

# Wednesday, August 31

Wednesday, August 31, 2011

1:13 PM

## Attendees:

### Public

Roger Urbaniak  
Al Senyohl  
Hal Boynton  
Frank Haw  
Clint Muns  
Norm Baker  
Michael Schmidt  
Nick Gayeski  
Frank Urabeck  
Andrew Marks

### WDFW

Heather Bartlett  
James Dixon  
Ron Warren  
Annette Hoffman  
Jeromy Jording

### HSRG

John Barr  
Lars Mobernd

Heather- starts off with past meeting population designation table and Dept.'s letter to the tribes

Frank U- so before we do that, we understand everyone is busy and at the end of the day a lot of us want to make sure that our fingerprints are on the final product. We don't agree with most of the choices in the reduction letter, and at the end of the day if this is going to be another NOF process that I feel is a sham I want to know that.

Heather- those decisions that had to be made are not new, as they were part of the reduction package that went to the governor. And so if there are specific areas that this group identifies for certain reasons we'll definitely note them and take them back. No one wants to cut hatchery production, and the Director is getting more sensitive to how reductions affect our fishery regimes. At some point you reach a depletion regarding fishery support. We recognize that, and we know we're close and at the same time we don't know.

Frank U- the bottom line is if we have a consensus on where the cuts should be, do we have any influence or are they a done deal?

Heather- the Issaquah, and the coulter creek, and the Bogachiel program reductions are done deals. Those are already incorporated into the budget.

Frank H- Hupp Springs?

Heather- That was not in the governor's budget

Michael- why wasn't Issaquah presented last time then?

Heather- We had not notified the tribes yet. Yes it was in the governor's budget. It's one thing for the Agency to cut production and then have to notify the tribes from a monetary stance, and another for biological and HSRG standards where our priorities lie.

Roger U- so because the facilities at Issaquah will still be there, where is the savings in the drop of # of fish versus just a flat budget cut?

Heather- can you clarify for me?

Roger U- Does a reduction in the eggs from a facility really save money?

Heather- If I understand your question the legislature allots us certain monies, and things are either line item that we have to do, and others are up to discretion. If we close Issaquah but there are a number of cooperative agreements in place are you asking if we will still be able to implement those agreements?

Roger U- yes and if we raise money can that continue production?

Heather- We have the ability to take donations to keep things going, but we can't participate in garnering the donations. If people want to support an activity through financial support they can do that.

Roger U- Is there any reason that the hatchery solicits for the money can we keep the production at the same level?

Heather- We did that at McKernan, as the state operates the facility but private funding pays for it.

Frank H- Are some of the tribes willing to fund any of these closures?

Heather- at the co-manager meeting we expressed that hope, and they may choose to come forward to support that.

Nick G- If we know there's a budget reduction ahead of time, and we say there's some biological reasons for reductions, and we can meld these together, but you are bound to "we need to notify the tribes of cuts first" how can we provide input?

Heather- that's why you are here to identify a series of options and we take those to the tribes to see if they agree or not.

Nick G- I see that, but if things from a budget perspective are treated differently I don't know how we affect that. If we were all in agreement to cut here / here / here are you able to take that to the tribes?

Heather- Issaquah, Bogachiel, and Coulter Creek were unilateral decisions by the Agency. In this forum everything is open. We will go through identification of programs, and we've been told by the Governor to further reduce by 5% and 10% packages in preparation. We have very little time though. So what we come up with here could feed into that, but it might only be Chinook as that's what we've gotten through. The options here are driven by conservation not money, and so it's our job to try to match those two up. To the extent that I have clear budget information I will bring that back. What the Director agrees to and the commission supports may be different than what this group recommends.

Roger U- You alluded to little time, and let's say Issaquah is a further example. IF they want to maintain those programs how long do they have to secure the funding to continue those programs? Is it the date you meet with the tribes.

Heather- No, it's before the legislature comes back in session in January, unless a special session is called. Even if we conceive of for the sake of this discussion, if we close Issaquah hatchery if parties came forward with operating funds we'd turn it over to private funding to keep it going.

Andy M- when did the package of the three go to the governor?

Heather- around November of 2010

Andy M- why wasn't that shared?

Heather- We had not communicated with the tribes

Andy M- The government is us; a representative government is the taxpayer. Unilateral decisions don't match up with that.

Heather- this group wasn't even conceived then. Those decisions were based upon money, and our thought process was trying to determine if the programs posed risk.

