

**Puget Sound Recovery Implementation Technical Team (RITT)**

**Agenda and Notes from Meeting (in italics)**

*Minutes by Krista Bartz; accepted at January 18, 2011, RITT meeting*

**Thirty-second Meeting - Tuesday, December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2010, 10 am – 3:00 pm**  
NWFS Montlake Room 370W

*Attendance*

*Present:*

- *RITT Members: Norma Sands, Krista Bartz, Mindy Rowse, Kit Rawson, and Mike Parton*
- *Puget Sound Partnership: John Meyer (afternoon)*
- *NMFS RO: Elizabeth Babcock (morning)*
- *Others: Thom Johnson (phone)*

*Absent:*

- *RITT Members: Eric Beamer, Ken Currens, and Kirk Lakey*

10:00 am Approve minutes of last month's meetings and today's agenda  
Choose notetaker

- *Krista was notetaker*
- *November meeting minutes approved.*

10:15 am Updates

- Regional Office – Elizabeth Babcock
  - Changes at Regional Office (RO)
    - *Elizabeth covered most changes during previous meetings. For example, the Salmon Recovery Division at the Regional was divided into a Protected Resources Division (headed by Donna Darm) and a Salmon Management Division (headed by Bob Turner; includes Tim and Susan). The Habitat Division, which includes Matt, did not undergo any reorganizational changes.*
    - *Elizabeth is in a development program that includes two rotational assignments (e.g., marine spatial planning). She can't complete these rotations and keep up with her normal Puget Sound workload for the RITT and Partnership. How this will be resolved is currently being decided. She'll know by the beginning of January.*
  - Skokomish Review logistics
    - *There's nothing new to report since last meeting. The RO staff is now ~5-6 weeks behind because they were finishing another assignment (completed Friday).*
  - New notices in the Federal Register
    - *The Domain Team is releasing a federal register notice on 4D determination for Puget Sound harvest management plan along with a technical document called "Population Recovery Approach for Puget Sound Chinook Salmon."*
    - *Kit noted that the RITT had heard the RO presentation on the Population Recovery Approach (PRA) at the RITT meeting May 2009 and a discussion was had, but he did not know how the RITT input from that discussion had been used. It would be helpful if the Domain Team could attend a RITT meeting and provide an update. Elizabeth will talk to the Domain Team about attending the meeting on January 18<sup>th</sup>. Kit asked that since the RITT focuses on all-H recovery activities, we would appreciate hearing about both their harvest 4-d rule and the hatchery EIS. In particular we would like*

*to know how their review of the hatchery plan will affect recovery implementation, particularly regarding pulling wild fish off spawning grounds to use as hatchery broodstock.*

- RITT – Liaison reports from recent meetings
  - *North Olympic: Mike reports that they are generating prioritization schemes for all of their projects. Their intention is to align their prioritization process with the RITT key ecological attributes (KEAs).*
  - *Puyallup/White: Mike met with Tom Kantz (Pierce County), Kirk Lakey (RITT), and Jason (Partnership) to get a basic overview of their project approaches – basically a “handoff” meeting with Kirk.*
  - *South Puget Sound: Krista and Roma met with the South Sound Strategy Group to hear the various watershed leads inform each other regarding their watersheds’ research priorities and current projects, followed by a discussion of strategies for South Sound.*
- PSP
  - *Roma is leaving the Partnership for a position with Port Gamble Tribe. Rebecca is going to take over as liaison to the San Juan Islands (SJI) for a while.*
- Joint Meeting RITT/RIST/PSSTRT
  - *Elizabeth doesn’t have a concrete answer regarding the RO’s opinion on the future of the RITT, RIST, and TRT. The RO needs to identify tasks and discuss how to implement the biological goals for steelhead. Once this is scripted out more fully, they’ll have an answer about what “form should follow the function.” In the meantime, if anyone has ideas beyond the RITT mission statement, please weigh in.*
  - *Norma said that it looks as if merging the steelhead TRT and RITT might not be a good idea at this point. She then asked Elizabeth about the status of writing a steelhead recovery plan. Elizabeth met with state recently; they don’t have the capacity to reproduce what was done for Chinook or chum in Puget Sound. They asked if NOAA wanted to spearhead this effort. So Elizabeth and Donna are discussing the possibility of putting together a small group of technical advisors (from NOAA and the co-managers) to create draft planning targets. Kit suggested that the targets for winter steelhead were based on habitat assessments and this might be a good model to begin with. Elizabeth noted that one of the challenges with steelhead is the lack of data.*
  - *The joint meeting begins at 9:00 not 10:00!*

