

Puget Sound Steelhead Recovery Team
February 24, 2015 Meeting Summary

Decisions and Actions from Meeting

Decision	Notes
1. Use some of the March meeting to compare alternative approaches (EDT, NetMap, RIPPLE/Shiraz, watershed assessments).	
2. Revised the narrative for the listserv update and agreed to send quarterly updates.	The first update will be sent soon.

Action	Assignment
1. Create a table comparing the different approaches for getting more specificity at the watershed level.	Tristan Peter-Contesse and others
2. Invite Greg Blair to present to the Recovery Team on EDT.	Elizabeth Babcock
3. Share the paper from Susan O’Neil that compares modeling approaches.	Tristan Peter-Contesse
4. Share the paper that Joe Anderson wrote comparing different models.	Neala Kendall/Joe Anderson
5. Share the contact listserv to the Recovery Team; send any additional names to add.	Claire Turpel; Recovery Team members
6. Revise and send the listserv narrative.	Elizabeth Babcock & Claire Turpel
7. Determine the source(s) of the data in the periodicity table.	Jeff Hard
8. Ask Joe Anderson to confirm if the data in the periodicity table is meant to show historic and current data simultaneously.	David Price
9. Update the DPS map.	Elizabeth Babcock
10. Create more in-depth crosswalk comparing DPS and watershed level recovery plans’ language and section headers.	Tristan Peter-Contesse
11. Follow up with Ken Currens and Ed Connor to figure out how to advance the Stresses & Pressures Workgroup’s first step.	Tristan Peter-Contesse

Welcome, Announcements, and Old Business – Elizabeth Babcock welcomed the Puget Sound Steelhead Recovery Team (Team) and led introductions (*please see end for a list of participants*). The main objectives for this meeting included: to further discuss the watershed assessment approach and to make writing assignments on the draft Recovery Plan outline.

Announcements – A Team member announced that the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) is coordinating a Puget Sound Day with staff of Representatives Heck and Kilmer. This will be a day in Washington, DC for people to talk with legislators about the importance of the health and care of the Puget Sound. It will likely be March 25 and an organizational meeting will be March 13 in Puget Sound (more details to be

announced). Interested people are encouraged to contact PSP or one of the Representatives' offices. This will conflict with the next Salmon Recovery Council meeting which will be shifted to accommodate schedules.

January 23, 2015 Meeting Summary – There were no edits to the draft meeting summary so it was accepted as final. A member noted that the point in the meeting summary about vetting the table of periodicity in the draft Recovery Plan outline with local biologists should also include vetting with co-managers' biologists.

Watershed Assessment Approaches – Tim Beechie from the Northwest Fisheries Science Center presented to the Recovery Team at the January 2015 meeting about watershed assessments and how those could be incorporated into steelhead recovery planning. At that meeting, the Recovery Team discussed the approach and identified several questions. These questions were considered by the Watershed Template Workgroup in mid-February. Tristan Peter-Contesse, Chair of the Watershed Template Workgroup, shared several discussion points by the Workgroup, including:

- The time and cost would likely be answered by whether Tim Beechie and his staff would identify a methodology to be applied locally or if they would identify the methodology *and* implement it locally. It was noted that this might not be known for some time.
 - Tim Beechie has estimated \$200,000 to do similar work for Oregon Coast Coho in the Nehalem watershed. That might be a good estimate for Puget Sound steelhead.
 - The Workgroup also discussed that the initial development and application of the model will take time and capacity, as well as the ongoing maintenance. The Workgroup did not identify potential groups or people to do the ongoing maintenance but did agree that it would be good to advance this as much as possible at the watershed scale with the people closest to the data, although they noted that there would be capacity constraints. This might need further discussion by the Recovery Team at a later date.
 - The Workgroup also noted that there is a grant opportunity open through April 20 offered through the Departments of Ecology and Commerce with National Estuary Program funding; work for local watershed assessments might qualify for those funds.
- The Recovery Team reviewed that they have already agreed to use Open Standards as the organizing tool for developing the Recovery Plan, but the Team has not yet decided on additional tool(s) to use at the watershed level. They have considered EDT and watershed assessments so far and there are other approaches available.
 - It was suggested that a table comparing the approaches would be helpful in determining which approach to move forward with. Greg Blair could talk to the Recovery Team about the EDT model, and might be available for the March Recovery Team meeting.
 - There are a couple of papers comparing different models that could be helpful in this discussion, which will be shared with the Recovery Team.
 - NMFS noted that it might make sense to use the same approach for all watersheds but if watersheds prefer to use a different approach, there is flexibility to allow for that.
- Sequence is also important for the potential model approach. Some approaches have coarse outputs, some finer outputs. Therefore, a coarse-resolution model could feed into a fine-resolution model.

- The post-doctoral modeler is looking into which method to employ in which system. There might be a need for different approaches for different areas of the Sound, depending upon how much data exists in that system.
- The Recovery Team noted that the Watershed Template and Recovery Goals & Scenarios Workgroups should keep in contact with each other in case the different models can interrelate and provide efficient use of data or time. The life cycle model will likely take months to get up and running.
- NMFS noted that they generally do not prefer EDT over other approaches because it takes a lot of data to make accurate predictions, and there is not very much existing steelhead data.
- A comparison of the models could include:
 - Time requirement
 - Capacity requirement
 - Cost
 - Sequence (how one model could feed another)
 - Level of output (coarse to fine)
 - How much data is needed/desired (how well it could deal with the lack of steelhead data)
 - Description
 - How the model / approach is traditionally used

Public Communications – NMFS created a contact listserv that 173 people have signed up for over the past 1-2 years. This listserv was shared with the Recovery Team via PowerPoint slides, and will be shared so the Team members can review and suggest if there are other names to add. PSP will also cross-reference the listserv names to those they know are leaders in each watershed. Elizabeth Babcock noted that she will update the Salmon Recovery Council about this listserv at their next meeting.

