



## **Snake River Salmon Recovery Board**

### **Special Meeting - Notes May 10, 2005**

**Board Members Present:** Dick Isaac, Dick Ducharme, Dick Jones, Eric Myers, Butch Klaveano, Cathy LaRoque, Yancey Reser, Stuart Durfee, Les Wigen, Ed Schultz

**Board Members Present By Phone:** Doug Mattoon

**Others:** Kevin Malone (Jones & Stokes), Bill Dowdy (USFS) Mark Grandstaff (WDFW) John Marsh (Parametrix), Brad Johnson (ACCD), Steve Martin, Juli Post

#### **Welcome**

Steve opened the meeting by welcoming the Board members and others present. Dick Jones had a concern about approving the April 26<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes because there was no agenda for tonight's meeting. While tonight's special meeting was published in the newspapers, there was no meeting agenda. It was concluded that the April 26<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes would be approved at the June 7<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. The Board's bylaws allow for items to be acted upon even if they are not on an agenda so the remaining decisions of the Board are acceptable.

#### **Review of Public and Agency Comments**

EDT results for the Asotin watershed, concern that the numbers aren't complete. The board discussed the feasibility of having Mark Wachtel rerun the numbers for Asotin to improve the information in the plan. Mark could do the analyses in a couple days. What should be done and who would do it. The board see requesting that the RTT to look at this situation and make a recommendation to the board.

Yancey Reser's commentary, "While the summary is comprehensive and does work well, refer to the full plan for more details. Ed thought the summary was good and the right size.

John Marsh explained that there is a lot of interest in adding more language to the plan about the other 3 H's. The 4 H's – habitat focus; it was always understood that it would be a habitat focus in the plan. NMFS is going to supply modules on the other 3 H's for us to incorporate to the plan. It was expected that these would start arriving the middle of May through this summer. NMFS is calling them "Modules of Language". They will include the following pieces.

Hatchery:Harvest:Hydro:Estuary

NMFS is developing modules for the Board's consideration for inclusion in the appendixes. Since these modules are not yet available it was discussed that the Plan should reference that these modules are forthcoming and at the Board's discretion they may or may not appear in the next version of the Plan. Dick Jones is concerned about adding disclaimers to the document that might get dropped. Dick Ducharme wants to cover the things in the summary that are in our control – freshwater indicators of success. Dick mentioned several issues that were of concern to him. Will out-of-basin effects address Dick's smolt to adult ratios? Dick believes that this is an important measurement and there are other measurements to that he would like to see incorporated in the analysis of how our recovery is

progressing. Dick wants all the measurements considered. Dick is concerned that the smolts leave the region but the adults aren't returning. If we don't gather information on the smolts we will be penalized for the adult returns. These returns won't be indicative of the ongoing habitat work but more the out-of-basin effects.

Parametrix will incorporate language to structure monitoring evaluation. In addition to a more robust write up on monitoring, the plan needs a section on threats criteria. Steve spent a moment to discuss threats criteria, i.e., what threats exist that are largely beyond our control that may affect the biological response we predict as a result of our habitat actions. A choice for the board of using the lower Columbia or build our own analysis during the transition period. NOAA did the threats criteria for the lower Columbia. The Board decided to defer this to the transition period, work with the RTT then provide a policy to the board.

Bradley Johnson wanted to see more recognition given to the work already done. Bradley believes mention of previous work done will provide more funding incentives to get the work done on Salmon projects in the future.

This board will coordinate our habitat plan with the other H's

A discussion of policy verses information exchange occurred with respect to the other 3 H's. It is important that this board be consulted with in the coordination of the other H's to make sure the plan for the other H's is complementary to the board's plan. Steve made a statement that the board should feel a lot more comfortable about making recommendation on the other three H's to agencies. Steve's perception is that the agencies are hungry for this input from the board.

Further Analyses of MSA (major spawning aggregates).

Steve used the map that Parametrix produced as an example during the board meeting. . First, Steve gave an overview so that all board members were familiarized with the MSA maps. Going through the entire region and giving a background on each of the rivers that were included. Steve noted that about 1/2 of our region lies in either little or big MSA.

