Puget Sound Recovery Implementation Technical Team (RITT)
Agenda and *Notes from Meeting (in italics)*
Minutes by Eric Beamer; accepted at October RITT meeting.

Seventeenth Meeting - Thursday, August 20, 2009: 10:00 am – 3:00 pm
Madrona Investment Office in Seattle

Attendance:

RITT Members Present:

- *Norma Jean Sands, Ken Currens, Kit Rawson, Eric Beamer, and Kirk Lakey*
- *Participating via conference call for morning agenda items: Phil Roni and Mary Ruckelshaus*

Domain Team Members Present:

- *Afternoon agenda items: Elizabeth Babcock, Susan Bishop*

PSP Staff Present:

- *Rebecca Ponzio, Joe Ryan (afternoon agenda), and Scott Redmond briefly, introducing himself as PSP staff to Science Panel*

Others Present:

- *Kirt Hughes, WDFW*
- *Present for the afternoon agenda item: Larry Lestelle (Biostream Environmental), Chris Weller (Point No Point Treaty Council), Paul McCollum (Port Gamble S'kallum Tribe), Thom Johnson (WDFW), Kyle Adix (WDFW), Dave Herrera (Skokomish Indian Tribe), and Cindy Gray (Skokomish Indian Tribe)*
- *Participating via conference call for afternoon agenda item: Doris Small (WDFW)*

10:00 am Approval of minutes of May and June meetings and today's agenda
Select Note taker!
May – approved
June – approved as revised (correction of meeting location)
Eric Beamer to take minutes

10:15 am Updates

Adaptive Management progress (workgroup)

- *The RITT AM workgroup (Kit, Ken, Eric, Rebecca) met with San Juan TAG yesterday (8/19) regarding translation their recovery plan chapter into the Miradi logic model (diagram). Progress was made for only the habitat H. The RITT workgroup is planning to meet with SJ group in late Sept for a complete translation (all H's diagramed in Miradi and draft decision chains for each action) of their recovery plan chapter*
- *The RITT AM workgroup is planning to start working with Skagit and Hood Canal watersheds in late September or early October*
- *The RITT AM workgroup is receiving help from Foundation of Success and TNC with Open Standards approach / Miradi translation and using approximately weekly webEx workshops/work sessions for training.*
- *RITT Watershed liaisons need to be involved when the RITT AM workgroup get to their watershed*

3-yr work plans – setting up meetings with watersheds (PSP)

- *Norma/Morgan meet with West Sound Watershed Council; they are looking forward to working on AM with RITT*
- *Eric/Morgan meet with the Island County TAG; they are looking forward to working on AM with RITT and committed to give them specific guidance on nearshore AM framework in Miradi when the RITT AM workgroup has completed the San Juans.*
- *Phil and John met with NOPLE – want help with AM, concerned about multi-species, esp. steelhead. Concerned about deficiencies in actions for 3yr workplans, esp H the LE doesn't have jurisdiction over (e.g., habitat protection through land use planning and regulation) – they wanted to know what guidance the RITT has for them to solve this. This is a universal problem across watersheds (pick up on this with Swin issues/comments). The answer is RITT continues to high light / document it as an impediment to implementation of the plan.*
- *Other watersheds have not yet met; RITT and PSP staff noted that some watersheds do not want (feel no need) to meet.*
- *PSP staff will contact watersheds to schedule remaining watershed meetings to review 3 year plan update comments.*

During this agenda item, the question came up regarding what RITT should keep track of in the AM framework and implementation of plan progress? Is it just Chinook or is it multiple species, as is described in some specific watershed plans? We did not fully answer this question, but the AM workgroup leaned toward the opinion of completing the AM process for ***Chinook*** *(and summer chum in Hood Canal) and* ***all H's*** *to start with. This work will be done with an applied "consistency screen" for (1) habitat, (2) the Chinook life cycle model, and (3) the direct threat list being developed for the PSP Action Agenda. It is a good starting point; the question of developing AM for other species will be revisited after our primary tasks are complete.*

PSP Update

- *PSP requested RITT to conduct a consistency check of proposed SRFB and PSAR projects with watershed recovery plan chapters (as has been done in past years). This work needs to be completed in August or early Sept. PSP staff will contact individual RITT members regarding their specific watersheds.*
- *PSP staff are organizing as ecosystem recovery coordinators, including the hiring of two new staff. PSP staff will then only need to focus on one PSP Action area.*

Ozette Sockeye Steering Com mtg update (Norma)

- *Norma reported on a meeting of June 29. The Ozette group has starting the planning implementation and AM phases of recovery plan.*

Mission Statement (Norma) & discussion

- *RITT members reviewed a draft mission statement.*
- *The discussion concluded that RITT needed a brief mission statement to adopt and another, more expanded, document that describes RITT roles/responsibilities. The reasoning included the idea that roles/responsibilities might change over time as the needs of salmon recovery implementation transitions but the mission would be more static and should be very concise.*
- *RITT members need to respond to current and past drafts (Phil resending his version) via email; with the goal to adopt at next RITT meeting. RITT member comments need*

to submitted to Norma by Sept 10. It was requested to copy Domain Team members also.