Frank U- the additional funding package that a lot of us were lobbied to support and subsequently supported through the last legislative was misleading then. We thought that additional fees would buffer significant cutbacks in fishing opportunity and it seems like that is occurring and our support was pretty important to get license increases through the legislature.

Heather- we don't know that opportunity will suffer at this point. At Issaquah right now we are still seeing a large surplus of returns to the hatchery rack.

Frank U- The problem here is public disclosure

Heather- I would say this budget was always there for folks to view as it went to the governor. Others could say this was hidden, as if you were aware of it or not.

Dick B- I'd like to make some suggestions for SH hatcheries that are more conservation oriented and can we do that?

Heather- So you want to make suggestions for SH now, you can do that and we'll note it.

Dick B- I'm thinking of improving production for conservation programs by improving yearling programs to two year old rearing strategies for improvement. I know that will increase costs.

Heather- That will cost more, so that means the other reductions will have to be larger.

Dick B- I'm willing to go there.

Heather- okay, but you have to realize that's a big cost elsewhere

Dick B- Yeah but one year rearing is doing a significant amount of damage. Wild stock fisheries are lost and that's more painful.

Frank H- One of the concerns is we don't measure success by what it costs to plant the seeds, it's the crop. What Dick is saying is that the 2 yr olds is actually cheaper due to better survival.

Dick B- As Frank says the probability of returns is higher, and improving the diversity is there as well.

James D- Great points, but we do need to get on with the letter and move on to Chinook.

Al S- I agree, but we should get through what we have planned.

Andrew M- I don't disagree, but something we've learned here is a time factor. If our input has any meaning we have to get our say in fast.

Heather- The letter also captures additional reductions conceived of that aren't line items in the Gov's budget. Some of the options may fit into the 5% or 10% scenarios, but it's likely we don't have enough reductions here. Hatcheries use a lot of general fund, and that's where we are taking reductions.

Al S- what's the response back

Heather- Nothing. We heard nothing at the meeting with the tribes so far.

Al S- does that tell us they are in agreement

Heather- I wouldn't begin to assume what that means

Michael- when we're going through these the Dept is putting forth what you are thinking about, and we're getting to comment on that? You have thought about what you want to propose in this HAIP process.

Heather- I can't say that.

James D- to re-reference the role of this group is to advise on the level of risk we are willing to take with hatchery programs. These cuts are simple harvest reduction cuts. There is a timing error here, but the concept of the group's role is to help with the conservation roles of the programs.

Frank U- I thought you wanted meaningful input, and so why are you giving this letter to us?

Heather- because you need to know what the base for these populations will mean.

Frank U- how do we influence the outcome? From a conservation concern this is group to do that, but from a harvest perspective is this forum?

Heather- If we identify the biological risks with the alignment here, or a higher harvest rate on the hatchery fish we want to hear about it. I will provide that back, and I can try to explain the process we went through in coming to these decisions. That's why the Director is definitely aware of providing

sustainable fisheries along with reductions. It's as if we're two or three years too late, as we didn't see the steep decline of the economy and we're dropping too fast to get out of it. The money is being pulled out from underneath us. You said you had some discussions and I really want to hear what the outcome was from that.

Frank H- I don't see the need for a hatchery on the Skagit system. Why are we keeping Marble mount?

Heather- the indicator stocks are necessary for fishery management purposes. They don't contribute to fisheries.

Frank H- is there an alternate way to achieve that?

Heather- So you are suggesting eliminating the coho indicator stock?

Frank H- well why not a stock that mirrors the Skagit stock at a facility that is already producing it?

James D- Recall though the marble mount hatchery also has the last chambers SH in that system.

Heather- and if we closed that program, then the Skagit will be closed for SH fishing. We hear a lot from the fishing community that they want that opportunity.

Dick B- what is the chance that we recover the Skagit, can we have fisheries?

Heather- yes, if the population was exceeding a biological target. Even catch and release, but it's not right now. We don't have enough NORs for operation of any fishery there without the MM program in place.

Al S- it's not just the river, it's all those boats out on Puget Sound.

Frank H- I question the impact of the Skagit on the coho fishery. It seems the most sense there.

Clint M- the hump tulips looks like elimination of the Chinook program there.

Heather- yes. The thought there is our fishers aren't benefitting from that release. It also complicates the fishery management in that area. That's the thought process.

