Objectives
Puget Sound Steelhead Advisory Group
Draft May 31, 2017

Within eight months, we will be successful if we have developed a document that:

1) promotes the conservation and recovery of Puget Sound wild steelhead with fishery and hatchery management aligned with habitat protection and restoration (all-H integration);

2) is developed in coordination with and reviewed by the Puget Sound Steelhead Recovery Team;

3) has sufficient flexibility to be compatible with the recovery plan adopted by NOAA Fisheries;

4) describes a path toward diverse and sustainable recreational fishing opportunities, with benchmarks to assess our progress;

5) recognizes the importance of steelhead and sustainable steelhead fisheries to our rural communities and state economy;

6) is informed by our scientific understanding of steelhead and the factors affecting their abundance, productivity, diversity, and spatial structure;

7) promotes greater understanding of steelhead populations through an experimental approach, and recognizes that adaptive management will be required to be successful;

8) is not constrained by previous fishery and hatchery management approaches;

9) identifies, considers, and where possible, addresses the highlights major factors limiting the abundance, productivity, spatial structure, and diversity of Puget Sound steelhead;

10) identifies watershed-specific strategies for fisheries and artificial production programs designed to achieve specific seasons and fishery types (catch and release, catch and keep, rivers with no hatchery production) in a manner consistent with achieving conversation objectives;

11) provides estimates of the funding necessary to implement the strategies;

12) enjoys broad support among stakeholders interested in steelhead, including anglers, fishers and those interested in steelhead as a part of the Puget Sound ecosystem;

13) identifies subsequent action steps with comangers, legislators, NOAA Fisheries, and stakeholders necessary to implement the plan; and

14) provides encouragement to our children, and their children, that they will also be able to enjoy our Puget Sound rivers and Washington State fish — steelhead.
Fishery Management and the ESA: Puget Sound Steelhead
How we got here....

- Listed as threatened – 2007
  - Primary limiting factor: present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of habitat or range
  - "elimination of direct harvest of wild steelhead in the mid 1990s has largely addressed this [harvest] threat"
  - Harvest rates continue to decline

- 4d Rule – 2009 (exemptions to take)
- Working with co-managers to develop management plan since 2007
- Current harvest has ESA authorization
DPS structure

32 DIPs > 3 MPG > DPS
- Summers
- Winter
- Summer/Winter

Health varies among DIPs
- Highest potential for steelhead production in N & E Puget Sound
- Small populations in S Puget Sound and the Kitsap Peninsula
- Potential production in Hood Canal / SJF highest in the larger rivers

Information limited
Recovery plan in the works
  - Abundance
  - Productivity
  - Spatial Structure
  - Diversity

VSP

NOAA FISHERIES
Recovery Criteria

- Populations sufficiently large, productive, and diverse
- > 40% of DIPs in each MPG are viable
- Life history expression is similar to historical
- Habitat use is at least 20% of capacity
- Distribution of viable populations minimizes catastrophic risk
- Extinction risk < 10% in 100 years
Guiding concepts

- Listed unit is DPS; populations = building blocks
- NMFS must assess distribution of risk across DIPs
- Assess risk relative to survival and recovery of DPS
- Recovery criteria, Viable Salmonid Populations (VSP)
- Intent of action = directed vs incidental take

Regulatory options
ESA Evaluation

- Impacts
- Recovery Criteria
- VSP

Magnitude/distribution of impacts?
Baseline condition?
How/where do you want to do it?
What do you want to do?
Take...what does it mean to me?

"...harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect any threatened or endangered species." (50 CFR 222.102)

Intent of action = Direct or Incidental?  
Intentional or Accidental?  

Regulatory options
Regulatory options

Incidental

Section 7 (Federal)
Resource management plans, construction, operation, and maintenance of a facility, hatchery-related actions, etc.

Section 10(a)(1)(B) (non-Fed)
State sportfishing programs, non-listed fish stocking programs, and other instream or watershed activities which may affect listed species

4(d) Limits 4/6 (State/Co-manager)
Harvest-related actions (co-manager state and tribal fishery plans; state fisheries; tribal fisheries)

Directed

Section 10(a)(1)(A) (non-Fed)
Scientific purposes or to enhance the propagation or survival of the affected species, e.g., surveys, genetic research, hatchery recovery operations
Plans must address.....

What?  How?  Where?

Population Structure/Status

Magnitude/distribution of impacts?

How will we know if it is working?

Consistency with U.S. v. Washington
Steps and general timeline for consultation
Example: Skagit Harvest 4(d) Plan, EA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Plan Submittal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Internal NEPA Scoping/RA Memo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Drafting of ESA/NEPA documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Release of draft ESA/NEPA documents for public comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Drafting of biological opinion; incorporation of public comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Finalization of ESA/NEPA documents; approval of RMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: **Done** | **Underway** | **To be initi**
Plan for success....

- Develop plan with map and recovery criteria in mind
- Choose a regulatory option consistent with action
- Make sure plan addresses all the criteria
- Transparent assumptions, account for uncertainty
- Larger scope increases complexity but allows more control, increases flexibility in how to draw the map
- Describe how harvest in other areas/other managers fits into picture
- Work with NOAA Fisheries in developing plan
- More detail, fewer assumptions, more efficient process