

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Subject: DRAFT minutes for the 22 October 2014 Willamette HMT meeting.

The meeting was held at ODFW Headquarters, Steelhead Room. Salem Oregon. In attendance:

Last	First	Agency	Email
Boyd	Bret	ODFW-South Santiam, Foster trap	brett.h.boyd@state.or.us
Friesen	Tom	ODFW	tom.friesen@oregonstate.edu
Grenbemer	Greg	ODFW- Marion Forks/ Minto	Greg.A.Grenbemer@state.or.us
Johnson	Marc	OSU	Marc.Johnson@oregonstate.edu
Kruzic	Lance	NOAA Fisheries	Lance.Kruzic@noaa.gov
Leonhardt	David	NWP-PM-E	David.S.Leonhardt@usace.army.mil
Mackey	Tammy	NWP-OD-TF	Tammy.m.mackey@usace.army.mil
Piaskowski	Rich	NWP-PM-E	Richard.M.Piaskowski@usace.army.mil
Sharpe	Cameron	ODFW	cameron.sharpe@oregonstate.edu
Thorpe	John	ODFW	john.thorpe@state.or.us
Walker	Chris	NWP-OD-TF	Christopher.E.Walker@usace.army.mil

Boyd, Kruzic called in.

1. Finalized results from this meeting.

1.1. July minutes approved.

2. The following documents were provided or discussed. All documents may be found at www.nwd-wc.usace.army.mil/tmt/documents/FPOM/2010/Willamette_Coordination/Willamette_HMT.html

2.1. 141022 HMT agenda.

2.2. 140723 HMT draft meeting minutes.

2.3. SS Adult Work Sheets 2013

2.4. Hatchery program goals.

2.5. Adult program goals.

2.6. WV Fish Counts

2.7. 2014-08-25 ADFRS - Post Construction Assessment Meeting Notes9_15_14

3. Action Items.

3.1. [Apr 14] Horn Creek weir/outplanting. **ACTION:** Sharpe will get a plan on paper and send to the HMT. **STATUS:** *completed but not yet sent to HMT. Sharpe will send the document to Mackey. He felt the plan worked well this year.*

3.2. [May 14] **Steelhead Workgroup.** **ACTION:** Corps will contact Marx and schedule this to occur at or after the next HMT to look at available data and put together a plan for this workgroup. The Corps will need to do this regardless while updating the summer

steelhead HGMP. **STATUS:** *University of Idaho is still working up the genetic data for this work group. Leonhardt has asked Chuck Peven for the summer steelhead HGMP but has not yet received it. The 2004 HGMP was comprehensive to the Willamette Basin, the new version will as well.*

- 3.3. [May 14] TDG issue below Big Cliff. **ACTION:** Greg Grenbemer will follow up with Lance Kruzic and Elise Kelley for concurrence or their recommendations for fish disposition while TDG is high. **STATUS:** *Walker noted that this is an ongoing issue. Sharpe said he was contacted by a NWP contractor who wanted to install TDG monitors. Sharpe gave him redd data and put him in contact with Elise (ODFW).*
 - 3.4. [Jul 14] Adult release sites. Homestead site. **ACTION:** Leonhardt will include Kremers on the meeting invite to further discuss this site. **STATUS:** *no update.*
 - 3.5. [Jul 14] Adult release sites/HMT documents. **ACTION:** Leonhardt will send all documents discussed at this meeting, including the .ppt and any .wav files to Mackey for inclusion on the HMT website. **STATUS:** *Leonhardt sent some documents. Mackey recommended HMT members send documents directly to her so she can post them in a timely manner.*
 - 3.6. [Jul 14] Steelhead Work group. **ACTION:** HMT will form a steelhead work group. **STATUS:** *pending until a draft HGMP is available for review.*
 - 3.7. [Jul 14] Steelhead RM&E. **ACTION:** The Steelhead Workgroup will compile a record of management decisions, studies, and monitoring efforts regarding summer and winter steelhead in the Willamette Valley. **STATUS:** *Leonhardt believes Chuck Peven has compiled a lot of this information. Sharpe noted there is a lot going on right now and we shouldn't just focus on historical data but current data as well. Leonhardt noted that any data Peven has collected is post 2004. Kruzic asked for an update on the summer/winter genetic work. Johnson reported 500 samples have been collected and will shipped off for analysis in the next week or so. Kruzic recommended Leonhardt inform BPA they need to work closely with ODFW regarding summer steelhead. Kruzic said the Action Agencies can't just submit a HGMP to NMFS; it is supposed to be a collaborative effort. Walker said he thought that was the purpose of the Steelhead Work Group – to collaborate on the HGMP and discuss any issues.*
 - 3.8. [Oct 14] Summer Steelhead. **ACTION:** Leonhardt will put BPA in contact with Johnson to discuss the summer steelhead HGMP.
 - 3.9. [Oct 14] Hatchery reports for fish disposition. **ACTION:** HMT will further refine their data needs and present those to ODFW Hatchery Managers. The goal is to develop a standardized reporting form for all of the hatcheries.
 - 3.10. [Oct 14] Hatchery program goals document. **ACTION:** Piaskowski will send his edits in track changes to Mackey for inclusion in the meeting minutes. **STATUS:** *completed and posted to the HMT website for review.*
 - 3.11. [Oct 14] Adult out-planting release sites. **ACTION:** Leonhardt and Walker will schedule a time to discuss the release sites with ODFW and WVP.
4. Leonhardt took a moment to discuss a meeting that occurred between July and October. He met with ODFW and Kruzic to discuss ways to keep HMT relevant. He said there was agreement to separating technical and policy issues. Leonhardt said there was some talk about revamping the HMT to mimic the Columbia. He noted that there was some resistance to that change. Sharpe agreed that keeping the HMT focused on technical issues makes the