James D- so the # of hump tulips coho is made up by the natural production. The aggregation decision impacts are aggregated and a disproportional ER is occurring due to the hatchery masking.

Hal- Bingham Creek reduction would make more sense

James D- It's been reduced twice already now

Hal- It's still exceeding the escapement goal by several thousand fish

James D- Yeah, but hump tulips is state funded hatchery solely.

Andrew M- our mission is conservation here, and what we continue to do to counter that is budget/treaty agreements and other processes. I don't know how to reconcile that. If we keep this to a conservation recommendation and leave the other components out of it we have to trust those folks outside of here.

James D- A recommendation by this group could be to regain harvest programs in a prioritized list that are conservation neutral. All of these cuts are fairly conservation neutral. Heather reiterated that some of these decisions are mis-timed but that's where we are. Totally willing to go back one watershed to re-examine.

Michael - Why not at Soos vs Issaquah? Is it the major escapement at Issaquah the factor that put it on the list?

James D- The production discussions are not settled with the tribe. Our draft designation for contributing for Cedar and Stabilizing for Soos didn't bring conservation into the discussion.

John- I'm confused, as the discussion goes on some of these do address conservation but we began with these as simple budget reductions that were conservation neutral.

Heather- some of these are simply budget driven, but some of them are both.

John- it's confusing still, conversation is coming in to play. Why isn't conservation the priority?

Heather- some of this deals with the size of economic savings we need.

James D- and some of them deal with MOUs that are termed that we can't change.

Heather- what you are suggesting is that there were better decisions that could have been made, and I don't know that there were. We've cut our coho programs except for Voights creek, and Soos Creek. Muckleshoot's have come forward with money so we decided that not a place to cut further. So then we have to look to large Chinook programs where we can gain the \$ we need to cut to achieve the savings size we need.

James D- These considerations have been forming over the last 3 budget cycles, so it's fiscal, conservation, and benefits to fisheries that we have to use to formulate decisions. So where we can show where there is unequal benefit to our constituents we might not cut. But if it doesn't have a significant value to non-treaty fisheries that elevates the program for cuts.

Frank U- the Green we'll want to re-examine from a conservation side. From a fishery side we'd like to see that a major cut there isn't going to be an issue for us.

Heather- ok moving on, we are passing around our working draft of population designations that we had from last time:

Geo-region	Population	Designation			WSMZ
		Primary	Contributing	Stabilizing	
Strait of Georgia	NF Nooksack	Yes			

	SF Nooksack	Yes			
Whidbey Basin	Upper Skagit - summer	Yes			
	Lower Skagit - fall	Yes			
	Cascade - spring	Yes			
	Suiattle - spring	Yes			Yes
	Upper Sauk – spring	Yes			Yes
	Lower Sauk – summer	Yes			
	NF Stillaguamish - summer	Yes			
	SF Stillaguamish - fall		Yes		
	Skykomish - summer	Yes			
	Snoqualmie - fall	Yes			
Central/South Basin	N. Lk. Washington Sammamish			Yes	
	Cedar		Yes		
	Green				
	White				
	Puyallup				
	Nisqually				
Hood Canal	Skokomish				
	Mid-Hood Canal				
Strait of Juan de Fuca	Dungeness				
	Elwha				

Heather- So we got as far as the Central/ South Basin.

Frank H- what about above Landsburg for the Cedar?

Heather- one of the actions was to remove hatchery fish at Landsburg to alter the pHOS.

Nick G- was there discussion about the Snoqualmie as a WSMZ?

Al S- The Tolt's been recommended but I'm not sure.

Frank U- I thought we were in agreement on the upper Cedar as a WSMZ?

Heather- I'm not sure it meets the definition. It's a section of a population, but not the entire Cedar. We could put down the recommendation though.

Frank U- There are some avenues here that make it attractive as a WSMZ.

Heather- ok so for both the Cedar and Snoqualmie I have them both down as candidates for a WSMZ.

James D- if it's a system that we see no benefit going forward for artificial production in the system that makes sense.

Frank U- and if we choose to block all hatchery fish from going above Landsburg we can do that to see what happens.

Nick G- for down the road monitoring the potential to have an impact on the lower Cedar will help as well. We might see fewer strays.

Michael- I had some consideration for SF Stillaguamish as well as Cascade if the Index programs were removed in my notes.

