

PUGET SOUND RECREATIONAL FISHERIES ENHANCEMENT OVERSIGHT
 COMMITTEE MINUTES FEBRUARY 7, 2011

| | | |
|--|--|----------|
| MEETING CALLED BY | Steve Thiesfeld | |
| TYPE OF MEETING | Advisory Group | |
| FACILITATOR | Clint Muns | |
| NOTE TAKER | Colleen Desselle | |
| ATTENDEES | Jon Lee, Clint Muns, Mike Gilchrist, Dave Croonquist, Don Freeman, Dave Knutzen, Rich Eltrich, Colleen Desselle, Pete Naylor, Matt Parnell, Dave Puke, Norman Rinehardt, Steve Thiesfeld, Jim Jenkins, Mike Schmidt, Art Tachell | |
| | | |
| Agenda Topics | | |
| DISCUSSION | Introductions. | |
| <p>The members of the PSRFE OC gave a short introduction of themselves as there were new members on board. Steve Thiesfeld indicated that this meeting is run by the members (not by him), and that the chair conducts the meeting. Clint thanked everyone for being present and provided information regarding the PSRFE OC for the benefit of new members, explaining how the meeting is run and that the committee's concerns are heard.</p> | | |
| CONCLUSIONS | | |
| | | |
| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
| N/A | | |
| | | |
| DISCUSSION | Orientation. | |
| <p>In 1993 recreational anglers teamed up with legislators to make things better in Puget Sound. RCW empowered the committee, creating a coordinator to ensure that the funds used are working well. Surveys are conducted to obtain \$10 per licensed sport fisher which goes to the Wildlife fund. This committee started in 2003. The director appoints at least 7 unpaid volunteers as members for a 2-year term. If extensive travel is needed to get to the meetings, the travel is reimbursed. The committee advises on all aspects of the program; reviews and provides guidance on the annual budget; selects a chair, reviews and provides comments on documents pertaining to enhancement projects; and addresses any other issues.</p> <p>Revenue for this fund started with a small amount of money in 1994, then shot up to \$1.6M/year up to \$1.8M mark, but has been declining ever so gently, and we are currently looking at an annual budget of about \$1.3-1.4 million. Our total budget for the biennium is \$2.8 (biennium is two fiscal years).</p> <p>One of the big goals of the project when we started was targeted Chinook releases, and they wanted us to produce 3 million yearling Chinook along with soliciting support; performing comprehensive research; researching on marine bottomfish; using hatchery programs to improve fishing; and other projects like go out and kill predators, and follow the wild salmonid initiative, which I don't think we do anymore. Some of the things we are doing is lingcod enhancement, mass-marking, and coded-wire tags (CWTs). There is a lingcod project where they probably started collecting eggs in 2000, took a hiatus, and believe that 2004 there was a release of 4-year-olds, and began collecting eggs again in 2008 (most recent). We have in the past helped to fund Lake Washington sockeye fishery monitoring (we actually have a part of our budget that goes to counting fish at the locks which helps us open the fishery when we have enough fish). We are trying to get to the 3 million yearling Chinook (fall Chinook held at the hatchery for a year) the idea was that they would have a tendency to stay in Puget Sound and be available in the winter for the blackmouth fishery. Our biggest hurdle to achieve the 3 million initially was where we were going to rear them all. We ended up doing a lot of stuff in salt water and had a lot of salt water net pens, then ESA came along and we could no longer have all the net pen fish wandering all over the Puget Sound looking for a place to spawn. There wasn't any place they could come back to and be collected. So in order to be compliant with ESA listing we stopped using the salt water net pens</p> <p>Recently we have had some set-backs - we lost the Percival Cove facility (Capitol Lake) due to water</p> | | |

quality issues (Dept of Ecology did not like our fish crapping in the water); McAllister Creek had some disease issues and that one has been lost; for quite a while not only were we more limited, but we lost some facilities, now we are actually getting to the point where money is our biggest hurdle to achieve our goals. We have:

- the contract work with Michael's group (Long Live the Kings) up in Orcas Island,
- the Skykomish;
- a zero program that we work in cooperation with Suquamish Tribe and Kitsap Poggie Club at Gorst Creek;
- fund a big chunk of Soos Creek, basically we are doing all the Chinook production plus;
- some yearlings at Icy Creek, about 300,000;
- Chambers (300,000 sub-yearlings),
- Lakewood (140,000 yearlings),
- Garrison (1, 050,000 sub-yearlings);
- Hoodspout 150,000 yearlings; and
- Skokomish River (Rick's Pond) – 300,000 sub-yearlings.