group more effective. He said he likes the size of the team and believes HMT can be more effective if the technical aspects are the focus. Kruzic talked about the different agency missions and getting to a point where the HMT members can appreciate and understand those differences. He expressed optimism at moving forward over the next year. Grenbemer said the hatchery managers don't mind attending if they can provide useful information. Leonhardt noted that there was talk about creating a spreadsheet that could just be filled out but he didn't feel that was the correct way to go. He thinks having the hatchery managers show up and share information is invaluable.

- 5. Hatchery Program updates – review adult fish disposition spreadsheet(s).** Sharpe offered his perspective of the spreadsheets. He said the hatcheries produce a monthly report but the formats were not consistent. He felt there would be value in providing consistent reports on a monthly basis. He said what would be most useful and be the most effective use of time, would be if HMT provides a list of must-have items that would be reported on each month. Many HMT members said Boyd's report is nearly perfect. What needs to be added are "clipped" and "unclipped" columns. Thorpe said it should be easy enough to get the information since it is already collected; it just needs to be compiled. Thorpe asked if individual fish need to be tracked or are general numbers sufficient (fish A went here or 20 fish were outplanted to here). Grenbemer noted that his report mimics what is needed in the HGMP so he can easily cut and paste. Sharpe and Leonhardt discussed what information is really needed/desired. Boyd explained his workbook has macros and compiles the information into the various sheets and formats. He said the big spreadsheet doesn't get sent out every time. The big spreadsheet collects all of the information that may be needed or requested from different agencies or data users. He does send out the smaller sheets on a regular basis depending on the intended use. Piaskowski said he felt the goals and objectives will help lay out the data needs. **ACTION: HMT will further refine their data needs and present those to ODFW Hatchery Managers. The goal is to develop a standardized reporting form for all of the hatcheries.** Sharpe and Boyd walked through the spreadsheets ODFW currently uses. Piaskowski said he doesn't see the frequency of the timing of the trap operations. Sharpe said you can find it by looking at when fish were handled. Grenbemer and Thorpe said ODFW doesn't get to close their traps. Thorpe said Federal traps can be closed but the State traps do not close unless there is an emergency or scheduled maintenance. Piaskowski clarified that he would like to know more about the pre-sort conditions. He said it relates to delay. He also said it could be included in an annual summary instead of a weekly summary. Kruzic said it should be clear on the data sheet as to when the fish are checked and moved. Sharpe recommends reviewing Traylor's spreadsheet to make sure his metrics are in the ODFW spreadsheets. ODFW recommends the final product be readily manipulated so users could do whatever data analysis they need.
- 6. Hatchery Goals, Objectives, Performance Standards – Spring Chinook program type; HGMP's; HSRG; IHOT M&E of Performance Indicators.** Sharpe said he noticed a common thread in the ODFW annual report comments; that the hatcheries should be looking at definable metrics. Piaskowski noted that the policy needs to be defined but that is a discussion for a different group. Sharpe appreciated that comment since he couldn't find much information regarding policy descriptions for different metrics. Piaskowski suggested HMT could put side-boards on the metrics. Leonhardt said the JDA Mitigation HGMPs have

very specific and measurable goals and metrics. He doesn't see that with the ODFW HGMPs and suggested they are needed so we have a better understanding of the potential impacts of the hatchery fish on ESA listed species.