Heather- I'll make a note of them. The Cascade if the Spring program goes away, and the conservation program on the SF Stilly.

James D- (goes over layout of handouts)

GREEN RIVER CHINOOK

Hal- What about the 1 million release of fish by the tribe's from palmer?

James D- I don't have that here

Nick G- So the coding of the bars, what's that?

James D- the green color is natural fish, the pink is hatchery fish, and the slashed bars are hatchery surplus either at the hatchery or in the wild habitat.

Dick B- so under habitat and productivity is the model or actual?

James D- so that's the current EDT estimate. Actual is unknown, as our recruitment data is questionable at this point. It a preliminary estimate.

Lars- it represents the habitat potential.

James D- Most folks believe it's lower than this. These habitat conditions are best case scenario. They may not be quite as productive as what we think.

John- but relative to other unknown these parameters are pretty high.

James D- so the habitat in Green river is the most suspect

Hal- So this is habitat all below the dam, why not include above the dam.

James D- the question of what fish would get past and with no downstream collection leaves us with the below the dam as what's available. The plot is PNI scenarios.

Nick G- so the initial fitness factor is that relative to some current wild fitness?

James D- yeah the natural abundance has a starting point, and it stabilizes after several generations. It's a directional model and it oscillates a little bit of survival.

Nick G- so it's relative to the current wild population?

Lars- It's relative to optimal survival in that habitat. A fitness of .5 the expressed productivity is .25 or half, or fully domesticated stock.

James D- Yeah so it says that this stock is fully domesticated. It just means the natural environment is not driving the fitness.

Lars- two things the assumption is that a fully domesticated fish will not do worse than half that of a fully wild fish. Glass is half full outlook.

James D- So the Soos Creek Fall Chinook is modeled here. In this case the hatchery fish are included in the ESA listing. Also we can examine some MSF scenarios to see if we can meet PNI goals. Then there's whether or not we want to designate as a WSMZ or not.

Heather- one of the discussion points last time was through MSF a reduction in PHOS.

James D- the working one and working two scenarios was modeling a no hatchery scenario to determine what a WSMZ would create. Working one would designate a primary population status, and it adjusts the program size down to a point that the program would meet the population designation.

Nick G- the assumption is that harvest across the board is unchanged.

Lars- did you look at a terminal selective fishery here? You would see something surprising there.

James D- This is one of the systems where depending on the flow year determines where the fish go.

Michael- so the harvest is limited because the tribes are hitting their take limits?

Jeromy- no what is occurring here is that in the preterminal areas you are limited by other weak NOR stocks and that pushes a large amount of hatchery fish into the terminal areas as the fisheries aren't powerful enough to take a larger number of hatchery fish.

Frank H- I would like to recommend a primary status for this stock. It traditionally gets huge escapement, and it's the only native stock in south sound, and I don't know of any viable spawning stock outside of the Green.

Heather- so how do you recommend we proceed in meeting the goal by 2015? Is it a priority here to do that? Both primary and a priority by 2015 you would be supportive of pursuing that?

Frank H- yes. There is a perception that the habitat is ruined here, and it's not the case.

James D- so the White is already a primary stock status and the Nisqually is the other primary here in south sound. So there is not another need for a primary status here.

Lars- and by designating it as a contributing just suggests that it can tolerate a higher hatchery influence, it doesn't degrade the population.

Nick G- You can make the converse argument that the Green has suffered from a large hatchery influence over a long period of time, and it needs a larger amount of protection to counter that. The habitat seems to be capable of supporting a wild stock, and we need to allow for some of the recovery of that fitness.

John- it would do that with some...

Hal- Well you could plant a weir and mirror the Nisqually model.

Heather- so reducing the production by this level will reduce harvest.

Frank U- so we may not have an appreciation of what the contribution of Green River has to outside fisheries.

James D- so regardless of its historical importance, it has been a biological anchor for the ESU. The population is now subjected to recovery efforts, and a draft designation of stabilizing was when Andy was still at the Dept. We didn't look to the Green or Lake WA to provide a primary stock, based on the last three years showing that the reduction of hatchery fish has lowered the NOR SAR and escapement. Maybe it's due to habitat, but unless hatchery fish get on the spawning ground we aren't seeing fish.

John- but I want to point out that as we deal with the other populations we didn't manage them for NOR production.

James D- outside the Green we had comanager EDT developed modeling.

