement selective fisheries, they see us as short circuiting salmon recovery, and now we can walk away from our commitment to habitat restoration by only needing hatcheries.

Sara - If your goal is to have a locally adapted population, you have to have enough habitat to do that. The tribes are not buying that we as a population will save enough habitat to make sure they have fish to exercise their treaty right.

Nick - They also think it disrupts the CWT program.

James - it's definitely not about us against them, but in an interest in moving forward in a more common goal of recovery...

Al S - It was my hope that when the committee that we would be able to look at watershed by watershed, and have the tribes involved.

James - We are doing that, by having you go through this with us then we relay that to them. Its not direct, its defacto though the same process.

Sara - We've done analysis on all our hatcheries and will share what's in compliance and not in compliance. Number 8 is where we begin to gain some real traction, but we are desperately trying to catch up with the recreational committee, by implementing lower river commercially, as recreational fisheries are not suited to do so.

Al S - I think we should be going to barbless hooks statewide.

Sara - So we'll seek funding from potential sources to implement selective fisheries.

Heather - so we sit down with the HSRG for our biennial budgets to get try to filter out prioritization. Its helpful to try to get funding from OFM, as the Agency is committed to getting this funded.

James - The tribes also take their HSRG funding requests through that route.

Sara - defining the full implementation of selective fisheries, this is exciting stuff. We are developing a model that will look at what happens when you turn certain selective fisheries off and on to pHOS, pNOB and other components. We're excited about this. The last thing is defining Wild Management Zones. That's clear.

Norm - Would that be a public educational thing

Sara - it will affect where we put hatchery fish.

Heather - it means we are not actively releasing fish there. Wild Salmonid Zones.

James - So sub-basins where we stopped planting fish don't equate to a WSMZ, but they could be candidates. If we haven't formally classified a zone as such, then just because we stopped planting fish doesn't mean they are WSMZ currently.

Dick - How is the Dept defining a major population group that is smaller than a VPS.

James - in the case of things that are listed the stock groupings are done by the TRT and the policy would say for each of those groupings.

Al S- So we are talking about the watersheds and the hatcheries. With the acoustic tagging that was done on SH the smolts were making it to the estuary but nothing was making it the Straits, and part of what we are talking about has to deal with Puget Sound.

Sara - Another forum the GMAP, there is a whole issue on Puget Sound Steelhead. We've tried to articulate what we're doing about things, and marine mortality is part of that. We're working with NOAA, PSP, Puget Sound Recovery Council at how we get at that. There is a black box that we don't know exactly what is going on, but we won't talk about that here.

Roger R - What's the definition of a wild vs. hatchery fish? Why can't you broodstock an unclipped fish and put them in a remote egg box, is that a hatchery?

James - there is a strong delineation point. If there is any artificial mate selection in the process, that's really the break point. You have a lot of different levels of involvement. For example on chum, pink, and sockeye vs coho or steelhead you'll have different levels of influence. The WSMZ don't have any influence. So everyone should have received the HAIP description via email. Most of the progress is in the very early stages. It was mostly developed to facilitate a common understanding of what the plan is. (James reads the description).

Andrew - So the agreed upon component and through the experiences are you able to reach agreement with the comanagers?

James - one thing we haven't really discussed yet, NOAA fisheries is involved as well. We have a coordinating committee to set the schedule for the HAIP process. There is a federal entity involved that has the final consultation on all of the programs, so we've been able to build a common understanding in the importance of coming to an agreement. It's mutually beneficial, as this will help steer our common interests as NOAA because of their consultation authority is very much directing this process. Otherwise effectively after they drop the final NEPA we'd be operating without a permit.

Clint - Since many of the comanager agreements are based on policy, has NOAA grown a spine? Are they willing to be objective?

Sara - (laughs) they'll be strong where they need to be.

James - most of you recognize the dual role that NOAA fits here.

Clint - it would be nice to see the federal agency be a little more bold.

Sara - so the Dept of Interior document that establishes the role of federal agencies' role in regards to treaty trust responsibility is for the tribes.

James - one of the more puzzling things about NOAA fisheries and what's driving their stance is they've had different approaches depending on the areas. They are really trying to formulate a more cohesive consultation process.

Sara - So at this point the effects of hatchery fish on wild fish, its an unprecedented time for NOAA to step in and deal with this.

