



Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership

Planning Committee Meeting

ROUGH NOTES

August 2, 2011 10:00 am – 2:00 pm
Port of Grays Harbor, 111 S. Wooding, Aberdeen

Attendees: Miles Batchelder, Chair Devona Ensmenger Key McMurry
Bob Burkle Mike Johnson Lee Napier
Dana Dietz Katie Krueger

Plan draft 7-15-11 distributed to: hard copies: Bob, Devona, Mike, Katie, Key; elec. copy: Katie

Staff has received comments based on the 5-21-11 draft Plan from: Krueger, Napier, Burkle, McMurry, Sims (a few), Jorgensen, USFWS (Plumb, Cook-Tabor, _____), TNC (Davis, Schroeder). Plus Miles led a roundtable/email discussion/rewrite of the Hatchery Harvest Target section with: John Mahan, Kirt Hughes, _____, _____

NOTE TO SELF: We need to include 4 comments we discussed with Bob after meeting Tuesday.

Decisions made:

1. **References will all be at the end.**
2. **Joint RTC/Planning Cmtee meeting on September 13th.**
3. **On p. 11 Estuaries, should read “and other plants,” not “or other plants.”**
4. **Mainstems, should read “appropriate sediment sizes” or “appropriate sediment types” or “appropriate sediment sizes/types,” not _____**
5. **Change “LWD” to “LWM” in Viability Charts also.**
6. **Add an Overall Strategy on Funding, including in-kind.**
7. **Decided on title: Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Plan (short title: “WCSSP Plan”)**
8. **Devona sending comments**
9. **Katie offered to work to understand Jim Jorgensen’s comments.**

Questions discussed including Decisions (decisions are in bold below):

(JMB summary of comments from USFWS and TNC)

- ***What is the focus of the plan? Is it on “natural origin” salmon sustainability?***

Miles – question of what the Plan is addressing, wild versus all salmon?

Move Harvest section.

Bob – Plan is for maintenance and recovery of HABITAT for sustainable salmon

Key – Plan is not just for wild salmon, but if it's good for wild salmon, things are improved for all

Bob – There's a place for hatchery salmon, especially where there's highly degraded habitat

Devona – Preventive AND recovery

-- We need to make clear: What is the intent of the Plan? Place of wild salmon?

Place of hatchery salmon?

-- There is a nuanced difference between "wild" salmon and "naturally-spawning" salmon, but the differences are very scientific, genetic and probably not important for the Plan

-- Several factors to address: Human interaction with resources

Preservation

Hatchery and Harvest

-- The most important element of Plan is trying to get people to care

- *Need to clarify the relationship between hatchery production to provide harvestable populations and wild fish protection. How do we articulate this better?*
- *Species Objectives – should we include a second, exclusively wild fish (natural origin) sustainability objective?*

Current Species Objective is slippery – how measure? Escapement goals change every year. We could use Harvestable Levels. But both Escapement Goals and Harvestable Levels are arbitrary and, after original science, usually decided politically. We need to create more accountability and meaning to this.

Katie – The goal is to keep hatcheries as long as their needed, not just to have hatcheries.

Devona – Science is currently saying that the strongest indicators are species diversity and life history diversity

Bob – Escapement goals are based on habitat capacity

Miles – If we use escapement, we need to define it and make clear what it means

Bob – Ask Kirt – how escapement goals are set, the differences between North and South in how their set

-- Escapement numbers are available; for the North (20 and 21), the numbers are ranges; for the South (22-24), the numbers are specific.

Group created a second Species Objective:

"By 2030, salmonid populations are managed for life history diversity, genetic diversity and productivity." ???

Also, group changed the first Species Objective to say "habitat-based escapement goals"

Miles – Another question is whether to repeat the "Good" or "Very Good" metric from the Viability Charts under each Habitat Objective bulleted sub-objective? Group decided that would be too cumbersome; best to put a sentence at beginning or end saying "See Chapter.... and tables for specific..." Or perhaps put page number of each specific Viability Chart (e.g., Estuaries) in each Habitat Objective (e.g., Estuaries). Say "specific metrics exist..."

Discussion of AHA – All-H Analyzer

----- (from here forward is notes from recording)

Bob – LISTEN TO BEGINNING OF RECORDING for end of discussion on NetMap/EDT/AHA, etc.

-- James Dickson is DFW hatchery staff working on the coast.

Katie -- Let's not put name of a specific tool (AHA) in the goals; they're continually being changed

Bob (Re Species Objectives) -- As long as we define what we mean by escapement goals – our definition of escapement goals might be slightly different than those envisioned by harvest managers. The harvest managers have a tendency to 'negotiate' escapement goals; it started out based on science, but ends up being also based on politics. We want escapement goals based on science, based on habitat productivity.

Miles – But we're not in the position of establishing escapement goals.

Bob – No, you're right. We could, however, advocate for escapement goals based on productivity, and that when they're modified, that they're done so based on the capacity of the system.

Result ---- see alteration of first Species Objective above (“habitat-based escapement goals”).

Katie – why don't we have comments from NOAA?

Miles – Do you think we should include charts of escapement?

Bob – No. Too complex; too much politics involved.

Dana – Is escapement info available at one URL?

Bob/Katie – No.

Mike – For this plan it's not relevant anyway. We can have a general statement.

- *Format and content could be closer to the style of recovery plans. Is the language too casual?*

It was agreed that the language is not too casual, but that we need to include specifics where relevant. Ours is not a NOAA-driven plan, nor is it a normal recovery plan.