Clint- the priority of this group is to change the face of the hatchery program. I would like to speak to the population as a contributing, as the Muckleshoot will not swallow a major reduction in program. It is also a major contributing factor to recreational fisheries in Puget Sound. It's a significant contributor to our winter fisheries, the major priority of PSRE. If we can't get a weir in, can we get a terminal fishery in there to address it, and if we go to a primary designation that ties our hands.

John- to follow up on there the size of the program is equal on a contributing or primary, and so it takes a hit with either of those designations.

Frank U- so status quo seems to be unacceptable here. So the MSF in the river is controversial every year. I think weirs would be good to look at, even MSF by the tribes to see what our options are. So with all the amount of money that's being invested here, I do think we move more towards a primary direction, maybe not a primary designation though.

Heather- ok we'll bring back what the ER rate on the hatchery fish that would be required to get there.

Hal- And we need to include the 1 million that Muckleshoot puts out, it needs to be put in here.

Heather- so we'll bring that back and see what it looks like.

Michael- so you look at selective fisheries and weir effectiveness. If you were to run two different programs maybe?

Al S- it goes back to whether we open boat fishing below the bridge as well.

#### PUYALLUP CHINOOK

James D- So I put in a no hatchery scenario, it produces a reasonable amount of catch. The 2nd scenario I kept the rates and removed the hatchery and there is no natural fish in the long term. If you backed off all AK and BC fisheries, all PT fisheries you see the little green blip you get for NOR production. This is strictly a hatchery reliant system.

Lars- so there is no legacy here and it can't sustain a natural population.

Nick G- So here is where I have some discomfort to address whether or not this population is extirpated or not?

James D- so this is a Green river derivative.

Nick G- the model shows a capacity of over 4,000 adults, or does the HR prevent that?

James D- so the PNI is very low.

Michael- why manage it as integrated?

James D- the potential for some conservation concern, because you are not segregated, and you may not be integrated either though.

Nick G- with a PNI of .05 how can you achieve recovery here? It raises a serious question of writing off the Puyallup as a harvest only population.

Lars- a stabilizing population like the Puyallup has a role. It's different from a primary, but it isn't written off.

Nick G- I doubt with this example that the fitness floor is a 0.5. This seems to indicate that it's lower.

Heather- the hatcheries can't do all the work in recovery. There are some populations that we are willing to take a risk to allow here given the scenarios here.

James D- in the Puyallup you are talking about a complete rebuild of a biologically sound stock. In the Skagit right now there might not be a current hatchery influence, and you want to keep that. Now here the Puyallup shoulders a larger burden of harvest.

Nick G- so we identify it as stabilizing, and this is status quo, and with a PNI of .05 I don't know.

Lars- you don't get much of a benefit of PNI until you get to above .5 so that's the conservation benefit. You don't get credit for moving it from .05 to .06 because the floor is .5

Frank H- so the hatchery component is relatively productive.

James D- It's a very difficult system to index due to the White. South Prairie is the only window we have. So Nick had some concern about stabilizing.

Frank H- Putting a weir across South Prairie Creek wouldn't be too difficult.

Al S- so the huge tribal investment here shouldn't we be pursuing something more from the tribe?

Ron W- what do you mean?

Al S- well we are talking about cutting back on the Puyallup?

Heather- No we aren't cutting any more at Puyallup.

Ron- correct.

James D- so Stabilizing is fine with folks here. So we're operating under current.

#### WHITE R CHINOOK

James- so the only program if the Hupp Spring cuts goes forward the White R Chinook would be on the tribes now. So currently we have a .3 PNI and it's in a situation that relies on hatchery fish for current survival. It's formalized in the recovery plan as a primary stock.

Nick G- is there no pHOS goal identified?

James- getting composition data is fairly difficult, as we have to coordinate with Muckleshoot and Puyallup. So do we agree to designate it as a primary? Then we have to determine how much political capital to spend on trying to get them to enforce a pHOS level.

Nick G- I don't see why a .3 or less is the goal

James- Well we can push for that threshold, but...

Frank H- It's fairly unique in that it originated from a very small number of fish.

Heather- I remember spawning them all, and we named them.

Frank H- well I would have urged you to keep the Hupp Springs program ongoing, as the Legislature agreed with that as well in HB 1698. I could think of no other facility that would be a higher priority program for segregation opportunity other than here.

Clint- there has been some considerable interest to do that with the White R stock

Michael- is there a biological risk in doing that?

