CENWP-OD 21 June 2017

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Subject: DRAFT minutes for the 21 June 2017 Upper Willamette hatchery meeting.

The meeting was held in the Large Conference Room at the ODFW Adair Office. In attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Last** | **First** | **Agency** | **Email** |
| Couture | Ryan | ODFW | ryan.b.Couture@state.or.us  |
| Kellley | Elise | ODFW | elise.x.kelley@state.or.us |
| Kovalchuk | Erin | NWP-OD-TF | Erin.H.Kovalchuk@usace.army.mil |
| Kruzic | Lance | NOAA | lance.kruzic@noaa.gov |
| Spear | Dan | BPA | djspear@bpa.gov  |
| Traylor | Andrew | NWP-OD-TF | Andrew.W.Traylor@usace.army.mil  |
| Walker | Chris | NWP-OD-TF | Christopher.E.Walker@usace.army.mil  |
| Ziller | Jeff | ODFW | Jeffrey.S.Ziller@state.or.us |

On the phone: Walker and Ziller.

Purpose: Staff from BPA, COE, NMFS, and ODFW will review the latest RME work regarding hatchery summer steelhead and rainbow trout programs in the Upper Willamette basin and discuss the effects of these programs in relation to 2008 BiOp.

1. Action items
	1. ACTION: Traylor will find the Leonhardt-administered PNNL ecological interations study.
	2. ACTION: Traylor will check with Piaskowski about any STHD parental analysis samples.
	3. ACTION: Kelley will check on offsite releases in the North Santiam during Minto reconstruction.
	4. ACTION: Kelley will look into the percentage of recycled fish that are harvested.
	5. ACTION: Traylor will find the UI study on summer steelhead recycling and Kelley will send out the ODFW summer steelhead recycling data.
	6. ACTION: Kelley will follow up with Boyd about spawning times and the original spawn time of the Skamania stock.
	7. ACTION: The COE will create a webpage under the WFPOM page to keep all the links to the different studies.
2. Background
	1. BPA doesn’t directly fund the Summer Steelhead program but instead matches COE spending. It is difficult to track the money to an individual program.
	2. NMFS received a letter from the COE back in March to discuss the StS Program and specifically asked if the program had coverage. NMFS responded in a letter dated 20 April. This meeting is to discuss some of the technical issues brought up in the letter.
	3. 2008 consultation (proposed action, RPAs, RME requirements, ESA coverage of summer steelhead and rainbow trout hatchery programs). One of the RPAs was to create a StS working group but there were several other key RPAs:
		1. RPA 6.1.6 - Improving the volitional release of StS and trying to pull out the residual fish in order to reduce the ecological impacts of the StS Program. This was fully implemented. Kelley said that sometimes, the StS juveniles that do not volitionally exit the hatchery are not released but put into a closed system. There has not been a specific RM&E study to follow up to see if this helped. There was one study administered by Dave Leonhardt presented at the Science Review but the results are called into question because of the tag burden where fish did not leave the raceways like they should have. The snorkel survey observations may have some value. ACTION: Traylor will find the Leonhardt study.
		2. RPA 6.1.7 - Recycling of adult StS at the hatchery. Originally it was supposed to stop 1 September but now it stops 1 August. At the N. Santiam, the fish are recycled once but on the S. Santiam, it depends on the run size. The number of fish being recycled is way lower than it was even three years ago. It appears that the RPA has been met.
		3. RPA 6.1.8 – This RPA directed agencies to reduce production down to 125,000 or below for StS in the N. Santiam. The RPA was implemented immediately. The current target is 121,000. The production was moved to the S. Santiam but even the S. Santiam production has been reduced.
		4. RPA 6.1.9 - Future management actions as directed by the StS working group. The meetings haven’t been regular but it is ongoing.
		5. RPA 9.5.2 – There were two main parts to this RPA: genetics work evaluating both the juvenile and adults and the spawning surveys for StS in the N. Santiam. With the amount of staff and funding, some surveys have occurred but not regularly. ChS is the main focus.
		6. Rainbow trout stocking is not a specific RPAs but the proposed action from the COE (including proposed hatchery releases throughout the Valley) were covered under the BiOp.