We will likely lose Rick's Pond next year, as he has been looking for something better with the City of Tacoma, and we have not funded him for next year. For those of you who are new, this [presented] table will be updated, but wanted you oriented around Puget Sound and where the current projects are. The only place we really don't have anything going on is up in Dave Croonquist's neck of the woods.

In terms of production in the program itself, we have about 2.6m being raised by PSRE dollars, and then we have about another 500,000 being raised by general fund or wildlife fund dollars. In our mind, we actually hit the 3 million mark because of the supplemental to what we were doing, but the auditor says those other fish didn't count so we didn't hit the 3 million. Slowly, but surely we have been switching these programs over to sub-yearlings, we are getting under 1 million yearlings released now (2010-2011), and part of that is that we are not seeing survival rates as we did historically. This is the real take-home message here for our problems with these programs – back in the 70s when they first started doing the delayed-release Chinook they were seeing survival rates between 3- 8% on every fish released, and it declined in the 80s, kind of came back in the late 80s and here we are in the 90s and 2000s. The survival is known because we put CWTs in them and we are able to collect those tags in the fisheries, hatcheries, and on the spawning grounds. Based on the number of tags we release you can calculate all the numbers you would have recovered in all of your fisheries and on the spawning grounds, hatcheries. It is simple mathematics; you released this number, but this many were accounted for. So the CWTs allowed us to have a pretty good general evaluation of what is going on with yearling Chinook. But you can see that if we are down here with about a 1% survival rate or less, we are 3-8 times lower survival than we were in the 70s. If we could get back to 3%, we would have 3 times better fish than we are having right now. Clint indicated that some of that reduction in the yearling production is because the oversight committee agreed to switch over to zeros since there was a broader problem beyond the winter blackmouth. All yearling life-cycle salmonids in Puget Sound have extremely low survival rates – coho, winter blackmouth, and steelhead. So there is something bigger going on in Puget Sound, and we had made the decision that it was not wise to continue to put money into producing fish that are not surviving. We switched to zeros, but we also have a place holder, and we have made it clear over and over and over again that if we can figure out what the survival issue is, we can get that survival rate up. We want to go back and raise yearlings because as you can see that in the beginning it was very good. As we see these survival rates go down, we are actually ramping up the CWTs so we are doing every program every other year, at least, so that we can try to keep track of where we are going and which programs are contributing well. The pressure is probably going to be on the hatcheries where the fish are not contributing to do something different or for the Department to make an executive decision that if this facility is not doing its job, we're going to move the money somewhere else as the money is tight.

The yearlings contribute more to the winter fisheries than the sub-yearlings. We heard clearly last summer at the public meetings to not put all our eggs in one basket: keep some yearlings while you work with sub-yearlings and maybe even some resident coho or whatever, don't limit yourself into one group. Those decisions were made as we have seen survival rates go down.

Surveys are done in the spring by random phone calls asking if the angler fished in Puget Sound within the last year. Did you fish for warmwater fish? Did you fish for salmon, steelhead, or sturgeon? These are the three programs the survey covers.

Steve went over the current production. Clint reiterated that winter blackmouth are a naturally occurring historical (over 100 years) component of our salmon fisheries in Puget Sound, not a hatchery product.

We do not have any rule-making authority, but we have been known to send a letter of advice to the recreational fisheries advisory group. So we do have some ability to make some input there. If you are looking to be very involved in the regulation process, the North of Falcon process is where that happens.

| | | |
|-------------|---|--|
| CONCLUSIONS | We need to continue looking for ways to increase production with lower costs. | |
|-------------|---|--|

| | | |
|--------------|--------------------|----------|
| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
|--------------|--------------------|----------|

| | | |
|------------|----------------------|--|
| DISCUSSION | Operating Protocols. | |
|------------|----------------------|--|

Steve provided a synopsis of the PSRFE OC protocols. Did not want to go through it, but asked that all members read it on their own. In summary, the agency feels your role is to communicate between constituents, stake holders, the folks paying the bills, and the agency. This means to communicate both ways - take what you hear out to those you interact with, and bring back what you hear from them to the agency. We should do everything we can to facilitate this communication. While you are here to help us make suggestions to the budget, the actual decision is made by the agency. We provide advice, guidance, and/or recommendations as to where we should go; the Director makes the final decision.