James D- small.

Lars- By making it a segregated harvest program.

Andrew M- So why aren't they marked again?

Ron- they are part of a conservation program and aren't supposed to contribute to fisheries.

James- so there are two transfers, one from Hupp and one from Muckleshoot up to the acclimation ponds.

Michael- so MSF role?

Heather- so we'll try to get a pHOS goal established as a .3 and then for Hupp we'll try to transition to a segregated harvest program. I don't know how well they get their hands on wild fish to get a high pNOB.

CHAMBERS/GARRISON SPRINGS/MINTER

James- so chambers is just above Steilacoom, just below Puyallup. It's operated as a harvest augmentation program for its entire life. Other than a stray rate concern, which has been deemed to be low based on CWT recovery it's a relative clean harvest program. The Terminal fishery is fairly productive on this stock. This is a situation like Samish where there are production options.

Hal- so in 2010 you harvested how many?

John- it's a terminal fishery

James D- Hatchery escapement isn't a limiter on the fishery

Ron- so when we take fish at Tumwater falls we still have more fish than we need

James- recommendations on these fish?

John- just to keep them segregated from the other populations.

James- so the only stock of conservation here is Nisqually and the amount of strays.

Clint- the other conservation factor here is the dilution factor for allowing fisheries to occur.

James- it's a legitimate argument. And if you flip the sheet over we can see Minter.

MINTER CHINOOK

James- So any recommendations for Minter Chinook, as it's the same scenario as Chambers.

Lars- what's the .10 mean? pHOS doesn't measure straying

James- segregated programs only limit on conservation is their affect on other populations, and whether they would stray into Nisqually or not. It's a problem with Minter.

NISQUALLY

Heather- so as a sidebar our webpage should be up soon.

James D- So in this watershed operation of the facility is tribal only. It's currently a segregated harvest program. There are plans in the short term to change management. We've agreed that it should be a primary already. They and many watershed groups have invested to reclaim a large amount of habitat, and the tribes proposed a plan to move forward with brood stock changes and weir implementation

Frank U- is that going to be in place this year?

James D- likely for a trial run this year. The Agency is supportive of that plan. So we are primary population status here. It's a segregated program, and the goal is to get to total mass marking.

Frank U- are we there now?

James D- I think we are getting there. The trajectory for obtaining primary metrics here is slower than the 2015 goal. This situation is where we would agree with the goal, and the speed at which we meet the goal is

Nick G- has there been discussion yet for setting benchmarks to meet?

James D- there is a starting point. The fulcrum is the weir at this point. They can move forward with selective fishing methodology.

Lars- the tribe has prepared a plan to get things done within a timeframe to meet the HSRG guidelines. It's a fairly important step for the tribes to take.

Nick G- but what can you get from us?

Lars- encouragement to support the tribe.

James D- while this program isn't under the guise of the commission we could try to get an MOU on timeframe for implementation, and possible thresholds and evaluation.

Al S- So the weir is a little above the hatchery?

James D- Yeah.

Ron W- It's scheduled to go in next week.

#### TUMWATER FALLS

James- so it's a segregated harvest program, Green R derivative. So it will be altered from 2.8 million down to 1.0 million.

Frank- so effect on recreational fishing here?

Nick G- where do these fish stray? That might be significant to other populations.

Heather- this is what transfers in from Coulter. This basic eliminates that. This will have an impact. The proposal is just a 9% reduction in south sound. Relative it's smaller than some of the other areas.

Frank U- so the tribes don't have the ability to say you can't cut here based on treaty right?

Ron- they could come back and say that. It's a double edge sword, as we'd likely have to cut staff if we can't cut hatchery program.

Frank U- we need to find a way to arrest this before it gets too low.

Heather- so we don't produce fish for purpose of surplus.

Frank H- so if we are going to get maturing Chinook and coho you'll get large surpluses. Deschutes used to be the heart of the black mouth fishery. Now we are looking at survival that is disastrous. Hopefully that will switch over.

Michael- so is there a surplus amount that we shoot for?

Frank H- So the problem is these fish aren't actively feeding and no longer biting.

Frank U- well you have to think about selling licenses and we have to look at keeping these production lines up.

Heather- that's not a new thought process for us. We've lost so much money we are cutting into core functions, and we have to preserve, protect, and perpetuate. We can't forego our other responsibilities to produce fish. We aren't cutting as we see things as superfluous. Not at all.

