Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team
Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds

Public Meeting Agenda
October 31, 2011

Agricultural Production Room, LaSells Stewart Center
Oregon State University campus
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.

PUBLIC MEETING:
Monday, October 31, 2011

9:00 **Convene Meeting** –Carl Schreck
Adopt agenda
Adopt July 2011 minutes

Updates and developments
- Budget
- Legislature
- Other

9:30 **Review of ODFW's Rogue Fall Chinook Conservation Plan** – Hughes
Team discussion and adoption of its draft review of ODFW's draft document *Conservation Plan for Fall Chinook Salmon in the Rogue Species Management Unit.*

11:00 **Draft Recommendation to ODFW Regarding Fish Conservation Plans** – Hughes & Schreck
The Team will consider and possibly adopt a formal recommendation to ODFW regarding native fish conservation plans and overall consistency among plans.9:30

11:30 **OWEB Budget Note Related to IMST Operations** – Tom Byler (OWEB)

12:00 **IMST Operations** – Schreck
Please note that this section will include a **Working Lunch** (Lunch provided for Team members, Staff, invited guests).

- Team will discuss key elements of an independent science team and value to the Oregon and possible working models to maintain a science review team under different funding scenarios. Discussion with Melissa Leoni (OWEB)

- The Team will draft a work plan for the 2011-2012 fiscal year and assess staffing needs and team member time commitments.

Independent Project Updates:

- Journal Article – Bob Hughes
- Book Proposal – Alan Yeakley
- Draft Urban & Rural-Residential Workshop Synthesis – Yeakley

- Team will review (and modify if warranted) its' *Charter and Operating Procedures* and *Guiding Principles* document and current efficiency. As part of the discussion the Team will also discuss Team members expressing personal and professional opinions through other outlets and how the statements may impact the IMST now or in the future (# 18 of the *Guiding Principles* document).

  The *Charter and Operating Procedures* and the *Guiding Principles* can be viewed at: http://www.fsl.orst.edu/imst/about.html

3:45 **Public Comment** (approximate time)

4:00 **Adjourn**

A brief public comment period will be available at designated times. Written comments may also be submitted at the meeting or sent to Kathy Maas-Hebner, Dept. of Fisheries & Wildlife, OSU, Corvallis, OR 97331 or to imst@fsl.orst.edu

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 IMST at 541-737-6105 at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting.

MINUTES
Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team
October 31, 2011

Agriculture Production Room, LaSells Stewart Center
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331

Members in Attendance:
Carl Schreck, Co-Chair
Clint Shock
Bob Hughes
Nancy Molina, Co-Chair
Alan Yeakley
Vic Kaczynski (via phone)

Members Absent:
none

Others Attending:
Kathy Maas-Hebner, OSU
Tom Byler, OWEB
Melissa Leoni, OWEB
Tom Satterthwaite, ODFW
Matt Falcy, ODFW
Dave Jepsen, ODFW
Joe Ferguson, Steamboaters
Kevin Goodson, ODFW (via phone)
Dan VanDyke, ODFW (via phone)

October 31, 2011 Public meeting

Carl Schreck convened the meeting at 9:04 am and asked that any Team member with an actual or a potential conflict of interest bring the issue to the Team's attention for discussion. Hughes reiterated that he may have a potential apparent conflict of interest in the IMST's upcoming review of ODFW's draft Rogue Fall Chinook Conservation Plan because he is involved with a Rogue River dam removal study. The IMST members did not feel that his participation in the study presented a real or apparent conflict of interest. No one else declared a conflict of interest.

AGENDA – Agenda was adopted as presented.

MINUTES – July 25, 2011 minutes were adopted as presented.

UPDATES AND DEVELOPMENTS

- **Budget** – After a few delays, the Team's budget for the 2011-2013 biennium is in place.
- **Legislature** – Representative Ben Cannon has left the legislature for a position in the Governor's Office. Senator Dingfelder's Committee is considering hatchery management issues in Oregon at the request of fish conservation groups. She will let the IMST know at a later date if there is a role for the IMST in the process based on past reports and recommendations issued by the IMST.

Review of ODFW's Rogue Fall Chinook Conservation Plan

Bob Hughes presented the Team's final draft of its review of ODFW's Conservation Plan for Fall Chinook Salmon in the Rogue Species Management Unit (July 8, 2011 draft) and summarized the overarching issues and general concerns addressed in the draft review. Hughes and Schreck explained the Team's concerns regarding the Plan's treatment of populations, limited monitoring, human demographics, climate change, and ocean conditions. ODFW staff expressed that monitoring healthy populations is difficult because most monitoring funds are typically spent of federally listed or at risk species and populations. The Rogue populations are healthy and adequate monitoring funds are not available.

Molina proposed drafting a recommendation that supports monitoring healthy fish populations and the need for baseline data to determine if negative trends in the population or habitat occur in the future. Adequate information on healthy populations will also provide benchmarks for at risk populations. The Team agreed that a recommendation is needed and it should be part of an overall set of recommendations sent to ODFW. The Rogue fall Chinook would be used as an example of why the monitoring is necessary.

Shock moved to conditionally accept the review based on minor changes and edits incorporated. The review was unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEM: Yeakley will re-craft the section on demographics, climate change, and adaptive management.

ACTION ITEM: Hughes will draft a paragraph on the implications and consequences of not doing more monitoring of the fish populations and their habitats.