James - So I read the definition of the plan and the process, and the end date of February 2012. What's involved here for each watershed most major watershed have a tribe associated with a U&A. It's gets a little murky. (James goes over Matrix with U&A tied with geography). February deadline is for Puget Sound out to Elwha, then for the rest of US v WA case area will be further out. This process started off within the Snohomish watershed, and there was a lot of jostling of what we wanted this plan to do. We've had a good relationship working with the Tulalips for a number of years and so we fleshed it out. That is the one you see that's the furthest along. The next step is take the information and start technical discussions, and that's where you come in to let us know what you want to discuss. That's the second technical meeting phase. Out of those technical meetings, which could just be a few as they may end up with status quo program size, that's where policy issues that can't be resolved are kicked up to a policy level. The comanagers want these discussions to function in a government to government process. When we get to talk about the disagreements, NOAA has helped to move things along.

Heather - the thought process is what we do here we hope to expand to the coast by 2013.

James - when it comes to renegotiating the US v OR 10 year agreement this will be similar to that. Probably a couple years prior to 2018 we'd bring the same discussion.

Al S - so where do we fit?

James - At the second level. The first meeting's are just editing the compiled data, and introducing and making sure we have the correct comanagers there.

Al S - So Heather we have the generic overview today, and so they are based on watershed now?

Heather - We're going to do it by species. It starts by designating a population and that helps determine what risk you're willing to take with production that will ripple into fisheries. Our goal is to reduce risk of the hatchery program, we need to see the effects on the fisheries to en

Michael S - Do you envision that the Dept has a perspective and the PS Hatchery Advisory Group will make recommendations on the position of the Dept?

Heather / James - Yeah

James - One alteration is we don't want to hand you the product and say what do you think? But in some cases it will. When we say a whole species we mean Puget Sound Chinook, or Puget Sound Steelhead. When you get into a watershed you won't be able to develop spatial bound goals. Its likely the most efficient way to go as well.

Sara - and my mind can't go watershed by watershed

Dick - In terms of technical information, can you send us all the hatchery programs?

Andrew - not just the state hatcheries?

James - We have a list of all the programs that are linked to a natural population. When we come back for the actual Chinook meeting, I can bring a list of programs that aren't linked to a biological objective. There are tribal programs that are on the list.

Heather - the discussion here is great, but I don't want to overlook the foundational meetings. Lets break for lunch and we'll start on Agenda item 5.

Lunch Break

Using Population Designation in hatchery management

James - (passes out example of foundational elements of population designations) So in the LCR we've already developed some impetus for identifying populations and status objectives. The TRTs have developed different structures for listed populations. There's substructures that make species viable. ESU or DPS, same thing different terminology. LCR is one of the best examples to use, important conceptual basis is there is hierarchical structure to recovery. Within that, there are some that more important to recovery for various reasons. Diversity of the ESU is important, and the TRT developed a matrix to lay over each of these listed populations, subESU strata are developed. In LCR you have the MPG groups, and the TRT said that there needs to be 2 sub-populations that need to be restored to less than %1 chance of extirpation over the next 100 yrs, considered the primary populations. Contributing populations are more mid level viability, and the stabilizing populations represent those that are maintained at a baseline level, and are at a low viability. So we are trying to come into the HAIP process with those defined. Some of the those are defined for us, but not to get too far ahead if you flip over the handout (labeled Table 3 Recovery objectives for LCR salmon and SH pop in WA) you'll see examples

of these designations. In Puget Sound the recovery plan was much more broad, and didn't set a lot of individual pop designations. There were a few that were identified as must have for recovery, but there are lots of other stocks of Chinook that weren't designated. Along with this structure the TRT developed, they developed a requirement that the MPGs contain at least 2 primary stocks for delisting. In Puget Sound the sub group units are broken up into 5 subunits, and then the second column is the current list of populations, and the third column lists the TRT identified populations that are primary. Notice it did not identify all of the primary, just some and then left it up to the comanagers and recovery boards for the remaining stocks and designations. That's a big part of this planning process. So the PSCSPRA came out as a draft of a model for all sorts of things to use from proposed funding for habitat to our hatchery program. It comes with two attached tables, and we're not going to drill down into this meeting today. We do agree with the concept of something that will move recovery forward progressively, but because of the lack of structure similar to LCR for Puget Sound things seem to be going slowly. If there was tons of available land and interest and money, that might work, but the longer we go without significant action the more we are falling behind everywhere.