Lars- It seems you want to look at the fishery first, and you need to prioritize those then first to list what are most important to you, and then you can determine which hatchery programs are associated.

John- right now there is not really an economic benefit to a yearling program due to survival anywhere in south sound.

Lars- it might be good to have a list of the fisheries to examine.

James D- so when we get money back, we may examine our priority there.

Heather- that's a different group of folks in fish management that deal with North of Falcon. It includes the sports fishery advisors. To prioritize a list of fisheries you'll have to take that to those folks. This body doesn't need to overstep into other areas.

Clint- if these programs are cut for budget purposes, they should be separated out from HSRG issues then. In that light this program should be pushed to the side.

Heather- true, but as a group you could determine what this program should be in size and still not violate HSRG parameters.

Andrew M- so we are talking about pounds of fish, and the source of revenue is influenced on perception of opportunity. Capacity of the facility on incremental scope affects that, and a return on investment. The fishery is not lbs of dead fish, but perception of opportunity.

Heather- I hear you on the perception part, I want to make sure you understand the lbs produced is not lbs caught. So we look at fishery contribution facet, along with HSRG parameter facets, and you want us to tie them together?

Andrew M- I'm suggesting that how you look at things in the fish not caught isn't taken into account. The perception of opportunity drives those license sales.

Heather- I know the Director is becoming very aware and concerned with that.

Frank U- The ramifications on license sales is the bottom line.

Nick G- well part of the problem is serving a consuming clientele. The Agency does have to be funded by also serving the conservation mandate and non consumptive aspect of natural resource protection and perpetuation.

Lars- I think the Dept is shifting the hatchery fish from the spawning grounds to the fishery. That's what they are focusing on. I think it's a matter of presentation. If you can tell the story that way.

Frank H- These segregated opportunities are the cost effective way to address costs.

John- yeah and the reduction here of Tumwater falls that pose no conservation role, this is odd where you could use that cut to make a conservation decision somewhere else.

James- Budd inlet has been open for a long time, but we can't make them recruit to the fishery. We have not enough money to do the programs that we have, and you look at escapements that exceed catch. They aren't providing the benefit anymore. Moving on. . . East Kitsap do we even need to do? No, okay.

#### HOOD CANAL SKOKOMISH CHINOOK

James D- So the Skokomish Chinook is designated as a primary. It's an in river MSF. Unrealistic restrictions on harvest would have to be implemented to get here. It's a primary designation. Right now with the habitat and the HR's are not compatible.

Michael- so the other part of this is that there is concern that the stock to habitat issue may be there. The return timing may be an issue. Stuff to consider.

James D- I understand that is a moving system, and these are listed right now, so we need to prioritize these fish. This is like the Puyallup all over. Frank U has indicated a concern over the hatchery program change. What we could do is see what thresholds we could do for changes. Do you guys see this as a priority to meet primary by 2015?

Frank U- no

Dick B- has there been discussion of changing stocks?

James D- yes

Dick B- was there ever a summer/fall run

John- yes

Lars- and the PNI is trying to achieve a population that is suitable to available habitat.

Frank H- the existing stock really isn't being given a chance here.

Lars- so if habitat is available for a different stock are these habitat rates underestimates?

James D- So you want us to bring back specifics about HR necessary to affect fisheries?

Frank H- what are the SAR here?

James D- 0.47, which is not too bad for Puget Sound now. Flip the page and we see Hoodsport.

#### HOODSPORT FALL CHINOOK

James- This is our only saltwater terminal facility. This has a better SAR than Puyallup, and good fishery contribution. We have that wipeout fishery there. So it's a segregated harvest program. The stray rate is assumed to be low, but unknown really. This fits into the Chambers/Minter/Samish model. It's a priority for harvest augmentation.

Clint- this facility we get more bang for our buck than any other facility. This one should be untouchable.

Michael- could you transfer some releases from Hoodsport to GA?

Frank H- we used to have great survival on spring stocks from Hoodsport.

James- so flip the page and we are at MidHoodCanal

#### MID-HOOD CANAL

James- so this is a small integrated recovery and research program. It relies on returns from Hamma Hamma and GA to make up the release. They're all unmarked and sustain incidental harvest. The no

hatchery scenario results in a small self sustaining population, and is designated as a primary for recovery. The other question is whether or not bringing in GA fish is detrimental, something to look at after the research program is done. Productivity is low.