- *Species and Stock information should be moved up to earlier in document (perhaps summarized and move tables to appendix?). Threats and strategies don't make sense without knowing the status of the fish first.*

Miles – He agrees with this one; we need to say up front, “What is this about?”

Bob – It's really more of a habitat plan; the threats and strategies aren't particularly addressing stock status.

Devona – But we need to make clear what this plan is about – the fish. Everyone agreed:

-- **Tighten up some of the paragraphs in the Stock Status chapter and add a summary of the most important data; put that up front in the Plan, with the extensive charts as part of Appendix.**

- *Actions outlined in Strategies chapter are not detailed at the watershed level. Can they be? Is this the purview of the LE strategies? What about strategies/actions not covered by LE strategies? How do we articulate this?*

Bob – True, but it’s on purpose; this is a federation of strong lead entities. **The watershed work is at the level of the Lead Entity Strategies. This point needs to be made more clearly.**

Miles – **Needs to be made clear in the Strategy Chapter intro section.**

Dana – **Maybe have a bulleted page in the Plan Introduction & Background chapter that outlines things we want readers to remember about this plan; things that are different about this Plan**

- Lead Entity Strategies are where actions will be taken in particular watersheds.
- There are some strategies that are regional, not LE

Mike – good idea

- *RE: Invasive Species – suggest using “control” wherever we say “eradicate.” No hope of eradication, the best we can hope for is control*

Agreed – use word “control”, not “eradicate.”

- *Strategy B5: Action 1 – there is a potential for this to be misconstrued as subtly introducing dam building. How do we clarify?*

Most thought that nobody would be silly enough to think we might mean dams here; **it was agreed to let staff figure out how to handle this.**

- *Process section provides too much detail for a conservation plan. Should be moved to appendix.*

Agreed – simplify the Planning Process chapter, put it earlier in Plan (?), then put detailed description in Appendix. Put Viability Charts in Appendix as separate section.

- *Escapement (as a species goal and as a metric in viability charts): We should identify what the escapement goals are (chart?) and cite their source specifically. Also – are they reasonable for use as a metric? Can they change over time? In addition to what escapement goals are, we should identify how they are set and how they might change over time.*

Dealt with earlier.

- *Suggest creating a table linking Threats to Objectives to Strategies. That connection is not currently clear enough*

Do Miradi graph/chart for each Strategy. Some people absorb information better graphically.

Bob: “Sustainability: The Movie”

- *Question about coordination of actions across the region – need to provide a framework for how strategies and actions will be effectively coordinated once they are prioritized*

This is an Implementation question. Add mention of when this will occur, in “Next Steps.”

- *How is climate change (our understanding of it) altering strategies and actions?*

See below.

- *How will plan be updated and changed in future in response to new info and circumstances resulting from climate change?*

Generally agreed that about all we can say is that Climate Change will affect our Plan as part of Adaptive Management.

Katie – what Climate Change will actually mean is constantly changing.

- *Habitat Objectives should be articulated as measurable – pull metrics from viability charts and include in objective language. Q: Is our objective to get to “good” or “very good?”*

See above.

- *Strategy B (protect and restore): Two of the biggest habitat problems on the coast are lack of large wood and input of sediment from roads. The plan does not include actions aimed directly at tackling either problem. Suggestions:*
 - *Plan needs to support actual implementation of instream lwm enhancement projects in “key” areas. Passive restoration and recruitment will not address short-term*
 - *Impacts from roads extend beyond connectivity/culvert issues. Sedimentation from landslides and chronic erosion is huge. Helping to support road maintenance/upgrades and decommissioning projects that reduce sediment inputs and hydrologic connectivity of roads to streams in “key” areas should be included.*

Again, dealt with at LE Strategy level.

- *Strategy B3; action 2 – explicitly include uplands here. Uplands contribute >50% of wood to streams and rivers (Reeves et al, 2003)*

Generally agreed that the action doesn't exclude uplands, so no need to change it.

This is where I, Dana, asked you, Miles, if you'd “gotten” what Devona (I believe it was Devona) had said and you said Yes.

- *Consider separating Hatchery and Harvest.*

Miles – Our earlier discussion was about the Threats section. Putting hatchery and harvest together in Threats doesn't necessarily mean that we need to have the Hatchery strategies and the Harvest strategies together.

Generally agreed that it would be very difficult to separate Hatchery and Harvest strategies.

Devona suggested explaining the different roles of hatchery and harvest and explained why we “lumped” them. LISTEN TO DEVONA at 1:10:32

- *Strategy E3; action 2 – move to education section*

Agreed to leave where it is.

- *Strategy E5 – included advocating for increased funding*

Add a second Overall Strategy – Fundi

ng. This would be better than adding Funding to each Strategy because someone might object to funding one specific Strategy and having a Funding component would be a flash point. Include in-kind funding.

- *Use of quotes – to improve clarity of material, quotes should be paraphrased and references made to source*

Discussion/rethinking of reorganizing Strategies by Function:

Funding

Data

Outreach

Partnerships

Influence Decision Makers

Or,

Outreach – Public (the public influence decisions); Decision Makers

Partnerships & Funding interrelated

Data – Scientific data; Practical data

Discussion re what was “sacred” and shouldn’t be changed.

Miles – What came out of workshops shouldn’t be changed lightly.

Katie – Workshops are a pooling of ideas; if a good idea comes up afterwards, we should include it.