Nick - So did the Dept request that the TRT revise this? The real problems were they knew of the upper Columbia and LCR TRTs and they explicitly eschewed that approach. The shared strategy plan was one of the key parts to getting this initially moving forward, but the data this was used is prior to 2004. They didn't even score it, and this thing has a long way to go before.

Sara - Puget Sound really felt that they needed all ships to rise, and are worried funding for others will fall if they are ranked differently.

James - Conceptually the all ships must rise is not progressing, but in this aspect the plan that is applicable to all stocks is what the shared strategy came up with.

Nick - But the Recovery Board seems to still want to spread the money evenly. Given the economy we do need to prioritize.

James - When dealing with habitat restoration and coming up with what work will give you what output its all speculative. It hasn't been around long enough to validate a whole lot of it. Knowing that going in, we shouldn't expect a lot of influx for money in, as folks may be getting salmon recovery burnout. As one reference that's one element we're trying to align with. The PRA approach validates all the must haves from the TRT, and tries to work the remaining watershed populations into.

Sara - can we talk about how HSRG used these?

James - When the HSRG went into the CR the earlier PS and coastal biological significance as a rating, they started their review in 2000, final reports came out in '04 and a lot of this stuff wasn't in existence. They relied on the managers for perceived and relative importance. For the CR they took this model and given the role in a macro population, that's the population you want to have the lowest level of risk. For populations that do have hatchery populations interacted and are designated as primary they took the base concepts of integration/segregation and applied more stringent levels of acceptable broodstock management. That's what we've taken and roled into our HAIP process.

Michael - so were those designations already done with the comanagers?

James - For listed populations yes, some of them are would be considered draft.

Heather - for the state and tribes are honing in some designation.

Michael - so you'll be able to identify where there's conflict

James - Yeah, and we're building this language from other areas, and it took a while for the comanagers to recognize the proposed designations. Once it finally started to click through the HACCC we have a common understanding of terms.

Sara - my prediction is that they won't use PRA for prioritizing habitat funding.

Dick - so Table 1 defines the populations

James - yeah so table 1 came out and was an agreed to approach to recovery. When NOAA reviewed it as a draft acceptance to the recovery plan, they said you need to make some designations. They published a list where they thought the must have were. The rest were left up to the localized groups involved to decide.

Dick - One of the reasons I ask that question is that they look like geographical designations rather than any genetic designations.

James - just like any recovery operation, a lot has to do with politics, funding, and then science. It's the job of a TRT to dig up every bit of information there is about that species. Legal, geographic, historical, all together. LCR might have been the least political groupings, as they went to the EPA which has a survey that they tied to biological aspects to geophysical features. This was then later backed up by some genetic work. I think they brought some elements to that when they came into Puget Sound. In Puget Sound they are called MGPs. This is what we have, in some cases you only had 2 populations left, so you weren't left with much.

Heather - So we are trying to do this for all the species

James - So we will try to keep this format for other areas as well.

Dick - Okay now I understand, and that helps a lot.

Heather - When we have to meet the HSRG standards, we 1st need population designations, and then we have to meet those designations.

James - if there is a mandate for the program.

Sara - so this is a snapshot in time, and four years ago during the start of large budget cuts, we put together performance data on our Puget Sound hatchery programs. Page 1 starts with Nooksack, and the top box tells us what we know about the Natural population (the population name, productivity). Then we dug in with the hatchery production and harvest results. (Sara goes through table) We used this data to drive cuts.

Heather - so some caveats like pumped, well fed, or gravity fed hatcheries the cost of production will differ just due to hatchery type. Also the purpose, the cost to put a fish into a fishery is completely different than a supplementation fish that is returning at a huge cost.

Sara - and so the real thought here is that we closed Elochoman, and we closed Grays, and the cost it takes to keep these running we needed this information. You now have some of that, and its just a snapshot.

James - For any of these programs, except for escapement back to the hatcheries, should be considered as minimums. It's also a fixed set of years, and so it was under development for a year. This was a first cut at it, driven by financial requirements and not conservation evaluation. Consider this a fixed point in time two years ago.

Sara - we are creating a web site to try to annually update this product, so folks can get at it easier.

Nick - I don't know if you did it here, but it would be nice to have the conservation programs listed here.

James - yeah some of the programs didn't have enough tag information to make it into this document.

Dick - did you guys prorate this over a 10 yr timeframe to figure out how much these fish would cost then?

