

Guide Logbook Advisory Committee

Meeting #5: February 10th 10 a.m. – 4 p.m.
NRB, Conference Room 682

Introduction: Raquel Crosier welcomed the group and introduced new faces and reviewed agenda.

Participants:

The following participants were present either in person or on the phone:

Robert Kratzer - Anglers Guide Service, Caleb Hitzfeld - CH Flyfishing, Randy Lato - All Ways Fishing, Marc Bush - Twisted Waters Guide, Cameron Black - Gone Catchin, Doug Saint-Dennis – 365 Charters, Greg Kain – Kain’s Flyfishing Adventures, WDFW employees – Chris Donley – Region 1 Fish Program Manager, Raquel Crosier – Fish Program Project Manager, Brodie Cox – IT Policy & Planning Manager, Jake Shapley - IT App Developer, Leah Snyder - Administrative Assistant, Becky Bennett - Enforcement Community & Environment Education Specialist, Captain Dan Chadwick - Region 6 Enforcement, Bryce Glaser - FPM Region 5

Update on Guide Logbook Rule and Implementation

- The group discussed the use of various logbook reporting tools
 - Raquel reviewed use associated with the paper logbook:
 - Distribution: 200 distributed in January
 - Logs Returned: Not many logs returned, today is the deadline for January
 - Version 2: Next version will have more instruction pages and a reminder to order the next book
 - Next order: 2,500 should get us through the rest of the year
 - Jake and the development team reviewed mobile app updates and use to date:
 - Downloads
 - 157 iOS
 - 147 iPhone (94% of users)
 - 10 iPad (6%)
 - 120 Android
 - Updates
 - 3 app updates within the first month
 - Stay up to date by turning auto updates on your phone
 - Bugs
 - Resolved:
 - Android – 403 Error
 - Android – SAW login being hidden by keyboard
 - In Progress:
 - Android – The logbook list intermittently not working
 - Android – Void functionality in offline mode
 - Android – Crash Reports

- Android – having to hit sync twice
 - Barriers to Use
 - Biggest Challenge is SAW authentication and registration – only 42 people authenticated
 - Need to get instructional videos out broadly to guides
 - Lessons Learned –more participation during BETA testing would have helped to identify bugs earlier
- Chief Bear provided an update on the approach of the enforcement team
 - Chief Bear emphasized that their focus is on education first during logbooks infancy and his push to get the app in the hands of all of his officers so they can test that out.
- Feedback from guides
 - Committee members relayed that attitudes seem to be trending upwards, less doom and gloom.
 - Committee members suggested the agency focus communications on authenticating mobile app users, clarifying why we are treating guides and charters differently when it comes to logbook data and how we plan to use the data.

Steelhead Portfolio Presentation – Jim Scott, Special Assistant, Director’s Office

- Jim Scott provided an overview of the Puget Sound Steelhead Advisory Committee’s Steelhead portfolio concept.
- The objective was to develop something like an investment portfolio with a proactive and diversified approach.
- After the portfolio was built, it was provided to the HSRG to get feedback on whether the proposed fisheries and hatchery changes were in line with our conservation programs.
- While Steelhead recovery is the top priority, the portfolio approach doesn’t treat every watershed the same. Instead it considers priority watersheds for recovery and whether the watershed has the habitat to sustain fisheries into the future.
- Committee members asked how the agency determines genetic deviation between wild and hatchery steelhead stocks. Jim explained some of the differentiation between stocks;
 - For instance, Skamania summer Steelhead are distinct from Puget Sound steelhead, they have a different number of chromosomes.
 - Early winter steelhead stocks are also genetically distinct
 - And in the integrated system on Green River, the hatchery and wild steelhead are genetically identical.
- Jim explained that the priority in the Quicksilver portfolio is “Conservation” – because sustainable fisheries depend on conservation of wild fish.
- He explained that keeping anglers on the water is very important- if there are no anglers on the water there is no one there to care about steelhead conservation and recovery.
- The agency began work on this portfolio with the PS Steelhead Advisors. It was important to get input and support from recreational anglers before meeting with our co-managers tribes, so we knew what we were asking for going into those discussions.
- The next steps are to get co-manager agreement, work with NOAA to gain approval, then request funding and staff capacity to do the hatchery and fishery monitoring work associated with the plan.

- Committee members asked what the agency is hoping to achieve in terms of recovery? Are we trying to reach historic levels?
 - Jim explained that the portfolio is being built with more pragmatic goals in terms of recovery – we are trying to be realistic about what our rivers look like today and what is achievable in terms of habitat restoration, spawning and rearing capacity.
- Committee members asked about wild steelhead gene banks, the process for those determinations and the measures of their success.
 - Jim explained that the goal was to establish one wild steelhead gene bank per region, and one was established in every region except N Cascades.
 - The process followed was to look for good habitat and potential for reducing pressure on wild stocks and strengthening runs. Criteria was established and public input was solicited.