Frank H- so we bring fish is from Hoodspport?

James- yeah it's looking at productivity to try to build back into the stock. It's research really.

Michael- we haven't broken 100 returns since 2001, maybe once. That's the problem

Frank H- under the recovery plan which system needs to be recovered the Hamma Hamma, Dosewalips, and Duckabush.

Michael- they are likely all strays from GA or Hoodspport. We don't know if there is NOR production, other than smolt out migrants. But it could be a sink.

James- it's a victim of the two highly viable population recovery goal. We do supply some of the fish for part of the program, so does anyone see this as a priority to alter the program towards HSRG parameters by 2015?

Lars- so there is a colonization phase in Hatchery Reform, so don't discredit programs that don't move toward meeting PNI here.

Michael- so I'd like to see a priority here to do something about it, as it's a major constraints on fisheries.

Heather- the question is whether we meet the 2015 commission policy though. Lars mentioned its in a rebuilding phase. It's at a colonization phase.

Lars- Redfish Lake is a good example. You'd terminate the hatchery and destroy the population.

#### DUNGENESS SPRING CHINOOK

James- We have two left. The spring Chinook program is a small supplementation program, and these are all incidental harvest rates. We would want to see average abundances come up here.

Lars- so for this population its so small the pHOS needs to be there so that you are insuring an environmental issue doesn't destroy it.

James- yes. And we have problems getting fish to recruit to the hatchery even. The pNOB level is a post season development. To actively manage it is hard because of that. We don't mark these fish, and this program came out of a captive brood program.

Nick G- but why don't you then do parentage tracking to account for genetic contribution?

Clint- this needs to be a priority but the timeframe is longer term.

Lars- so identification of brood stock management? CWT funding?

James- yeah

Michael- so it sounds like MidHood Canal the answer is no to 2015 but it's a priority.

Frank H- it's a very unique stock.

ELWHA

James- So the restoration starts this fall. I don't know how to couch this habitat.

Norm- so speaking with the bio's out there they speculate it might be over 75k productivity possible here.

James- well this is hard to predict as this habitat expectation is simply using the 1st 5 miles at 8k production for NOR. Currently we're at a moderate rate of conservation, so the capacity increase as the habitat utilization.

Nick G- the adaptive management program is yet to be developed for termination. In a sense there are some unknowns, it is primary but meeting PNI during dam removal, and to test the habitat is

Lars- but right now you are trying to gene banking, then colonization, then post everything

Ron- so the hatchery is about RM 3.5. As we venture further into post dam removal, possible risk of catastrophic loss of genes is high due to sediment loading. There is going to be a longstanding process due to the situation here and the adaptive management processes will require input. I would like to carry that on as the Agency's stance on key issues as dam removal occurs as outlined in the restoration plan.

Michael- so prioritizing monitoring and evaluation money for that can we support that here?

Ron- we believe as the state we have the obligation to double check with the citizenry to see where we go.

Andrew M- we were told the National Parks Service were driving the bus, but spent the money and want out. The adaptive management process seems to be going the way that it won't garner broad support yet, so Michael's suggestion to prioritize monitoring there is front and center.

Ron- right there with you. We can try to get some adaptive management components put together for that.

Nick G- to get back to Lars' line. The dam removal period, we should try to ensure pNOB components of that meet the highest standards. Things may be optimistic or even worse.

Andrew M- we've been told the money for monitoring is gone. This is a lifetime legacy type of project.

Michael- so what did NOAA say to that? As they are going to through this VSP monitoring process and this would be a great case for that.

Nick G- so we've spent 350 million dollars already, and they are saying why do they need more.

Ron- so instead of putting funds towards 2 facilities, no one wanted to listen to us. I told the park 10 years ago we wanted joint facilities, and the tribe said they'd talk to us in a year after they worked out the kinks. We as an Agency we spent \$480k to operate the Chinook program.

Michael- So can we put in a WSMZ here?

Ron- that's the reason the Agency believed we wouldn't remodel the rearing channel as we feel that river will do it itself.

Heather- so our next meeting is Sept 14th, and what I heard, it would be helpful to provide you with modeled options for the Green and the Skokomish, if we implemented MSF to affect pHOS. I'll also bring back an updated population designation summary. The other thing is the letter from the tribes is providing estimates of effects of hatchery reductions on fisheries. We should be maximizing the use of our segregated programs.

***Next meeting Sept 14***