6.1. Harvest Metric. Leonhardt walked through the "hatchery program goals" document.

Piaskowski recommended some language changes to help clarify the goals of the program related to harvest and conservation. **ACTION: Piaskowski will send his edits in track changes to Mackey for inclusion in the meeting minutes.** Sharpe suggested the FEMP should be re-drafted to include the North Santiam and Foster. Until that happens by ODFW, the focus appears to be on the South Santiam. [*Post-meeting clarification from Kruzic: the FMEP applies to the entire ESU and mandates freshwater fishery impacts to be less than 15% on all natural-origin populations. When the FMEP was finalized in 2001, there was only data available for natural-origin Chinook returning to the Clackamas, McKenzie, and North Santiam populations, thus the reason for the focus in the status assessment on these three populations. However, the fishery impact standard applies to the entire ESU. The FMEP is evaluated annually, and there has not been a need to re-draft the FMEP to date.*] Piaskowski said the numbers discussion is a policy discussion. He suggested this discussion should be centered around the metrics used to evaluate the programs. Sharpe said the harvest data is based on anticipated harvest in the North Santiam and McKenzie. No tribal harvest in the Willamette other than lamprey harvest at Willamette Falls. Harvest metrics could include ocean fisheries (CWT data), commercial, sport, freshwater, etc. Piaskowski would like to see an annual summary of catch, regardless of where it occurred. Kruzic asked if the reason for this summary is due to the purpose of the hatchery programs. Piaskowski and Leonhardt said yes; that the HGMPs state that one of the reasons these hatchery programs exist is for harvest but there is no further discussion of harvest in the HGMPs. Kruzic said that the harvest needs to be put into context of management on the ground and constraints that may be in place, such as ESA fishery impact limits, etc. Kruzic said the old sub-basin plans had harvest numbers and NOAA Fisheries has said if we want to put harvest numbers in the HGMPs, then use the numbers in the old basin plans because there isn't anything better. Kruzic suggested it would be a huge workload issue to quantify what each program is producing and he isn't sure it would be helpful to know. He said the driving factor is the exploitation rate on natural-origin Chinook and not harvest numbers. Piaskowski said that the NWP funded program needs to be evaluated in a way to ensure the goals are being met. Kruzic suggested looking at the whole ESU before going to basins. Piaskowski said the harvest goals are based on basin/programs. He asked if Kruzic is recommending lumping those numbers together. Kruzic said the starting point should be at the ESU before it can be broken down into sub-basins or programs. He added that harvest numbers are generated at the ESU level first. Leonhardt asked if the harvest goal is 1400 and for ten years only 300 fish are harvested, what would ODFW do? Sharpe said it depends on what the 1400 means. Does it mean 1400 are needed for a goal of removing 700 fish through angling? Kruzic said in real life, environmental constraints may result in reduced harvest. Another limitation could be impacts on ESA fish. Leonhardt and Piaskowski stressed that catch data is needed as a starting point. Kruzic said the metrics and results are known but how does that change management? Leonhardt said if the results show that the harvest goal isn't met, would you adjust smolt production? Using the McKenzie as an example, Piaskowski said there would need to

be a policy discussion to determine what the 1400 was supposed to be; 1400 caught or 1400 available for angling opportunity. Sharpe said the creel data is available in the annual reports. Johnson added that catch data is available on-line. Kruzic suggested ODFW check in the with Clackamas harvest group to see if there is an opportunity to coordinate. Piaskowski said for NWP we need to understand catch rates. Sharpe asked if that is on proportion of the adults caught in the fisheries. Piaskowski said we need it by commercial, sport, and by reach. That would provide us with a good starting point. Kruzic asked what management options would be available. He feels that NOAA Fisheries has a good idea of the impacts and needs. He said the information is available but it just needs to be compiled in one place. *[Post-meeting clarification from Kruzic: There was a lot to this discussion, but the bottom line would be to include some more information in the existing Chinook HGMPs on 1) survival data from smolt to adult return, 2) some information on total catch of hatchery Chinook in fisheries from the FMEP reports, 3) include some of the existing creel survey catch data from tributary harvest, 4) explicitly highlight the returns to the hatchery trap showing how a) broodstock needs are met from year to year, b) how outplanting/reintroduction goals are met from year to year. This would provide some of the information folks are looking for to help evaluate the performance of the hatchery programs in meeting mitigation responsibilities. Realizing, there are other factors and limitations that control the amount of harvest (i.e. Pacific Salmon Treaty managing fishery impacts on Willamette Chinook while in the ocean, freshwater FMEP directing impacts to less than 15% on natural-origin Chinook, in many years environmental conditions below the dams are not conducive to catching hatchery Chinook in the lower Willamette, upper Willamette, and tributaries due to flows, temperatures). So even if there is an abundance of hatchery Chinook available to catch, there are other constraints that drive the harvest of these fish. This is the reality of it.]*

