

**Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team
Public Meeting Notice & Agenda
February 22 & 23, 2005**

**Richardson Hall Room 313
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR**

Please Note: Times listed on agenda are approximate; topics may be added or removed the day of the meeting. Please check <http://www.fsl.orst.edu/imst/> for most recent agenda.

Tuesday, February 22, 2005

9:00 Adopt agenda – Carl Schreck
Adopt January 2005 meeting minutes

General Team Business

Set meeting dates for July 2005

Update on Reports and Developments:

- Joint Ways and Means committee
- House Committee on Water
- OWEB Board Meeting on March 16 & 17, 2005

9:45 **Review responses to recommendations** received from state agencies regarding Klamath basin and temperature reports – Carl S.

Team to review and adopt draft letters prepared after the January 19th discussion for ODFW, DEQ, ODA, & OWEB

10:15 **Team review and discussion of draft Oregon Coastal Coho Assessment** – Nancy Molina

- Team decision on format of the formal reviews sent to the State.
- **Team discussion and final review of the draft document titled: “Part 1: Viability Criteria and Status Assessment of Oregon Coastal Coho” December 20, 2004 draft**

11:45 Public comment

12:00 Lunch (on your own)

12:00 **CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION** to discuss personnel issues open to IMST and support staff only

1:15 **Resume Team review and discussion of Viability criteria and status assessment document** – Nancy

Possibly adopt draft review with direction from the Team to the workgroup.

IF TIME PERMITS:

Team review and discussion of the draft document titled: “Part 3B: Policy for the Evaluation of Conservation Efforts: the certainty that the conservation effort will be effective” January 31, 2005 draft – Carl S.

Team to begin review and discussion of draft document

4:45 Public comment

5:00 Adjourn

Wednesday, January 23005

8:30 **Team review and discussion of the draft document titled: “Part 3B: Policy for the Evaluation of Conservation Efforts: the certainty that the conservation effort will be effective” January 31, 2005 draft** – Carl S.

Team to review and discussion of draft document and begin drafting formal review to the State

11:45 Public comment

12:00 Lunch (on your own)

1:00 **Team review and discussion of the draft document titled: “Part 3B: Policy for the Evaluation of Conservation Efforts: the certainty that the conservation effort will be effective” January 31, 2005 draft** – Carl S.

Review and discussion of the draft document titled: “Part 1: Synthesis of Viability Analysis and Evaluation of Conservation Efforts” January 31, 2005 draft – Carl S.

3:45 Public comment

4:00 Adjournment

A brief public comment period will be available at designated times. Written comments may be submitted to Kathy Maas-Hebner, Dept of Forest Science, OSU, Corvallis, OR 97331.

The Coastal Coho Assessment documents the IMST will be reviewing at this meeting are available at:

<http://nrimp.dfw.state.or.us/OregonPlan/>

Reasonable accommodations will be provided as needed for individuals requesting assistive hearing devices, sign language interpreters or large-print materials. Individuals needing these types of accommodations may call Glenda Serpa at 541-737-6551 at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting.

Campus parking information is available at <http://oregonstate.edu/> or by calling Parking Services at 541-737-2583.

MINUTES
Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team
February 22 and 23, 2005

Richardson Hall, Room 313
Oregon State University,
Corvallis OR 97331

Members in Attendance:

Carl Schreck, Co-Chair
Stan Gregory
Bob Hughes
Carl Yee
Nancy Molina, Co-Chair
Rich Shepard

Others Attending:

Kathy Maas-Hebner, OSU
Leah Gorman, OSU
Ellen Deehan, OSU
Bruce McIntosh, ODFW
Jay Nicholas, OWEB
Pete Lawson, NOAA Fisheries
Mack Barrington, ODA
Chris Jarmer, OFIC
Bill Percy, OSU
Mark Chilcote, ODFW

**AUDIO TAPES OF THIS MEETING ARE AVAILABLE THROUGH THE
OREGON WATERSHED ENHANCEMENT BOARD. Please contact Bev
Goodreau (503) 986-0187.**

February 22, 2005

Co-Chair Carl Schreck convened the meeting at 9:00 AM.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Carl S. said that if any Team member has a real or perceived conflict of interest they should raise it at the beginning of the discussion for the appropriate agenda item

AGENDA

The draft agenda was adopted with minor reorganization.