The Recovery Team reviewed the draft narrative that will be sent as an update to the full listserv. There were edits to several sections of the draft narrative, particularly to the Life Cycle Modeling and Workgroup sections. The plan for the meetings in each of the Major Population Groups (MPGs) has been tweaked; instead of three meetings (one in each MPG), the Recovery Goals & Scenarios Workgroup suggests having six meetings (two in each MPG). This allows for the first meeting to be a more basic meeting and the second meeting to be more targeted to technical people.

With those edits, the Recovery Team agreed to a narrative that NMFS can send to the full listserv. The Team also agreed to a goal of sending an update to the listserv quarterly.

Recovery Plan Outline – The Recovery Team reviewed the short-term assignments and then identified new assignments for members to draft.

Short-term Assignments

- Update the periodicity table and ask Bill McMillan if it can be shared.
 - The table has been updated since the January 23rd meeting. Bill McMillan is comfortable with this being shared with the Recovery Team, at the MPG meetings, and with co-managers.

- A Team member noted that it is currently unclear what the data is that was used to populate this table. Hopefully Jeff Hard can get that answer since it is likely the data came from the Technical Recovery Team (TRT).
- Once that question is answered, the Recovery Team might need to review the table again and determine how much to share at the MPG meetings with local and co-manager biologists.
- It was suggested that teasing apart this data to identify the data at the population level could help.
- A Team member asked if the table is meant to show both historic and current data simultaneously. Though the technical people with those answers were not at the meeting, Team members thought that was the intent of the table. David Price will follow up with Joe Anderson to verify this.
- Update the DPS map.
 - There are several inaccuracies in this map so Elizabeth Babcock will follow up with the NMFS mapping team to update the map.

Recovery Plan Assignments

The Recovery Team reviewed several sub-sections of the Introduction section and identified Team member(s) and deadlines for a draft of these sub-sections. These are noted in the assignments document.

A Recovery Team member noted that how and where to include H-integration into the watershed chapters is an important discussion for the Team to discuss at a later date. Additionally, habitat protection will be discussed later by the Team, too.

Workgroup Progress Reports

Recovery Goals & Scenarios Workgroup

- Dr. Phil Sandstrom has begun as the modeler and is starting to familiarize himself with the literature.
- Joe Anderson has been in touch with several people to set up the meetings in each MPG, likely to be held in June. The northern MPG meeting will be in Mt. Vernon, and the southern MPG meeting will be in Tacoma. The Hood Canal MPG meeting is still up in the air; they are considering Lilliwaup or the Forest Service office in Quilcene. Recovery Team members are encouraged to send other location ideas to Joe Anderson.
- More information on the MPG meetings will be shared with the Recovery Team at future meetings.

Watershed Template Workgroup

- The group is working towards two big items: guidance to the watersheds for how to apply the Common Framework, and the template for watersheds to do their recovery planning.
- The Workgroup discussed how to align language and elements of the Recovery Plan at the DPS and watershed levels; they want the language for those two to be the same.
 - Tristan Peter-Contesse had done an initial comparison of the language for the DPS and watershed level recovery plans, but could also prepare a more in-depth version for the March Recovery Team meeting.

- The Workgroup next meets on April 23, and the focus of that will be a work session on:
 - Confirming the portfolio of elements for steelhead recovery (adapted from the Hood Canal steelhead pilot project and the Chinook Common Framework), and
 - Reviewing the steps and lessons learned from the Hood Canal and Nisqually pilot projects.

Stresses & Pressures Workgroup

- The Workgroup’s next task is to summarize existing documentation on the steelhead DPS (including TRT materials) and crosswalk with the Puget Sound Pressure Assessment taxonomy.
- Workgroup members experienced capacity constraints which prevented any progress on this so far but with some shifts in workloads the group hopes to start this task soon.

Administrative Updates

- NMFS submitted the Federal Register notice for the 5-year status review of steelhead.
- PSP will check for room availability for the next Recovery Team meeting (March 31).
- Potential next meeting topics:
 - Discuss and compare different modeling approaches (EDT, watershed assessments, NetMap, RIPPLE/Shiraz). Consider how the approaches fit in with Open Standards and the life cycle model.
 - Continued work on the Recovery Plan outline (update on assignments).
 - Compare language/headers for the recovery plan at DPS and watershed levels.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30pm.

Participants

Name	Affiliation
Elizabeth Babcock	NOAA’s National Marine Fisheries Service
Ed Connor	Seattle City Light
Ned Currence	Nooksack Tribe
Jeanette Dorner	Puget sound Partnership
Neala Kendall	Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife
Steve Leider	NOAA’s National Marine Fisheries Service
Randy McIntosh	NOAA’s National Marine Fisheries Service
Tristan Peter-Contesse	Puget Sound Partnership
Scott Powell	Seattle City Light
David Price	Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife
Amilee Wilson	NOAA’s National Marine Fisheries Service
Claire Turpel	Triangle Associates