ACTION ITEM: The subcommittee will resend the completed review to the full Team the week of November 7 in order to send the final to ODFW by November 11, 2011.

ACTION ITEM: Hughes will draft a recommendation regarding the need to monitor healthy populations, not just at risk populations.

Draft Recommendation to ODFW Regarding Fish Conservation Plans

Hughes introduced the subcommittee's draft recommendation on increasing the consistency among ODFW's fish conservation and recovery plans and the need for more agency expertise in areas related to climate change, human demographics, and water use. As written, Molina felt that it was outside the Team purview to recommend staffing or agency structure. These could be included as possible approaches to addressing the recommendation. Jepsen, Satterthwaite, and

Goodson (ODFW) explained the difference between recovery plans which are part of a federal process and includes biological and technical review teams and conservation plans which are based on the State's Native Fish Conservation Policy. The draft documents that the Team receives can have multiple authors, but data availability dictates the modeling approaches used. ODFW does not have land management authority in the basins covered by conservation plan and must rely on partnerships to improve habitat conditions. The Team agreed to further develop the draft recommendation and to reconsider it at a future meeting.

ACTION ITEM: Molina will redraft the recommendation based on the meeting discussions.

Independent Project Updates:

Urban Book Proposal – Yeakley has not made any additional progress since the last update. He plans to send a draft prospectus to the Team by November 15 and the final prospectus to Springer by early December.

Urban Journal Article Proposal – Hughes has not made any additional progress on the draft article since the last report. His intent is to get a draft to the Team in December, but more realistically in January with a 2-to 3-week turn around for comments.

Urban/rural-residential Workshop Synthesis – A draft summary of the workshop has been prepared and sent to the subcommittee for review. Yeakley will send suggested edits to Maas-Hebner including a draft executive summary in November. Maas-Hebner will prepare a revised draft and send to the Team by early December. Once the Team has reviewed and approved it for release, the subcommittee would like to send the draft to participants by the end of December for their comments.

OWEB Budget Note Related to IMST Operations

Tom Byler (OWEB Director) indicated that Melissa Leoni will be OWEB's point person on the budget note and presented a draft process to the IMST. The state legislature charged OWEB with examining the IMST statutory charge, resources available, and efficiencies with current structure including the appointment process and operating model. OWEB will be coordinating its work with the Governor's office and key state legislators. Leoni discussed the proposed time-line for meeting January 1, 2013 reporting requirements and deadlines if statutory changes are warranted and can be addressed in the 2013 legislative session. During the afternoon session of the IMST's meeting, Leoni received feedback from Team members on what they saw as the strengths and weakness of current operations and what possible alternatives exist.

IMST Operations

Schreck suggested splitting the afternoon into discussing short-term and long-term IMST operations.

Short-term

Team members stated what work they are doing for IMST this coming year and the approximate timeframe they have for accomplishing the work. Except for a possible redband trout conservation plan, the Team is not aware of any other pending review requests from state agencies. Maas-Hebner will begin contacting agency staff and attending appropriate meetings and legislative sessions to help determine what scientific areas need to be addressed in the state. During the conversation, the Team decided that it would be efficient to consider holding workshops to effectively gather and assimilate information rather than traditional literature reviews.

Workshop possibilities mentioned included:

- A follow up workshop to the June urban/rural-residential workshop.
- A workshop on forest riparian management targets on state forests and tools for assessing potential impacts or benefits of management prescriptions, particularly thinning.
- A workshop on stream water budgets in eastern Oregon and effects on salmonids.
- A workshop on how agencies are progressing toward the goals of the Oregon Plan. This would require more exploration and discussion with OWEB and other state entities.

The Team also reviewed the Charter and Operating Procedures and the Guiding Principles. No changes were made to either document.

ACTION ITEM: Molina will prepare a proposal for a forest riparian management workshop.

Long-term

Long-term operations were discussed along with some possible alternative strategies. Some of the issues brought up included:

- There are pros and cons concerning the number (7) of team members. The Team discussed the need to have a productive conversation with the appointing authorities about when it is better to fill a vacant position or to use the available funds to complete work already in progress. The appointment process needs to take into account diversity of disciplines and backgrounds of Team members. Some backgrounds do not lend themselves well to the type of work IMST currently does. The statute does not specify who, based on employment, can and cannot be on the IMST.
- Each team member is expected to produce original material not just review and comment on other members' writing. Presently there is no method to deal with accountability related to individual team member production. One idea brought up was having a probationary period for new appointees and before they can serve the full four years they would undergo a review of how well they are working with the Team and how productive they are.
- In recent years, the Team has been focusing on reviews for agencies not independent reports like the urban report. The reviews do allow for direct dialogue with the agencies but the larger reports help to bring information together that is not presently available for use by state and local agencies.

- Compensation of team members could be changed. What are the pros and cons to having voluntary vs. compensated appointments, stipends vs. an annual FTE rates, and how to better balance compensation between university and non-university team members? One way mentioned that could be used to address the discrepancy in productivity among team members was to compensate all Team members with a low base FTE rate (i.e., high enough to prepare for and participate at meetings) and then provide additional FTE to members preparing and writing reviews or reports to reflect their higher level of productivity.

Public Comment: no public comment was given

The meeting was adjourned at 3:41 PM