MINUTES

The January 2005 minutes were adopted as submitted.

GENERAL TEAM BUSINESS

Brief review of future meeting dates and locations:

April 27 & 28 – Corvallis

May 17 & 18 – Portland

June 8 & 9 – Corvallis

July meeting dates will be set at the next Team meeting.

UPDATE ON REPORTS AND DEVELOPMENTS

Joint Ways and Means Subcommittee on Natural Resources

Nancy attended the Subcommittee's February 15 meeting to describe the IMST's role and upcoming work. The importance of an impartial science team was stressed by the Joint Ways and Means Subcommittee. Nancy encouraged all members of the Team to attend the next meeting (no date set) of the Subcommittee on Natural Resources to support the presentation.

OWEB Board Meeting

IMST is invited to speak at the Board's next meeting on either March 16 and 17, 2005. Nancy will keep the Team informed of the date and time.

House Committee on Water

Speaker of the House Karen Minnis formally notified the Co-Chairs that the House Committee on Water will be the House committee for the IMST to report to. As yet, there is no comparable committee in the Senate.

Scope of Work for 2005-2007

A draft was distributed and the Team discussed its scope of work for the next two years. There was also discussion of salmonid conservation and restoration activities. The document was adopted with revisions.

ACTION: Kathy will send a copy to the Joint Ways and Means Subcommittee on Natural Resources and to Tom Byler, OWEB Director.

REVIEW OF RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS – Carl S.

The Team discussed draft letters regarding agency responses to IMST recommendations made in the Klamath Basin and Temperature reports. Draft letters were based on Team discussion at the January meeting. The letters were adopted with edits. The draft letter to DEQ will be discussed when Stan is present at the meeting as he is drafting the reply.

ACTION: Kathy will send the letters to ODFW, ODA, and OWEB.

TEAM REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF DRAFT OREGON COASTAL COHO ASSESSMENT – Nancy Molina

Carl S. said Nancy and Leah did a marvelous job incorporating Team comments into one document. Nancy led the remainder of the discussion.

TEAM DISCUSSION AND FINAL REVIEW OF THE DECEMBER DRAFT DOCUMENT TITLED “PART 1: VIABILITY CRITERIA AND STATUS ASSESSMENT OF OREGON COASTAL COHO”

The Team discussed the draft coho assessment. Carl S. is not sure that de-listing is warranted and feels the State conclusion that populations are viable needs further discussion. Bruce McIntosh and Mark Chilcote, both from ODFW, were available to answer questions on the State’s assessment and viability analysis.

Carl Y. commented that de-listing is a decision of NOAA Fisheries, but the IMST should point out the things the State has done that the Team questions as scientists.

Carl S. agreed, adding that the Team’s review document would not take a position on delisting but will identify the strengths and weaknesses the Team found in the assessment. The question for him is, “Does the IMST agree with the State’s final conclusion that North Coast ESU is viable?”

Nancy asked whether there was adequate information in the draft document to support the State’s decision that the ESU is viable. There are two components to consider – pure scientific analysis and how to apply precautionary principles to policy and science.

Rich commented that he’d like to see more data.

Carl Y. suggested that the Team have a clear statement of support or non-support of the State’s conclusions in the review. The State could then explain why some of the things the Team will suggest weren’t included in the assessment. There was general agreement among the Team members.

The Team noted that the difficulty of separating ESA issues from Oregon Plan issues is time (short term vs. long term concerns) and scale.

Assumptions in the assessment were discussed and whether it was adequately conservative in measuring the risk of extinction. The assumptions are not conservative in terms of protecting the stocks. The transition is rapid. What of early warnings in dependent populations – what happens

if the assumptions are wrong? Need 3 generations (9 years) to determine risk of extinction but the assessment uses only 7 years of data.

Stan commented that management of fishery harvest and hatcheries are the quick problems to turn around and asked what if habitat is the driver? Habitat (quantity and quality) takes longer to turn around.

Mark Chilcote, ODFW, explained the Ricker model curve and his analyses.