James - no. With all that in the mind this table here is PS Chinook; pHOS, PNI, and harvest rates for giving updates on progress towards updating the commission on how we are trying to meet HSRG standards. (James walks through table using Nooksack as example)

Nick - So here's where you can see some problems with NOAA analysis, Snoqualmie Chinook are listed as a tier 3 and its arguably the largest wild population we have.

James - and so you can see based on the color coding of the cells here whether things are meeting goals or not, and where we have data to track that or not. It also helps determine where we are likely to meet a goal in the near future or not. A good example of that is the NF Nooksack Spring Chinook, where due to the supplementation program is putting a whole lot of hatchery fish on the spawning grounds, but the objective is conservation in that case to put a lot of fish out to bolster or jump start the NORs.

Frank - on the White River Spr Chinook why don't we know the pHOS there?

James - Where we run the White R program out of Minter Creek, and the White R program from the Muckleshoot. None of these are fin clipped, and so we can expect it to be in the red, but we don't have the exact data to get at that right now.

Frank - I expect the MidHood Canal programs to be in the red as well.

Michael - There is data there.

James - yeah.

Heather - that would be good to get, so we can track that.

Dick - under your long term goals what is that saying?

James - We are trying to meet a long term abundance goals of either lots of fish with low recruits/spawner or low #s of fish with high recruits/spawner.

Heather - so our next meeting we're going to be a little bumpy as we get started as you can see not everything is canned so you are involved.

Sara - I think we tackle one of the watershed at the next meeting and see how it goes.

James - ok so we'll go through an example of the type of template to assess how it went, and then we'll move on to a species oriented meeting.

Michael - what about the watershed where there are hatchery populations and no significant natural populations?

James - yeah we should probably tie those in geographically. Like Glenwood Springs tying in with Samish and Nooksack.

Michael - Ok what about the ecological interactions. I don't have a belief that this will be able to tie in the ecological interactions here, but are you looking at evaluating those somehow?

James - There is recognition that there are things that are external to what we can do here. In one manner with the explicit formation of these WSMZ maybe we can get at that type of issue in the freshwater, but the estuarine and marine environment we don't necessarily have the opportunity to deal with it here. We are however dealing with some major components of hatchery risk here.

Roger - Are you looking for comments to be written out or emailed to you?

Heather - email would help us prepare. I'll make a copy of the sign up sheet.

James - so for the meeting on the 28th we'll have questions answered, example of the Snohomish watershed, and then we can start to work through Chinook at the following meetings.

Sara - know at the following meetings we'll want you to weigh in on these population designations, and where we have the WSMZs.

James - In the SSMP there are some descriptions of what a WSMZ is. Maybe an update on what you think a definition is, as we bring forward candidates then we would be able to clearly designate.

Roger - when you talk about a program goal of conservation, is that to maintain goals to a historic population level?

James - well there are different levels, as stocks vary in health. Conservation can mean just preserving the size and current level, but it can mean you are trying to move it from its current unhealthy status to healthy.

Andrew - When I read item #11 in the policy about WSMZs I thought there was a definition to go with that. What were the authors thinking when they wrote this item?

James - there are definitions, but not one strict definition. In the SSMP its called a wild steelhead gene bank, but for salmon its described in the original 2004 HSRG recommendations.

Heather - So you should have a copy of the SSMP, and no releases of hatchery origin fish will occur in the basins where the natural population spawns, and we didn't mean to preclude fishing in that basin but it did have to be above and beyond certain conservation levels.

Andrew - As we see the shift here, we might look at fishing in these conservation areas

Sara - I would say we don't know that a short term goal of fishing on wild fish fisheries is the way to go

Andrew - I think it's a worthwhile discussion to have. The economic piece of the pie for steelhead look expensive to produce but you make more than you are putting into it.

Clint - yeah you just have to characterize it correctly

Frank - well you can always look at the benefit at catch and release fisheries

Nick - and maybe look at limited entry fisheries

Frank - an extreme example might be looking at adams river country

Nick - I think that's what Andy was referring to, not as a possible consumptive fishery

Sara - that's works for me, that we'd list steelhead and they'd still fish.

Andrew - I think that given this group is varied, we'll stretch the envelope and think outside the box.

Heather - ok next meeting, next Thursday at 2, and we'll start by answering questions, and then dive into the Snohomish process to try and as Sara puts it, turn the dials to examine the effects.