ICTRT Meeting – January 23-24, 2007
Portland, Oregon

Members in attendance: Fred Utter, Howard Schaller, Charlie Petrosky, Phil Howell, Pete Hassemer, Casey Baldwin, Tom Cooney, Michelle McClure (via phone)
Non-members in attendance: Damon Holzer, Don Matheson

1. Tasks for peer review--target a small group for solid technical review, but also send to tribes, agencies, environmental groups, etc. Also submit for ISAB review.
    a. Viability Draft
        i. Targeted for early February
        ii. Prioritize the viability document to ISAB (Gaps to follow)
    b. Gaps
        i. Define treatment of hatchery effectiveness
    c. Matrix model re-write
        i. Incorporate changes to S3 relationship (climate scenarios)
    d. Include a cover letter describing the documents and how they relate to each other
2. Viability document major updates
    a. Put technical details in attachment A while keeping the body more general
    b. Added uncertainty language
    c. Added sockeye size category
        i. Emphasized getting stocks on an upward trend, then evaluating lake size to identify escapement goals
    d. Population-level criteria
        i. Expanded extinction definition (QET/RFT)
        ii. Discussed stock-recruit forms
        iii. Bulked up language pertaining to uncertainty in curves and evaluation of current status
    e. SSD
        i. No major changes
    f. Thresholds and size categories—bulked up rationale
    g. ESU/MPG scenario section
        i. Write a summary of at least one scenario
        ii. Reference to appendix G
    h. Extirpated areas memo
        i. Clarify application to more than single MPG ESUs
        ii. Attach as an appendix to the viability document
    i. Additional needs
        i. Run steelhead weir datasets and evaluate variance and autocorrelation
        ii. Need a wrap-up/conclusion and/or executive summary up front (for inclusion after initial review)
            1. Wrap-up discussion points
                a. Justify ICTRT approach
                b. Discuss black/white rating issue

c. Give a general picture of organization
d. Relate that we have applied the criteria and that they work in real population assessments.
e. Review from Paul
f. Size category changes
g. Setting minimum abundance targets for "maintained"
h. 10-year geomean abundance measures versus using annual targets
i. Emphasize working up from the population level (not a summation approach)
    i. Aggregate approach should be based on the weakest link
j. Recovery plan should take broader objectives than just getting by
k. Population management versus ESU recovery

iii. Cover letter (including package with current status assessments)
1. Draft/outline (Michelle)
2. Paragraph describing issues addressed within the two attached example assessments. Also acknowledge that planners may have used earlier draft versions of the example assessments. For additional detail, refer to assessment package.
3. Selection of examples
    a. Avoid populations with two thresholds due of core-area considerations
    b. Choose populations with strong datasets
        i. consider including a population with a weak dataset
    c. At least one example with significant hatchery influence and habitat alteration
        i. also one population without these issues
    d. Include language discussing the range chosen
    e. Include a steelhead population
    f. Consider adding a narrative
    g. Decision—include only one or two examples
        i. Steelhead—Umatilla
        ii. Chinook—Wenatchee

3. M&E Workgroup
    a. Key information gaps for A&P
4. Hatchery effectiveness
    a. How should we treat hatchery fish with respect to productivity
        i. Addressed in SSD criteria
        ii. Show how hatchery effectiveness may impact productivity, but don't necessarily alter observed productivities

iii. Discuss with Casey for appropriate UC Steelhead value (for use in status assessments)

5. Draft conclusion section
    a. 4 parts
        i. What was presented in the report, segway into hierarchical structure
        ii. Development of criteria—tested/refined criteria via current status assessments
        iii. Application criteria—assess at the population level
        iv. Intent of criteria—use information to determine MPG viability (possibly include ESU level)
            1. value of assessments is to inform recovery planning efforts
    b. Note (generally) that updates have resulted from the incorporation of new data and improvements to existing datasets and analyses.
6. Cover letter – keep brief (not too much detail)
    a. First paragraph
        i. Need to include reference to pop ID document
        ii. Evaluations of alternative future scenarios are too vague
    b. Second section
        i. Add that we also describe an approach for conducting status assessments using the criteria
        ii. Standardize terminology
7. Additional SSD material
    a. Get information from Paul
        i. Literature search to support issues from previous meeting
    b. Michelle to finish remaining pieces
    c. Add rationale for allowing moderate SSD but not AP (another group to tackle)
8. Other issues for follow-up
    a. Add clarification of “maintained” populations
    b. Clarify treatment of harvest in datasets (attachment A-1)
    c. Identify where the population datasets are located
    d. Get comments on main viability document (and conclusion, letter, M&E) by February 6th (circulate documents before Friday)
    e. GoTo meeting and conference call on February 8th
    f. Consideration of hatchery effectiveness
        i. Imnaha as an example (Tom and Rich)
        ii. Upper Columbia Steelhead (Tom and Casey)