#### 11:00 am Salmon Dashboard Indicator task

- *This task (a visual representation of how the indicator is doing) is supposed to be done by end of December. The subsequent task (the description) is due in June. The RITT discussed several changes to Norma’s graphs, which had been edited by Krista, including:*
  - *“Natural origin” needs to be specified*
  - *Catch and escapement need to be clearly defined*
    - *Figures show what returns or is caught in a given year*
    - *Catch = all removals from populations, not just harvest*
  - *Escapement targets needs to be better explained, cited, and perhaps re-named*
    - *Consider making it a band, rather than a line*
    - *Kit would be fine with single line if*
      - *It represents an abundance target, not an escapement target (because escapement targets don’t include catch)*
      - *The caption makes it clear that you want to be at or above that line*
    - *Identify the estimation method use to get the targets*
    - *Kit noted that these aren’t exactly escapement targets*

- Consider plotting total abundance, not just NOR abundance. (but we don't estimate hatchery catches)
- Consider ways to depict the upper graphs so they can't be easily misinterpreted
  - Use a pop-up box/disclaimer to highlight that abundance is one parameter, but it's not a complete picture – you need the other 3 VSP parameters
  - Extend the x-axis back to 1952 on the upper graph
- Mindy and Norma incorporate these changes and send an updated draft to the RITT by the end of December, 2010. There will be opportunities for the RITT to make additional changes.

11:30 am Adaptive Management and Monitoring (AM & M) – status and issues

- Questions arose from Elizabeth and Norma, such as: who's going to sustain/maintain the AM&M plan in Miradi at the watershed level? Will it be the RITT or the watershed leads/technicians? When is the RITT going to finish this project? Or will the watersheds need ongoing guidance from the RITT? Is Miradi a database for storing monitoring data?
- Various RITT members also stressed the need to acquire the license key code for Miradi ASAP. It doesn't make sense to hire someone on the East Coast to operate the software during tailoring meetings with the watersheds. RITT members and watershed groups need familiarity with Miradi if this AM & M framework is going to fly. According to John, there's a "hiccup" right now with the Miradi license. The Partnership is working on it.
- The pooled document that Rebecca is pulling together should have each component attached as a chapter, after the section about strategies, pressures, stressors, etc. The components' text and tables should not be integrated (as in Rebecca's early draft), because this takes the material out of context.
- Updates from individual watersheds:
  - Skagit update: a subgroup of the RITT is filling out the Miradi forms for this watershed as requested by the watershed. This subgroup includes Ken, Eric, and Kit. The subgroup and Rebecca recently met with Shirley Solomon and Mary Raines to tailor the RITT template to the Skagit recovery plan. Their next meeting is early February. Kit will send an email of their schedule to the rest of the RITT. A final product will not be available until May.
  - Hood Canal (HC) update: According to John, HC is going through an integrated watershed management modeling exercise that is based on Miradi and broader than salmon, but it includes salmon. They've hired an FOS person to help and they're working with TNC people familiar with Open Standards. They don't want to make progress with that broader effort and then revisit this salmon piece; rather, they want to move the salmon piece forward now. Rebecca said that we might be able start helping them with the salmon piece at the end of February, which didn't go over well. Therefore, Mindy said she would try to edit the Chinook portion of the template now so it was applicable to chum. She will ask Tom to read her edited document and add text. She'll also fix the references. We'll need to figure out how to depict chum in Miradi (i.e., would there be one green box for Chinook and another for chum, both in the same diagram? Or would there be separate diagrams?).

12:00 noon Lunch

12:30 pm Review of PSP Projects of Regional Significance (PoRS)

- Background from John: A subgroup of the Salmon Recovery Council (SRC) has been driving this effort. The "order of events" that the subgroup proposed was to 1) get the project list from the watersheds, 2) give the list to the RITT for review (however the RITT feels it's appropriate to weigh in), 3) using the review, the subgroup then devises a plan for the SRC that summarizes the projects, describes the gaps, and provides a possible strategy for how you might fund the projects long-term. Then the SRC figures out what they want to do with the info.
- Issues raised by various RITT members:
  - Regional significance of projects?