Update on NOF – Kyle Adicks

- Kyle ran the committee through the NOF schedule, pointing out the March 31st Lynwood public meeting.
- He explained that given the 2016 coho returns and poor expectations for this year, we expect to see something similar this year with restricted river and ocean fisheries.
- He explained that this past year was one of the worst years on record based on surface water temperature and volume of copepods out in the ocean. For a while, scientists were calling the warmer temperatures a blob, but they are now calling it an ocean heatwave.
- He explained some of the key challenges; Mid Hood Canal, Southern Resident Killer Whale protections, Big Bar land slide, CR Fall Chinook and chum.

Discussion of Cowlitz – Bryce Glaser provided an update on Cowlitz Fishery issues

- Bryce updated the group on actions that WDFW and TPU are taking to reduce avian predation
 - The Cowlitz Trout Hatchery owned by TPU and operated by WDFW produces a large proportion of steelhead and trout in the Cowlitz.
 - TPU is currently working on designs and funding to rebuild the hatchery. In their rebuild, they will have fully netted ponds.
 - WDFW has been pushing for some additional netting to help prevent predation until the new facility is complete. Funding has not been provided by TPU thus far to do that work. TPU has funded increased hazing pressure with a new contractor over the past two years.
 - TPU & WDFW have begun PIT tagging fish in the ponds and have responders at the entrances of the ponds which will help track how many fish are released from the ponds.
 - WDFW has also requested funding from the state legislature for increased seal and sealion management work and worked hard at the federal level to increase both hazing and removal allowances under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. WDFW has also been working with USFWS and hydropower producers federal to understand and mitigate for avian impacts. USFWS has a coordinated plan for the Columbia River which has helped to think strategically about statewide

management vs. local management which has resulted in moving the birds around to different sites.

- **The committee asked Bryce some questions that were captured in the Q&A below**
 - What is the timeframe to rebuild Cowlitz Trout Hatchery?
 - 2-5 years before hatchery groundbreaking
 - Is WDFW adding predation estimates into release numbers?
 - WDFW tracks survival from egg to release and figure in estimated predation rates.
 - TPU is mandated to supply mitigation, is WDFW holding TPU accountable?
 - WDFW tracks actual release numbers, making sure we are getting those release numbers. PIT program should help with accuracy.
 - Are WDFW and TPU managing for egg take / smolts going out and not for returns?
 - WDFW and TPU are managing for best hatchery practices, which combines egg take, smolt release and return percentages. There are many ways that you can release spring Chinook, there was the standard smolt the agency was raising at all facilities. There haven't been many changes in production, which is pointing more toward environmental factors.
 - Is the Cowlitz tribe building a hatchery across from the pump house?
 - No. Not to our knowledge.
 - What is going to happen to Riffe Lake land locked coho fishery after the traps become more efficient at Scanewa Dam?
 - It isn't possible to recover and reintroduce a stock if you can't get the smolts to return. One of the major actions TPU has been working on is rebuilding the fish passage and collection. Before this happened, they would pass and go through the turbines into Riffe. WDFW flagged this issue last month and asked to form a subgroup to discuss this situation and what the issue really is. Should we start planting again? TPU isn't obligated to provide this but is willing to talk about it. Kokanee is on the list of options, dependent on food/survival. We don't want TPU mitigation to be replaced with these fish, however. Because Riffe is technically a landlocked fishery, it gives us more leeway in what we can introduce.
 - Are the two hatcheries on the Cowlitz operating at maximum capacity? If not, what are the constraints?
 - TPU has a legal obligation to produce 600k pounds which can be distributed among species. The 600k lb. requirement is essentially the hatcheries max capacity. The net pen at Mayfield Lake is helping us expand capacity. We are trying to work with TPU on brood survival, size at release and if there is interim work, we can do to expand capacity. We are looking into possibly raising more spring Chinook at the facility and moving coho to net pens. There is more risk involved because we would be moving fish more often. The commission has asked for more production under SRKW, and we think we may have room under ESA to raise more fish in the Cowlitz system—Steelhead and coho are almost maxed out. When they rebuild the Cowlitz trout hatchery, we are looking at increasing the production limit. The real question to ask is with more money, how many more fish could we manage to raise? There is the legal capacity of about 800k pounds of production, but not the physical space to raise the fish.

Wrap-Up - Raquel will work on getting advisory group contact info to enforcement