The two questionable ones are Pataha and Deadman and the Board decided that both will be little mSA. Dick Ducharme wanted the Chinook off the Pataha and Steve will seek input from the RTT. The Board also noted that George Creek should be a priority restoration area because it was modeled with EDT. Steve made a point to thank Bill Dowdy of the US Forest Service for all his work building maps that we will be using in future iterations of the plan. Bill is building them in GIS so we can overlay data and spatially orient it correctly. The Parametrix maps are CAD and do not lend themselves to linking GIS data. However, the CAD maps are quick to assemble and considering we need them by June 10 so PMX can get them incorporated in the June Plan, the CAD maps are the preferred type at this time.

A question came up about reporting rebuilding numbers in the population viability curve diagram. The Board wants to aim above recovery but not be held accountable for those lofty goals. Dick Jones is concerned that the restoration goals could destroy the economy. Dick Jones mentioned that if the goals were too high stakeholders wouldn't be happy. That the numbers should start lower and as we have success then we can move the range up.

Range of planning targets we are going to pull the word "range" off the viability curve and re-label as a range of planning targets.

**Review of John Marsh’s notation on the public and agency commentary.**

Below are the notes that were taken by John Marsh during the course of the meeting and the decisions that were made by the board.

## Snake River Salmon Recovery Board

### Decisions from May 10, 2005 Meeting

**Decisions**

- a) Accept comment, incorporate in June version.
- b) Accept comment, address in “transition” this summer/fall.
- c) Reject suggestion in comment.

**Major Comment Themes**

**Decisions**

Major Comment Themes	Decisions
1. Add language from draft bull trout recovery plan	Draft will be included in June Version; other comments will be considered by Board on June 7 for consideration for inclusion in the October version
2. Re-organize section of the plan	A – simple only
3. EDT – bull trout	B –not resolved
➤ add ranges to results	A
➤ redo Asotin, Touchet, Tucannon and Others	B
➤ check results with empirical data	RTT come back to board with recommendation on what should be done
4. Summary vs. Full Plan – what goes in summary?	A - summary should remain a summary so limit additions to vital items
5. 4H’s – focus on habitat	A - current plan will focus on habitat
➤ add language on other 3 H’s	B
➤ out-of sub-basin effects	A - add back language that was accidentally deleted
➤ NMFS “module” (mid-May, mid-summer) put in short	A, B, C; statements that modules

paragraph acknowledging something coming from NMFS put in short paragraph acknowledging something coming from NMFS policy role/recommendations of SRSRB see #14	are forthcoming from NMFS will appear in June Plan; Modules will be reviewed in the summer for possible inclusion in the October version
6. MSA's and MSA's – need to revisit?	A
7. Rebuilding vs. Restoration	
➤ which term	A = restoration
➤ definition	A / B: RTT will meet on May 24 to develop proposed definitions for Boards consideration on June 7
➤ add other plan and mandates to vision and restore	C
8. Implementation Plan	
➤ needs details	B
➤ costs (range of costs)	B except A for lead entity process
9. M & E	
➤ needs details	B
➤ costs (productivity & monitoring)	B
10. Instream flows	
➤ need more info in plan	A
➤ include results of COE/CTUIR study, WRIA's HCP, other	B
➤ viability curves do not include increased flows	B
11. Maps	
➤ standardize	A
➤ for each MSA	A

➤ update distribution	A (add Or/WA border and make the Snake River a bigger line)
<b>12. Recovery Conclusions</b>	
➤ add other analysis	A
➤ add empirical information	A
<b>13. Plan Title</b>	
➤ add "for SE Washington"	A
<b>14. Add threats criteria: what caused problems/are they solved or minimized</b>	
➤ growth management	B
➤ ocean conditions	B
➤ drought	B
➤ harvest	B
➤ predation	B
➤ land trust purchase (access)	B
➤ assurance of local incentive implementation incentive (need funding)	B

Name	Attendance for 2005											
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Doug Mattoon	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes							
Dick Isaac	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							
Jay Holzmiller	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Dick Ducharme		Yes	Yes		Yes							
Dick Jones	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							
Eric Myers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							
Gary James	Yes		Yes	Yes								
Butch Klaveano	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes							
Del Groat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Gary Cole		Yes	Yes									
Cathy LaRoque	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							
Yancey Reser	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes							
Stuart Durfee	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes							
Les Wigen	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes							
Ed Schultz	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes							