

Willamette Action Team for Ecosystem Restoration (WATER)
 Research, Monitoring and Evaluation (RM&E) Team
 Issue Elevation Paper Review Meeting
 October 4, 2016

Facilitator's Summary

The following summary is intended to capture basic discussion, decisions and actions, as well as point out actions or issues that may need further discussion at upcoming meetings. This summary is not intended to be the "record" of the meeting, only a reminder for RM&E members.

ACTION	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	BY WHEN
Follow-up with Lance Kruzic re: annual parentage analysis, spawning survey and screwtrapping issue paper and the RPA/HGMP discussion.	Stephanie	10/27
Review issue papers with Managers to gather input on the level of detail necessary	RM&E team members	10/27
Add language to the Green Peter issue paper regarding the Foster studies	Stephanie & Cam	10/27
Review all three issue papers and provide feedback to the RM&E team.	DSC	ASAP

Participants on the phone for all or part of the meeting: Stephanie Burchfield (NMFS), Mike Hudson (USFWS), Rich Piaskowski (Corps), Christine Peterson (BPA), Cameron Sharpe (ODFW);

Facilitator: Emily Plummer; **Support:** Tory Hines, DS Consulting.

Overview of September 22nd Meeting and Issue Paper Review

At the September 22nd RM&E meeting the team discussed FY 17 projects where there was disagreement and decided that five concepts should be elevated to the Steering Team (in three issue papers). In preparation for the Steering Team meeting on October 14th, the group agreed to draft one-page issue papers that described the concept/issue, identified the type of issue, listed the pros and cons, stated a deadline or time to respond and provided a conclusion noting the requested management direction. Rich Piaskowski, Corps, agreed to draft an issue paper that incorporated APH-09-01, APH-15-01-SYS and JPL-10-02-SYS; Stephanie Burchfield, NMFS, agreed to draft an issue paper for APH-17-02-GPeter; and Mike Hudson, USFWS, agreed to draft an issue paper for JPL-11-02-DET/MF. A call was scheduled to discuss the content of the papers and next steps for elevating to the Steering Team.

APH-09-01, APH-15-01-SYS, JPL-10-02-SYS

The group discussed Lance Kruzic's, NMFS, comment (provided via email) that this issue paper identifies many topics already addressed in the Chinook HGMPs that the Corps and ODFW submitted to NMFS in August. He noted that the HGMPs will result in new hatchery consultation and ESA decision on the Chinook hatchery programs. Additionally, there is concern that the discussions between RM&E and the Steering Team may overlap with the submitted HGMP for the new hatchery consultation. Rich noted that clarification is needed on what information the RPAs require compared to what is required in the HGMPs. In order to fund, the Corps needs to see clear goals and objectives as they relate to the research needs for supporting implementation of the RPA and the HGMPs. In regards to the concepts covered in the issue paper, Cam Sharpe, ODFW, stated that from ODFW's perspective, conditions in the sub-basin change every year and ongoing continuous monitoring is needed. The group agreed to table this

conversation and follow up with their colleagues and managers on how to frame the issue before the RM&E meeting on October 27th.

- **ACTION:** Stephanie will follow up with Lance regarding his concerns on overlap between the HGMPs and RM&E issue elevation. Emily will signal to Donna a need for conversation at the Steering Team and G-4 regarding needed clarity on the RPAs and intersection between RPA, RM&E issues and HGMPs.

APH-17-02-GPeter

Stephanie stated that NMFS' RPA requires initial studies at Green Peter to inform both the COP alternatives analysis as well as to gather data that would inform passage feasibility for the next BiOp after the current one expires. She said that NMFS considers the Green Peter study as necessary to inform passage feasibility. Rich shared that from the Corps' perspective, Green Peter passage was not included in the RPA or the COP, and thus additional RM&E is not necessary at this time. Stephanie pointed out that the "pros" list cites the five places in the RPA where this study is required. From Stephanie's perspective the "cons" list, which says the RPA does not require this study is incorrect. Rich noted the RPA language cited in the issue paper ("4.1 – Adult outplanting: ... if NMFS, after coordination..., determines it necessary to evaluate passage at Green Peter Dam, then the Action Agencies will also release Chinook salmon above that dam."), requires discussion by Managers, since this decision about the necessity to evaluate passage at Green Peter Dam has not be made. Rich also shared the COP did evaluate passage at Green Peter, and follow-on discussions with NMFS confirmed that passage at Green Peter will not be pursued at this time. The group reviewed the point/counterpoints for the issue paper and continued to revise the information for the Steering Team. Cam added that spawning surveys and screwtrapping research has provided valuable information on problems with natural origin production. Rich expressed that the current level of information is sufficient and the RPA does not require downstream passage at Green Peter. Stephanie shared that from NMFS' perspective, the RPA requires this information as part of the COP alternatives analysis and to inform the next BiOp.

- **ACTION:** Cam and Stephanie will work together to add description on lessons learned from Foster to illustrate their agency perspectives of the importance of this project, specifically, the evidence that the 2010 brood failed because a storm event early in 2011 scoured redds. Given, therefore, that the South Santiam above Foster is a risky place to place the majority of wild fish returning the subbasin, alternative spawning, incubation, and rearing areas above Foster should be identified and tested for their ability to spread the risk of catastrophic events wiping out entire cohorts. River reaches above Greenpeter are the obvious choice to expand the distribution of Chinook spawners and increase viability of the population. .

JPL-11-02-DET/MF

This issue paper addresses the ongoing analysis and paired-release study of returning adults. Rich noted that the Corps does not see a need for data analysis at this time and that a multi-year analysis can be conducted in 2018. Cam noted that the data analysis should not be delayed, as the delay would risk losing the institutional knowledge of those who have put in extensive time on this study already. Rich noted that in order for the Corps to fund this project, the Steering Team should provide resolution by March or April.

The team agreed to continue refining the issue papers before presenting them to the Steering Team. Additionally, they discussed the need to have RM&E Team members present at the Steering Team meeting in order to respond to questions that the Steering Team may have. It was noted that it is important for the RM&E team to set the elevation up for success and that more time is needed to prepare the papers and staff the meeting. Thus, the RM&E team will postpone their elevation until the November

Steering Team meeting. Prior to that, they will work internally with their colleagues and managers to refine the papers. DS Consulting will also provide input on the level of detail in the issue papers.

- **ACTION:** RM&E members will review the issue paper and follow up with their managers and DS Consulting.
- **ACTION:** DS Consulting will review all three issue papers and provide feedback to the team.
- **ACTION:** The RM&E team will reconvene on October 27th to finalize the issue papers.

The next RM&E meeting will be on October 27th from 9:00-12:00 at the DS Consulting Office.