6.2. Smolt to adult survival estimate metric. SAR = return to the hatchery. Sharpe suggested the SAR would be smolt to spawning adult (includes hatchery spawned and strayed adults). This number is available on the McKenzie. Sharpe said the data is available; just need an analyst to work it out. Kruzic said it is important to be clear in the definition of SAR. Piaskowski said it seems, for harvest, a pre-fishery SAR is needed. For conservation, the SAR needs to look at adults returning to the trap. Sharpe said the metric can be provided but what is the goal tied to SARs. Sharpe said the hatchery would take the average SAR and operate within the normal variation. He said that while the metric can be available, there isn't a goal. Piaskowski said the SAR is a metric used to evaluate the program in terms of harvest and conservation. ODFW agrees with including SARs and will provide the information.

6.2.1. Leonhardt said that method is being used for JDA Mitigation. It is called TAP (total adult production). In the Columbia Basin, the SAR was not meeting the needs of fish managers. Those managers need to know that enough smolts are produced to result in enough adults to meet the all of the harvest, conservation, broodstock, etc needs. Thorpe asked how TAP differs from old JDA mitigation. He said the target is the same, 30K adults. Leonhardt said the target is the same, but the method for accounting for these fish has been changed. Sharpe asked if the report with TAP could be sent to ODFW. Thorpe asked if PAC members have that report. Leonhardt said yes. Thorpe decided

he has the report and can take a look at the TAP. *[Post-meeting clarification from Kruzic: The Willamette hatchery Chinook situation is quite a bit different than JDA Mitigation. JDA Mitigation fish stocks/species have a completely different life-history and thus are managed in fisheries, etc quite differently than Willamette Chinook. Willamette Chinook are not exposed to a meaningful degree to any commercial and recreational fisheries south of the Canadian border, lower Columbia commercial fisheries, Zone 6 Tribal fisheries, Columbia River recreational fisheries like JDA Mitigation fish. In addition, Willamette Chinook provide an important function for outplanting/reintroduction purposes, so that fishery harvest has to be managed closely (and comply with the FMEP <15% on natural-origin Chinook). JDA Mitigation fish harvest rates are much, much higher, and thus important to see how these mitigation fish are contributing to a wide range of fisheries in the ocean and freshwater. The Willamette Chinook are different.]*

- 6.3. Stray Rate.** A fish from one hatchery program straying into a different basin. Sharpe said this is not important and the data suggests this is a very rare fish except for South Santiam reared in Willamette and released, un-acclimated, into the Molalla. An acclimation program is now in place in the Molalla. ODFW will continue to report on it but they do not believe it is an issue. Sharpe said there was a focus on getting carcasses in the McKenzie as part of the comparison of CWT recoveries in the McKenzie and the Coast Fork.
- 6.4. Conservation.** Leonhardt asked if we need to know how many fish to out-plant upstream. ODFW said there are out-planting goals and they are treated as firm numbers. These are not based on good data. Piaskowski said the numbers should be based on the capacity of the habitat upstream and hatchery needs to support harvest and conservation. Sharpe agreed with this metric. Piaskowski asked Kruzic if he agreed with having a discussion about out-planting fish above Detroit in a similar fashion as South Santiam and Cougar. There was agreement that the plan should be written and there should be a meeting to discuss it. Sharpe suggested having the pedigree work prior to having those discussions. No plans to put wild unmarked adults above Detroit in 2015, but HMT will want to out-plant these fish in 2016. *[Post-meeting clarification from Kruzic: Every year in preseason planning the HMT discusses the goals for outplanting of Chinook above the dams. This is the opportunity to discuss any changes, modifications if folks are not satisfied with the outplanting goals. The data shows in some years the goals are greatly exceeded, in some years they aren't met. This is based upon returns back to the hatchery traps. Now what?]*
- 6.5. pHOS.** Kruzic said it might worthwhile to input the pHOS numbers from the recovery plan. He said it might be useful to have the return rate as a metric. Johnson asked if the returns to the mouth of the river is known. Kruzic said back calculations would be used. Sharpe said the calculations could be done. Kruzic said the reason this would be useful would be when you see a pHOS of 95%, you might be less alarmed when you know how few wild fish there are below the dam and how high the hatchery returns to the trap are. Sharpe used current year returns to illustrate the differences between the return and collection rates at the different traps. Those differences need to be explored further to try to find ways of improving collection.