- *Should we state not just which projects are consistent with 3-yr work plans but also which are actually regionally significant?*
    - *Why are individual watersheds responsible for proposing regional projects? Is there a mechanism for watersheds to work together to come up with these projects?*
    - *Why not ask each watershed to rank projects in order of importance to the region, omitting their own? This would provide a ranking of importance.*
    - *Alternatively, if we were to take a Sound-wide view of pressures (from the Miradi list), you could tally which pressures are confronted by each project. Also, working from the other end, you could assess which un-listed projects could address the largest number of pressures. (“Your results chain is fairly limited if you go into Ohop Creek with \$1.5 million...”)*
    - *What about asking watersheds to meet in regional groups to discuss common pressures and to use their project list to come up with a new list that’s more regionally-oriented?*
    - *John’s response to several of these ideas: The watersheds aren’t going to want to re-do the process of coming up with the list). That said, we’ve asked watersheds to come up with regional projects, but we haven’t provided them with a regional forum in which to discuss projects. Perhaps we can ask the watersheds to come up with regional themes at a Watershed Leads’ meeting. Come up with a list of things that need to be addressed.*
    - *But this list needs to be based on hypotheses based. It can’t be based on nothing. It can’t just be a list of “good things to do.”*
    - *Other examples of regionally significant projects: Chesapeake Bay, Tahoe, HC’s regional sewage plan. All used some sort of decision-support system.*
  - *Review criteria?*
    - *The RITT agreed to review the 3-yr work plans for consistency, but not to review individual projects. We have a very structured approach for reviewing individual watersheds’ recovery plans and work plans, but we never reviewed Vol. 1 of the Recovery Plan. There was no rolled-up, regionally integrated view of the individual watersheds’ recovery plans. Now we’re being asked to review projects for regional recovery, but we have no framework for this. The challenge for providing RITT input is to determine the method that we ought to use to review/evaluate the project list. (John’s response: the SRC wants to move on this, so figuring out criteria can’t be a multi-year process.)*
  - *Subsequent use of the reviews?*
    - *The SRC isn’t doling out money but they’re influential in what gets funded, so it’s important to understand how they’re going to use our judgments. Also, an affirmative RITT reaction to any of these projects will be viewed as helpful, but criticism might not be as influential or useful. (John’s response: the SRC is going to have to figure out how to fund these projects, and a thumbs-down from the RITT will help them in their decision making, or that message will be transmitted back to the watersheds.)*
- *Next steps*
  - *Mike will draft a short memo to the SRC summarizing these ideas. The SRC meets at the end of January, so Mike will send a draft to the RITT for review prior to the next RITT meeting (1/18/2011).*
  - *John’s ideas for what type of info would be helpful in the memo:*
    - *“While this list of projects would enhance salmon recovery in X, Y, and Z watersheds, it doesn’t cover...”*
    - *“All of these projects on the surface seem to be consistent with the 3-yr plans”*
    - *“If certain projects (i.e., derelict gear) were extended outside their WRIAs, they would be regionally significant.”*

- “A more robust way to look at this list would be to examine at how pressures map back onto specific projects.”
- Provide a recommendation about integrating across plans
- Describe the idealized regional project

AM & M

- Notes are integrated into the other notes from 11:30 am.

3:00 pm Adjourn

RITT Next Meetings – January 18, 2011 (regular 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday meeting) at NWESC Montlake  
 January 31 & February 1, 2011 – special joint meeting at NWFSC Montlake  
 This will be a joint meeting of RITT/RIST/PS Steelhead TRT with  
 Jan 31 primarily RIST issues and Feb 1 RITT and TRT issues  
 RITT Meetings are held the third TUESDAY of each month.

**Outstanding Ideas/Task/Issues/Agenda Items**

| RITT   | TRT   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adaptive Management Plans for each watershed (ongoing)</li> <li>• Population ID and sequencing (request from RO)</li> <li>• Climate Change Guidance for recovery implementation (backburner)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chinook Viability document</li> <li>• Flow document</li> </ul> |

**Watershed Liaisons - RITT and PSP Last Amended 8/28/10**

| PUGET SOUND watersheds |        |         |                       |       |         |
|------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------------|-------|---------|
| San Juan               | Mindy  | Rebecca | Lake Wash.            | Kirk  | Jason   |
| Island                 | Mindy  | Morgan  | Green                 | Kirk  | Jason   |
| Nooksack               | Eric   | Rebecca | Puyallup/White        | Mike  | Jason   |
| Skagit                 | Eric   | Rebecca | North Olympic         | Mike  | John C. |
|                        | & Kit  |         | West Sound            | Norma | John M. |
| Stillaguamish          | Kit    | Morgan  | Hood Canal            | Ken   | John M  |
| Snohomish              | Krista | Morgan  | Nisqually             | Ken   | ?       |
| South Sound            | Krista | ?       |                       |       |         |
|                        |        |         | <b>OZETTE</b> Sockeye | Norma |         |