Clint stated he feels that with the current director, that we and the agency are partners. New legislative proposal to replace what is currently law. A letter was sent on this. I moved ahead with that. It was my call.

| | | |
|-------------|---|--|
| CONCLUSIONS | Need to ensure that we communicate with the agency and the agency keeps communications with us. Always let us know what you hear from others. | |
|-------------|---|--|

| | | |
|--------------|--------------------|----------|
| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
|--------------|--------------------|----------|

| | | |
|--------------------------|-----|------|
| Keep communications open | All | None |
|--------------------------|-----|------|

| | | |
|------------|----------------------|--|
| DISCUSSION | Appointing of Chair. | |
|------------|----------------------|--|

The nomination for appointment of a new chair was opened. A nomination was put forth by Dave Croonquist for Clint Muns to continue as chair; it was seconded by several. Clint stated that he would not decline, but opened it up for more nominations. No further nominations occurred. No opposition. Dave Knutzen suggested possibly going to co-chair establishment. Existing legislation and proposed legislation stipulates a chair. Chair's authority is to work with the PSRFE coordinator between meetings.

| | | |
|-------------|---|--|
| CONCLUSIONS | Clint Muns to remain chair of the PSRFE OC. | |
|-------------|---|--|

| | | |
|--------------|--------------------|----------|
| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
|--------------|--------------------|----------|

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| Clint Muns remains chair | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|

| | | |
|------------|--------------------------------|--|
| DISCUSSION | Minutes of previous meeting/s. | |
|------------|--------------------------------|--|

Minutes from the October 6, October 26, and December 15 (all 2010) were presented.

| | | |
|-------------|--|--|
| CONCLUSIONS | Dave Croonquist moved that all minutes be accepted and was seconded by two others. No opposition. All minutes were accepted as read. | |
|-------------|--|--|

| | | |
|--------------|--------------------|----------|
| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
|--------------|--------------------|----------|

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| N/A | | |
|-----|--|--|

| | | |
|------------|----------------|--|
| DISCUSSION | Budget Update. | |
|------------|----------------|--|

Steve Thiesfeld presented a budget update. With the various activities we do, most of which he went

over on the production table, down at the bottom you will see some things like fish health. We have to ensure that our fish are healthy and they need to be sampled to see if they are healthy or if they need to be treated as necessary; we have the coordinator (which is my position) – two months’ of my salary each year; and then marine fish enhancement lingcod – the legislation authorizes us to work with marine fish and right now we are funding some tagging of some artificial lingcod production at Manchester Lab when those fish are released they get radio- or acoustic-tagged and Jon tracks them around and sees where they are going; we also have below the Glenwood Springs and Rick’s Pond, we have the Lake Washington sockeye – again that’s contributing to the counting the fish as they come through the locks – we do that every year; and finally the coded-wire tags. This is how we are evaluating these programs – we have to pay to put those CWTs in each year. So the allotment (amount budgeted for the biennium), total is \$2.863m. There is a fiscal year 2010 breakout; sometimes the money is not allotted 50/50 between the first year and the second year; then the third column over (with numbers) is the actual expenditures for the first fiscal year. The state fiscal year is run July 1 through June 30.

We had budgeted \$1.46m the first fiscal year and we spent \$1.32m so we actually had a variance (difference between what was budgeted and what was spent) so we were actually \$140,000 to the positive in the first fiscal year. For the fiscal year, we had planned about \$1.4m in expenses. Our plan to date is what we planned through whenever I ran this, which was this morning. Of the \$1.4m predicted, we would have spent \$851,000 by now. Our expenditures to date are about \$650,000. We are actually coming in a little under budget, but that always happens this time of year. The hatchery boys will not leave any dollars left unspent, and before the end of the fiscal year you will see those expenditures get a lot closer to what we have allotted.

Of note, the variances in the fiscal year to date is the one in red (in parentheses is a negative number in this accounting methodology). You will see that Chambers Creek yearling’s budget is \$35,000 in the hole for fiscal year to date. There is only \$9-10,000 in that account to get us through the rest of the biennium, and I suspect we are going to be over by the end of it all. The region is working to try to help out with this, and they are showing some of the savings for Minter and maybe even Hoodspport might make it back over there to help Jim out this go round. Hoodspport is \$73,000 positive for the biennium. Other noticeable differences are there is Wallace at about \$130,000 to the positive right now and they have allotted their money really weirdly; they allotted more money this fiscal year than they did the last one. I have some hope that we are going to see some of those savings come around to us. The other one that is showing a pretty positive variance is the \$70,000 for the biennium for the coordinator.