- 6.6. PNI. Need a goal.** Sharpe said PNI is a low number in all of the systems due to the low number of wild broodstock used. Sharpe asked so what. Until there is major recovery of wild fish, this goal isn't going to be met. Kruzic agreed that it is good to report how the metric is or isn't met but it needs to be put into context. He said it is the lack of wild production that is driving this metric. Leonhardt agrees but there should be a PNI goal.
- 6.7. Trap Operations.** Piaskowski asked about metrics for trap operation. Walker said the metrics and protocols are included in the WFOP. He said the draft WFOP was sent to WATER for review and he is now addressing the comments from WATER. Sharpe asked how specific the language is in the WFOP. Walker said the language is general but the plan can be updated annually. It should be considered a living document. Sharpe discussed the difference between delay and holding. HMT will need to make sure the language is finessed to reflect the operation of the facilities while ensuring the best care for the fish. Kruzic said there were previous documents detailing protocols for the various facilities. Piaskowski asked if ODFW and NOAA will be supporting the WFOP when it comes out. Kruzic and Thorpe agreed. Walker said he anticipates having it done by the end of the month. Sharpe asked if the fish disposition could be included in the WFOP discussion. Walker agreed that it could be. [*Post-meeting action item from Kruzic: make sure data reporting in 2015 addresses this issue of making it clear 1) when the ladder is in operation, 2) when the trap is checked and fish handled/moved, 3) when all of the fish are outplanted, etc. The data reporting needs to be clear so everyone knows how long fish are held in the trap and how many fish.*]
- 6.8. Spawning distribution and spawning PSM.** Sharpe said he has created three levels (0%-20%, 20%-50%, and 50%-100%) and the general goal is low PSM. Greater than 50% PSM is alarming.
- 6.9. Adaptive Management.** Regular review of the programs. 3 – 5 years has been the schedule in the past. The review wouldn't necessarily be to change the program but to look at how each program is performing. Sharpe said the preliminary data will be available at the end of the year. Sharpe said he synthesized data going back several years and that data is included in the 2012 Annual Report. Friesen said he found the task order for the analysis; it included \$75K for an analyst to summarize data from 2010 to current year. Sharpe said paying for the analyst would provide a better product. Leonhardt said Bern Klatte didn't have the \$75K. Mackey confirmed that funds were not likely to be available.
- 6.10.** Piaskowski asked Sharpe to think about how to prepare a report that helps evaluate the metrics, even though there are not solid goals associated with each metric at this time. Leonhardt noted that if the split basin approach is adopted in the HGMPs there will be slightly different management scenarios. Sharpe said the technical reporting of the metrics is already available. How to evaluate those metrics will take some more thought. Piaskowski added that the expectation for NWP is providing passage while meeting the mitigation requirements. There will be a transition in production as is reduced when passage increases. Piaskowski said the report from ODFW should address the metrics in a way that can be applicable now and as the programs transition to something else. Sharpe said he needs to think about how to frame the discussion around the data to make it meaningful.

7. **Adult Out-plant Sites** – review meeting notes and discuss sites that still require evaluation. This item will be tabled. Leonhardt will talk directly to the hatchery managers and their staff to figure out what changes may be needed. Sharpe said Greg Taylor and the WVP Fisheries staff need to be included. This discussion needs to occur prior to the out-planting that may begin as early as May 2015. Sharpe asked if there will be access to the Breitenbush site. Leonhardt said he thought the answer would be yes but he will check. Thorpe thought there may need to be a Cooperative Agreement with the landowner. Leonhardt didn't think that was likely since NWP doesn't like to enter into Cooperative Agreements with private landowners.
- 7.1. Kruzic asked for a briefing on what has happened. Leonhardt said he sent out meeting notes and asked for feedback. If Kruzic isn't on the routing, Leonhardt will make sure he gets added. There was a question about if RM&E is needed on fish being out-planted to see if the release is having an impact. Piaskowski said the bigger discussion includes the long term plan for these sites , more specifically are adults likely to be released at these outplant sites or into reservoirs where they can then volitionally migrate upstream? Sharpe said the UI data will help guide that discussion. Leonhardt said he would like to see these sites functional and useable since NWP invested a lot of time and money into the sites. **ACTION: Leonhardt and Walker will schedule a time to discuss the release sites with ODFW and WVP.** *[Post-meeting clarification from Kruzic: NMFS says the RPA action for these outplanting sites is not met until there are adequate and sufficiently working outplant sites available to use. So these issues with the particular sites need to be fixed.]*