



DATE: September 22, 2005  
TO: Anadromous Fish Advisory Committee (AFAC)  
FROM: Dave Statler, Chair  for  
SUBJECT: DRAFT Action Notes for the September 20, 2005 AFAC Meeting

**If there are no objections within 8-days, these actions will be considered final.**

AFAC Meeting  
September 20, 2005  
CBFWA Office, Portland, Oregon

**Draft Action Notes**

**Attendees:** Dave Statler (Chair, NPT), John Palensky (NOAA-F), Phil Roger (CRITFC), Dave Ward (ODFW), Lawrence Schwabe (BPT), John Shurts (NPCC), and Tom Iverson (CBFWA)

**By Phone:** Pete Hassemer (IDFG) and Dick Stone (WDFW)

<b>Time</b>	Objective 1. Committee Participation	100%
<b>Allocation:</b>	Objective 2. Technical Review	%
	Objective 3. Presentation	%

**ITEM 1: Review and Approve Agenda**

**Discussion:** Tom I informed the AFAC of an upcoming conference sponsored by the Idaho Council on Industry and Environment and the Northwest Power and Conservation Council - Idaho. The conference is titled "Practical Paths to Salmon Recovery, Part II" and will be held in Boise, Idaho, on October 4 and 5, 2005 (see attached). Contact the Idaho office of the NPCC for further information.

**ITEM 2: All-H Analyzer Project Update – John Shurts, NPCC staff**

**Discussion:** John S. provided an update on the AHA project.

- 1) The Council staff has completed several workshops intended to connect the AHA project contractors with the subbasin level parties that have ties to the data used for the AHA model. Workshops were performed for the Deschutes, Umatilla, Walla Walla, Clearwater, Salmon and Imnaha subbasins. The contractors gathered the local stakeholders who have ties to the fish and habitat data and demonstrated the web enabled AHA model with the default parameters. The work groups verified the data as much as possible and Council staff hopes that participants were energized to follow up on the Mobrand website by continuing to validate the relevant data. A key issue identified in the workshops was the need to break out the salmon and steelhead stocks to align with the NOAA TRT populations to insure compatibility of the two efforts.
- 2) The AHA project contracts expire on September 30, 2005. The deliverables include the web enabled tool (AHA model) with default data for most salmon and steelhead stocks in the basin under current and planned conditions. All sources of data will be documented and a roll up tool is included in the AHA model which allows development of province level objectives. Also, user help groups have been established and a list of registered users have been identified.
- 3) What next? The Council staff is wrestling with how to perform data maintenance and long term storage of the data. Mobrand will likely store and maintain the data through 2006, but a long term solution needs to be found.
- 4) How is the Council going to finish the AHA project? With the upcoming loss of Bruce Suzumoto, Council staff does not have a lead person for this effort. It is likely that Peter Paquet will take the technical lead, but the next steps are not clear. There is a need to validate the AHA data in each of the subbasins within the basin, but there is not work plan for accomplishing that. It is likely that the Council will rely on individual parties to take on that role when the call for Amendment recommendations is released.
- 5) Finally, the Council will be entering an amendment process soon to adopt province level biological objectives into their Program. With the current timing and conflict of many processes at this time (FY 2007-09 project selection, NOAA Recovery Planning, etc.), it is not clear when the Council will call for amendment recommendations. The purpose of the objectives will be to measure success of and guide program implementation.

The global data sets used for the AHA model (SARs, harvest, etc.) need verification by collaborative groups. The AHA exercise captures a set of assumptions in the global data sets, but those represent status quo. Future efforts need to make sure that planning allows for improvements in the current status of the global data sets. The AFAC expressed concern that the AHA model focuses on habitat and hatcheries and keeps hydro opportunities off the table. Biological objectives should be set independent of the AHA model.

**ITEM 3: Regional Management Plan and Resource Status Report Development**

**Discussion:** The Members agreed at their August 29, 2005 meeting that CBFWA should develop a regional plan that captures biological objectives and limiting factors for focal populations in the basin. However, it was not certain exactly what the plan should incorporate or how to develop the plan. The MAG was assigned the task of developing an outline and work plan for CBFWA to develop the plan. The MAG will be meeting on September 21, 2005 to discuss this issue in detail.

It is still uncertain at what scale data should be compiled to feed a regional plan, how objectives should be set (again a scale issue), reporting, and performance metrics. The Coordinated Systemwide Monitoring and Evaluation Project (CSMEP) is addressing some of these issues, but not explicitly for the development of a plan or annual report. The Northwest Environmental Database (NED) workgroup is also tracking this issue, but functions more as a think tank on these issues and has not released any decisions or recommendations. The NOAA Technical Recovery Teams (TRTs) have defined the scale and performance metrics for listed ESA stocks of salmon and steelhead at the population level. Whatever regional effort moves forward should be consistent with the NOAA approach.

A regional plan would likely establish and track biological metrics against benchmarks and provide the framework for an M&E plan to support that tracking effort.

The building blocks for reporting at the ESU or province scale is most likely populations (as defined by the NOAA TRTs). There is likely different language used to define objectives at the different scales. For example, at the population scale objectives may be abundance or VSP parameters like spatial distribution or survival. At the ESU or province level, those objectives would be described in the number of successful populations and probably not in “rolled-up” or cumulative population level objectives. For example, a province objective would likely not be the sum of all abundance targets for all populations within that province because we know that the variability within individual population targets is very high and the likelihood that all populations meet their objective simultaneously is very low in the best circumstances.

A possible definition of objectives may be “a measurable performance metric with a defined timeframe.”

The MAG will discuss how to structure the report card and possibly develop a work plan for establishing the report card at tomorrow’s meeting.

**ITEM 4: Election of AFAC Chair**

**Discussion:** It is time for the AFAC to elect a new chair. Dick Stone was nominated for chair and Dave Ward was nominated for vice-chair. Dave Statler is also willing to chair for one more year. Due to low attendance, the AFAC asked Tom I to follow up with other members. The election of the next chair will occur on October 13, 2005 at the next AFAC meeting.

**ITEM 4: Lamprey Technical Work Group – Standing?**

**Discussion:** Dave Statler raised the question of how to deal with the LTWG charter, now that the CBFWA charter has been modified. During the CBFWA charter discussions, it was clear that the technical committees were not allowed to create subcommittees. Therefore, the legitimacy of the LTWG is in question.

**ACTION:** **The AFAC recommends to the MAG that the Members formally address the standing of the Lamprey Technical Workgroup as a subcommittee of CBFWA.**

**ITEM 5: Next Meeting**

The AFAC tentatively scheduled the next meeting for 9 am to Noon on October 13, 2005 in Portland, Oregon at the CBFWA office. A conflict with the October Council meeting may arise, in which case the meeting will be changed to either the afternoon or the following day.