		7. NMFS feels that the RPAs are being met. In the letter sent to NMFS, the COE expressed concern that RPA 6.1.1. mentions StS and rainbow trout and therefore should have an updated HGMP as was done for ChS. NMFS said that the HGMPs were approved for Rainbow Trout, StS and ChS but there was an additional requirement for the ChS because of the take of unmarked fish for brood. The original HGMPs for StS and trout were approved by incorporation into the BiOp. Now the work group needs to decide if the programs are the same or if they need updating.
3. Recent RME findings
	1. Genetics work – juvenile and adult
		1. Juveniles – There was an evaluation in 2014 by Johnson and Friesen in the N. and S. Santiam. The analysis was fine but the samples were not random. The authors sent another proposal to RM&E but they weren’t funded. However, they did receive a small grant to take samples but the results have not yet been analyzed. There is only one sample year due to funding but the samples are randomized this time. The other report is a juvenile genetic study of steelhead done at Willamette Falls. This was a several year study.
		2. Adult samples at the Falls: Caudill is doing a study but due to health problems the data may not be available. Samples have been taken but not analyzed. This was a radio tagged telemetry study funded by the COE.
		3. There is a parental analysis of any fish that enter the traps but it is not known if any steelhead samples have been taken at Minto/Foster. ACTION: Traylor will check with Piaskowski about any steelhead parental analysis samples.
	2. S. Santiam juvenile ecological interactions work - this was the tag burden study discussed above. Traylor will send out the final report and the ODFW comments. PNNL also worked as a consultant on the report.
	3. Evaluation of management release changes – Kelley didn’t think any study has been done but there is anecdotal evidence from fisherman about good fishing due to the release from Minto during construction. This indicated the potential for releasing fish further downstream. A creel survey was done once but the results could not be used to assess the program. ACTION: Kelley will check on offsite releases in the North Santiam after construction.
	4. Evaluation of the recycling protocols are generally looked at but no study has been completed. ACTION: Kelley will look into the percentage of recycled fish that are harvested. UI did a study and presented at the Science Review. ODFW was doing an unofficial study at the same time. ACTION: Traylor will find the UI study and Kelley send out the ODFW data.
	5. Radio telemetry at the Falls - Using the radio telemetry to get the distribution of StS spawning naturally. The radio tag results tell you where the fish ended up not necessarily the path it took. The battery in the tag doesn’t last long enough for spawning. This would not be an effective way of looking at distribution.
	6. Spawning surveys- temporal, spatial overlap sts, stw – There was three years of funding plus one year on the S. Santiam. Genetics may give a clearer picture.
	7. Spear mentioned the 2015 Status of the Species from NMFS which may have information. Boyd has attempted to move the spawning time of summer steelhead so spawning occurs earlier in the year. It appears to be working. He had fish ready to spawn in the beginning of November. This past year, spawning was completed by Dec 25. That was just one year and there could be annual variation. There were years where spawning was in Jan and Feb. ACTION: Kelley will follow up with Boyd about spawning times and the original spawn time of the Skamania stock.
4. New effects analysis and status of existing BiOp incidental take coverage: All information on StS needs to be organized to see if the previous BiOp still covers the actions. The HGMP needs to reflect the current program. If the HGMP is not in line with the BiOp then the consultation needs to be resubmitted.
5. Next steps: ACTION: The COE will create a webpage under the WFPOM page to keep all the links to the different studies. Traylor wants to review the studies and compare to the RPAs. The data will hopefully answer questions about if the RPAs are working. Kelley suggested updating the HGMP by following the same format as the ChS HGMP that everyone is familiar with. Although Kruzic suggests updating the current HGMP for StS with the current program, BPA and COE stated the need to confirm with policy and legal staff first. Updates to the HGMP are still covered under the BiOp unless it completely changes the program. The first hatchery 2000 BiOp had a lot of RM&E for rainbow. This information may be helpful to review.