Other

PSP Science Update

Mary reported PSP is currently soliciting authors for its bi-annual science update of "state of the Puget Sound." Chapters include the following topics (according the RFP for authors):

- *Defining desired future states of the ecosystem and natural and social system indicators*
- *The Biophysical Condition of Puget Sound*
- *The Socio-Economic Condition of Puget Sound*
- *Impacts of Natural Events and Human Activities on the Ecosystem*
- *Strategies to Protect and Restore the System*

The science update will be done using Wiki technology, including a peer review step, so that updates can be made quickly in the future as new information becomes available.

12:30 pm Lunch Break

1:00 pm Skokomish

Presentation from Tribes (Larry Lestelle) - see draft Chapter 1 from Tribes

WDFW comments – see WDFW response

General Discussion

Skokomish (1:00pm – 3:00pm)

Dave Herrera introduced this part of the agenda by stating that the following presentation is in response to some of the RITT comments on the Skokomish Chinook Recovery Plan Chapter (2007). He stated that a major change has occurred since the original drafting of the recovery plan chapter and writing of the RITT comments. This change is a settlement agreement over the Cushman hydroelectric project. The Cushman Settlement includes many elements of recovery but fundamental to Chinook salmon recovery options for the Skokomish River is an agreement on restoring the flow regime to the North Fork Skokomish River.

Since writing of the recovery plan chapter, Larry Lestelle, at the request of the Skokomish Tribe, has have been conducting analyses of existing data (primarily from the Skokomish and Queets, according to the presentation) relating Chinook salmon life history characteristics to stream flow. A purpose of today's meeting was to show RITT the new information and the new proposed recovery strategy based on restoring extinct life histories and to hear comments from the RITT on the new analyses, plans, and recovery strategies. Are there gaps? What's missing? Larry's presentation was meant to start this evaluation and discussion process. Two documents were sent to RITT and Domain Team members: prior to the meeting. a draft word document titled: Chinook Salmon Life History Profiles and The Key to Recovery and after the meeting a copy of Larry's powerpoint presentation. In addition the RITT received comments on the word document by WDFW.

Larry's presentation stated these new analyses support the following findings and conclusions:

- *Both early and late timed Chinook salmon were historically present in the Skokomish River. Early and late timed Chinook were likely historically present both (north and*

south) forks suggesting there could have been 2-4 Chinook populations within the Skokomish River prior to flow and watershed alteration.

- *The indigenous Skokomish Chinook populations are essentially extinct at this time.*
- *Current Chinook life history characteristics (as relected by river run timing of adults and their spawn timing) are starkly different than historic Chinook characteristics.*
- *There currently is a mis-match between the current Chinook life history characteristics and current habitat characteristics [before the flow regime change?] (this was river entry and spawn timing with respect to instream flow and freshets).*
- *The Cushman Settlement will restore historic hydrograph shape (timing, but not overall magnitude) to the North Fork, which will change the opportunity that Chinook salmon have to enter/migrate within, spawn, and rear in the river. It will also change sediment and wood dynamics (expect a large increase transport of sediment over current conditions).*
- *Skokomish Chinook population recovery will require using Chinook stocks with life history characteristics that are adapted to the range of environmental conditions that are being restored in the Skokomish watershed.*
- *To recover Skokomish Chinook salmon, recognizing the preceding bullets, there should be a two phase recovery approach:*
    - *Phase 1:*
        - *Re-introduce early-timed Chinook to the North Fork*
        - *Restore North Fork flow and channel characteristics*
        - *Expand early-timed Chinook to the South Fork*
        - *Maintain existing George Adams Hatchery program*
    - *Phase 2:*
        - *Continue Phase 1 components*
        - *Broaden the recovery program to restore the late-timed population as river conditions improve and stabilize.*

The discussion that followed helped clarify the data.and analyses. While it is clear that the current population in the Skokomish (Green hatchery stock origin) is different genetically from the historic population(s) it is not clear how the extinct population(s), could be re-introduced. The historic aggregation was probably more than one population, at least a early run in both forks and a late run in the lower river. The historic populations were supported by a more pristine habitat and a different flow regime than exists today. While the Cushman agreement will restore flows in the North Fork to at least higher levels than they have been since the dam was put in in the 1920's, it will take a while to realize the changed flow and the changes in sediment and other characteristics of the habitat. Will the current George Adams hatchery stock be able to adapt to the improved habitat and increase in productivity and diversity or will and introduction of a new stock be needed to get the early and late runs returning?

3 pm Adjourn

Next Meetings – September 17, 10am-3pm
October 15, 10am-3pm
And third Thursday of each month

Outstanding Ideas/Task/Issues/Agenda Items

RITT	TRT
September meeting – What does the PSP Science Panel do and how can we interact? **Back Burner** Symposium/Book for TRT products	Ozette Pop ID and Viability documents (*both are finalized as NWFSC technical memos and can be found on the salmon recovery web site)* Summer Chum document (*submitted to NWFSC technical memo publication Apr 2009, in review*) Chinook Viability document

Watershed Liaisons

Straits	Phil Roni	Lake Wash.	Kirk Lakey
Hood Canal	Ken Currens & Bill Graeber	Green	Kirk Lakey
Nooksack	Ken Currens	West Sound/Kitsap	Norma Sands
San Juan	Mary Ruckelshaus	Puyallup/White	Kirk Lakey
Skagit	Eric Beamer	Nisqually	Ken Currens
Island	Eric Beamer	South Puget Sound	Norma Sands
Stillaguamish	Kit Rawson	Nearshore	Bill Graeber
Snohomish	Kit Rawson	Ozette	Norma Sands