Stan is concerned with the use of this curve and its apparent relation to habitat capacity. Mark explained that the analysis included changing the recruitment limit in the model. He did not change a direct measure of habitat quality within the model.

Nancy thought that dependent populations were important. Mark said that one possibility would be to run the analysis for the coast with the dependent populations to see if they are important, but ODFW does not have the data.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There being no public comment, the Team went into executive session over lunch to discuss personnel issues.

SUMMARY OF EXECUTIVE SESSION – Carl S.

When the meeting reconvened, Carl S. summarized the executive session discussion and described a letter the IMST will write to the Governor's Office concerning Team membership. Carl asked for Team discussion on whether or not the Team should prepare a letter to the Speaker of the House with their concerns over the appointment process. It was moved and seconded to discuss it.

Rich felt that appointments are politically made, and that is fine with him. He opposed writing a letter.

Stan said the letter needed to focus on the function and responsibility of the Team under the Oregon Plan. He spoke to the ethical obligation to serve the State, and the same ethical obligation to speak up when certain actions affect the Team's ability to function.

The Team voted to send the letter, with 5 "Yes" votes and one "No" vote from Rich.

ACTION: Carl Y. will send ideas to Nancy. Nancy will send her notes with Carl Y.'s comments to Carl S. to prepare a draft letter. The Team will review the draft before accepting it.

COHO ASSESSMENT DISCUSSION RESUMED

ACTION: Nancy will incorporate changes on the viability assessment and forward to Leah. Team members will forward their comments to Leah, who will complete the edits by next Tuesday at the latest. Leah will forward the revised draft to the Team members, who will send back any final comments. The finalized review will be sent March 15th. Leah will incorporate edits into the cover letter.

**TEAM REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT DOCUMENT TITLED
“JANUARY 2005 PART 3B: POLICY FOR THE EVALUATION OF CONSERVATION
EFFORTS: THE CERTAINTY THAT CONSERVATION EFFORTS WILL BE
EFFECTIVE”**

The Team began their review and discussion of the draft PECE Policy document.

ACTION: Nancy will lead the work on the Team’s response with Leah’s assistance.

The Team needed more details and information. Bruce McIntosh, ODFW, contributed to the discussion.

ACTION: Nancy will type up today’s discussion for tomorrow’s discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There being no public comment, the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 PM until the next day.

February 23, 2005

Co-Chair Carl Schreck reconvened the meeting at 8:58 AM.

VIABILITY ANALYSIS LETTER – Carl S.

The final letter needs to be submitted to the State by March 15. The Team considered if it should send a draft review to the state and then finalize the review. Carl S. commented that if the Team releases a draft, it becomes public record. The Team needs context. There was discussion of the balance between recognizing strengths and identifying weaknesses.

PART 3B PECE – Nancy

Nancy distributed a draft of the previous day’s PECE discussion for the Team’s review. The Team discussed various aspects of the draft ODFW documents, including:

- Quantitative approach (power analysis) as a tool to evaluate monitoring.
- Assertions in the document not fully supported.
- Whether it is appropriate to comment on economic analysis, connections to scientific issues? Bruce McIntosh, ODFW, suggested that pages 5 & 6 of the LCDC analysis included information on rural population growth.
- Adaptive management – is it really happening?
- Uncertainty – of implementation vs. effectiveness.
- Time – how long will it take to be effective? Wood might be hundreds of years.
- Part 1 and Part 3 could be combined.
- Strata – what is the value?
- Points where the draft(s) is(are) overly optimistic

Viability

The Team discussed comments on the draft report’s conclusions. Is the Team comfortable about whether uncertainty of viability is portrayed accurately? The overall conclusions on page 52 of

the draft assessment are not adequately supported by evidence. Nancy suggested adding a paragraph to the letter.

ACTION: Team members will send comments to Leah and Nancy. They will send a revised draft out next week for the Team to finalize via email.

DEQ RESPONSE TO TEMPERATURE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS – Stan
Stan reviewed the Team’s response to DEQ. The draft letter was adopted by the Team.

ACTION: Kathy will send the letter to DEQ.

REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS – Carl S.
Carl reviewed the action items from the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT
There being no public comment, the meeting was adjourned at 12:30 PM.