

Minutes from the November 14, 2002 meeting of the Oregon Coastal Coho Subcommittee of the Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast (SONCC) Technical Recovery Team

Attendees: Heather Stout NMFS, Rosemary Furfey NMFS, Tom Wainwright NMFS, Peter Lawson NMFS, Tom Nickelson ODFW, Chuck Huntington Clearwater Consulting

Meeting was called to order at 10:30 am.

1. Introductions
2. Notebooks. Heather passed out notebooks with various documents relating to Oregon Coastal Coho. These include Federal Register notices, and other background material.
3. Recovery Plan Guidelines. Rosemary gave a brief overview of a recent meeting on joint USFWS/NMFS Recovery Planning Guidelines that she attended. She also handed out the Draft Endangered Species Recovery Handbook (Aug 2002), NOAA Office of Protected Resources Recovery Planning Guidelines (September 1992), and the Recovery Planning Guidance for Technical Recovery Teams (September 2000). She also mentioned that there should probably be a Federal Register Notice regarding embarking on the Oregon Coastal Coho Recovery Planning Process. Rosemary also reported on a reorganization taking place in the Regional Office . A new Salmon Recovery Division has been created and may include Rosemary as the Oregon Coastal Coho Recovery Coordinator.
4. SW Center Overview. We had a brief discussion regarding how the OCC committee is organized and how it relates to the SONCC, SW Center, SW Regional Office and NW Center and NW Regional Office. The OCC is a subcommittee of the Southern Oregon Northern California Technical Recovery Team. As such, our deliberations are advisory to that group. We need to keep lines of communication open to the people at SW Center (Tommy Williams) and the SW Regional Office (Greg Bryant).

At this point, our charge is to

- a. Identify Independent Populations (complete a report)
- b. Do a Viability Assessment, (complete a report)
- c. Evaluate ESU Viability Scenarios, (complete a report) and
- d. Identify Data Collection-needs, priorities and guidelines (complete a report).

Steps a and b will happen before the Recovery Team begins (phase I); steps c and d will be ongoing during the recovery planning (phase II).

5. Perceived roles/time commitment.

Review Lower Columbia River Willamette Population Identification Report outline as template (see attached outline)

Comments:

- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife has current distribution maps-doesn't cover above man-made barriers
- Cedric Cooney has Historical distribution on Streamnet?
- Life History- want this more focused on OCC than status review, much data is available and needs to be pulled together e.g. spawn timing. Ian Fleming's (OSU) post-doc working on jacking rates
- Geography-basin size summaries??, CLAMS (Central Landscape Analysis and Modeling Study) may have good summaries
- Hatchery History: 1995 status review is still good as far as stock transfers go, production data needs updating (Bill Waknitz for 03 update)
- Population Structure, need to comment briefly on past population ID structure (Kostow, Nickelson), need to discuss uncertainties, consequences of lumping/splitting error.
- Scale of independent populations
 - consider minimum basin size from models
 - consider migration routes/ headlands
 - consider geology/ Life History ?etc. differences
 - consider in context of monitoring capability

Roles/ tasks for next meeting:

- Chuck will bring GIS maps of subheadings under Ecological Information,
- Heather will bring information under Life History that specifically pertains to OCC, and talk to Ian Fleming's post doc re: jacking rates
- Tom W. will get information from Bill Waknitz re:Hatchery History and stock transfers,
- Peter will talk to the CLAMS folks for Geographic Template Information.
- Tom N. will ask Cedric Coony for documented occurrences of historical populations and will work on tracking down biological data.
- Tom N. will work with Steve Jacobs on spawn timing- (Tom N. will put together comparative data across basins)
- Tom N. will work with Mario Solazzi to get info on juvenile migration from traps studies and BLM Umpqua studies
- Rosemary and Heather and graduate student will work on outreach issues with appropriate watershed councils and interested parties.
- David Teel will have genetics analysis available in April or May
- Tom W. will ask for any updated allozyme data for OR Coast (status review update) and contact Laurie Weitkamp re:Coded Wire Tag (CWT)updates

- Peter will summarize CWT data for status review update
 - Rosemary will check into Northwest Region GIS support
6. Timeline: Next Meeting February 25 at 10:30 Corvallis Research Facility- progress reports on data gathering detailed above, Subcommittee goals are to produce Population ID draft during the Summer of 2003 and to produce the population viability report during the Winter of 2004
 7. Review Data that NMFS is using in BRT meeting
 - a. Big issues: separating hatchery and wild spawner estimates, what population scale is best for analysis
 - b. For 1990-2002, best data is basin-scale population estimates from Stratified Random Sampling (SRS) data (Nickelson 2001 stock definitions). Steve Jacobson will provide natural ("wild") and total spawner estimates by basin.
 - c. Calculation of pre-harvest recruits: expansions by Gene Conservation groups (GCG) used in the 1997 status updates is problematic, especially for the Umpqua and Mid South Coast GCGs, because CWTs don't reflect incidental take/hooks mortality and most individual hatcheries are poor indicators of regional harvest rates. Recommend using the standard OPI harvest rates for all populations, note possible N-S cline in harvest rate
 - d. For longer term data, no reliable estimates at basin scale, so recommend using 1950-present peak count expansions on a coastwide basis, or possibly broken down by GCG/Monitoring area.
 - d. NOTE: SRS calibration study in the Smith River suggests that SRS estimates are about 30% low, even after the 33% observer bias correction has been applied.
 - f. For the Rogue Basin, the best data is the Huntley Park expansion estimates of wild and hatchery-origin spawners. Gold Ray Dam counts are probably not reliable for trends because early years had observation method problems, and the counts were heavily biased by hatchery outplants in the 1970s. Recent SRS surveys don't provide a reliable overall population estimate, but might be used for proportioning the Huntley Park estimates into subbasins, if that's necessary.
 8. Set Meeting Date/topics. Meeting Date will be Tuesday, Feb. 25, 2003 at ODFW Research Facility on Highway 34 at 10:30. Topics will be:
 - Ecological Information,
 - Life History that specifically pertains to OCC,
 - Hatchery History and stock transfers,

- Geographic Template Information.
- Historical populations and will work on tracking down biological data.
- Outreach issues with appropriate watershed councils and interested parties.