

**Columbia River Basin Lamprey
Technical Workgroup**

Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife
Authority

2501 SW 1st Avenue Suite 200

Portland, OR 97201

columbiariver.fws.gov/lamprey.htm



Meeting Minutes

March 1, 2005

Present: Jen Stone, Doug Hatch, Christopher Claire, Jen Graham, Sam Lohr, Matt Mesa, Dave Ward, Mary Moser, and Molly Hallock. On the conference line were Mike Clement, Neil Ward (representing CBFWA), Dave Clugston, Abel Brumo, Tom Iverson, and Jeanette Howard.

Summary of past events and purpose of the meeting: On January 24, 2005, the Workgroup met to revise the Critical Uncertainites document, but was not able to finish the resident species portion. The purpose of today's meeting to was finish the resident portion of the document, and if time allowed, address the concerns that the Anadromous Fish Committee (AFC) had on the draft document.

Process: The Workgroup revised the Critical Uncertainties document on a paragraph by paragraph basis. Changes were made to the document only when the Workgroup reached consensus.

Miscellaneous Discussion Points: Please refer to the DRAFT Critical Uncertainties document for the results of this meeting. General comments made during the revision process are summarized below

- In the body of the report, we need to make clear the inter-connectedness between each of the critical uncertainties

Response to the concerns of the AFC: The Workgroup was provided with a copy of the concerns of this committee, which were drafted by Howard Schaller (USFWS) and Gary James (CTUIR).

1. *Reconsider ranking of anadromous Population Delineation or provide a detailed explanation for its #3 ranking.* After discussion, the Workgroup decided that they were not going to rerank any of the critical uncertainties because they felt their methods and results were sound. Dave Ward, Christopher Claire, and Matt Mesa will draft a response to the AFC's concern, providing further justification as to the ranking results. They will provide their comments to Jen by March 11th for Workgroup review and Jen will provide a final response to the AFC by March 22.

2. *Differentiate between strategies that affect juvenile and adult passage.* Mary Moser will review this portion of the document to determine ways to make the text more clear, yet not redundant. She will provide Jen a draft response for Workgroup review by March 11th, and Jen will provide a final response to the AFC by March 22.

3. *In the Population Delineation section, the Workgroup should acknowledge and contribute to existing genetic libraries instead of developing new ones.* The Workgroup agreed and appropriate changes were made to this section of the document.

4. *Please describe how the Knowledge Gap was used (ranked).* The Workgroup clarified this process in the main body of the document. The Knowledge Gap score was used only to break ties between the critical uncertainties. The critical uncertainties were ranked initially by biological benefit.

5. *Why did the Knowledge Gap receive a intermediate ranking for Restoration Activities when there is very little information known?* There is some information regarding the effects of restoration activities available for the CRB, mainly work conducted by CTUIR. The Workgroup felt the score of 3 was appropriate, and acknowledges that since Knowledge Gap scores were only used to break ties, a change in score (if debated and approved) would not affect the overall ranking of this critical uncertainty.

Next Meeting: The next meeting of the Workgroup was not scheduled at this time. Regular Workgroup meetings are scheduled to occur every six months. Unless a specific request is received by the Workgroup, the next meeting will likely occur in August 2005.

Meeting Adjourned