As you recall we were hoping to have a full-time coordinator on and working for us by now and that has not happened. We still have that, and if we are successful in getting the position; that will eat into the budget as well as the \$15,000 we decided to allocate for Rick’s Pond for one more year of production. Another notable on the down side is the Lake Washington sockeye. I did not allot that money correctly. That will come out the \$70,000 coordinator budget as well (~\$3-4,000 more). We are looking pretty good for this year, and we may have some money to help with Chambers.

Whenever money comes into the agency, the Indirect is an overhead rate the agency charges for purchasing, payroll, and region office support, etc. It is 17% of the money received that is not spent on fish food.

Hopefully we will come out about even and obtain some of the savings. Presumably, we will get a request from Jon for some tags soon, and that will probably come out of the \$70,000 as well. All spending is authorized by the Legislature. We want to keep a little bit of surplus, but not a lot. In the lean budget times, if we had a lot, it would be put to another use. This has eliminated any idea that we would ever be able to fund a capital project.

| | | |
|------------------|---------------------|----------|
| CONCLUSIONS | | |
| | | |
| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
| To be continued. | | |
| DISCUSSION | Legislative Update. | |

Steve received a call from Kurt today re SB5291 out of natural resources and marine waters in the Senate. Jo (Deputy Assistant Director) asked if it included the CCA friendly amendment. I don't know. There is a hearing tomorrow at the House. I am passing out the original legislative document along with the friendly amendment document. I have read the proposed changes. This was sent to you all previously, so hopefully, you have all had a chance to look it over. Steve walked through the changes (blue denotes CCA's changes, red denotes our changes). Page 4, first sentence should state: Increase angler trips and participation, on line 11 added **to the maximum extent possible the Department shall seek to reach consensus**. Not a deal breaker from the Department's perspective. Section 6 suggested addition the director shall appoint at least 7 members from a list of applicants, and they added **and recommendations of recognized recreational fishing organizations** ensuring broad representation from the local sport fishing community. **The director shall give deference to the recommendations of recognized recreational fishing organizations in selecting advisory committee members**. What you'll note there is that we specifically took out organizations because the agency and the group felt that you do not have to be a member of an organization to represent sport fishing interests. Not sure what recognized recreational organizations are. One more on the next page in paragraph 3, One of the responsibilities of the oversight committee was to report annually to the director and to the commission on the goals of the program, the effectiveness of the program in meeting those goals, review and provide (we had had guidance in there, they struck it out), recommendations to the department on the annual budget **and program expenditures**. The agency as a whole does not have a huge amount of heartburn with the basic ideas that are instilled in here. There is some angst over the part about the agency having some deference to applicants in organizations. Clint stated that his primary objection to this is that at this late point in time to come in and change the language, it did not set well with me and after having read it wondering if we are just kind of expanding the language without really changing anything. It seems to me that the director obviously will gravitate toward applications from recognized organizations. As members of recognized organizations can be most prominent in regard to interactions with the agency, and I also have a little bit of issue that it is not very specific as far as excluding non-organizational representation but it seems like it kind of eludes to that. I do not agree with that if that is what the intent is. Dave Croonquist stated that this kind of language should the proposed merger pass and the director becomes appointed by the Governor's office this would force that the director to utilize groups like the CCA or whatever so from that standpoint this could be a cushion against people from coming in from other organizations like commercial fishing organizations or whatever. Steve indicated that he did not know if these last appointments to the committee has anything to do with this language, but the CCA did have an application who was not selected as it was felt that the CCA had enough representation on this committee. I am just reaching as to whether that was part of it. Dave is on the CCA and this is the first time he has heard of it as well as Norm. It did not go through proper procedures with CCA. Clint stated that the committee spent a significant time coming up with this language, and the first time I heard of the changes was on Saturday. The key point is that we as an oversight committee did write a letter that we handed to the agency's legislative liaison, Ann, to carry forward to help with passage of our legislative proposal and we pointed out that we supported the proposal as it existed. At this point I am scheduled to be at the House hearing tomorrow on the companion bill. Is that letter still valid? In my mind it is. What does the oversight committee recommend? I do not want to sit there and misrepresent the oversight committee. Steve indicated that the applicants were asked if they were representing an organization in an official capacity. The member needs to be able to get information out to the recreational community whether it be through an organization or to various individuals. It is not necessary to belong to an organization to be able to do this. Clint wants to know that in light of this new language, do we still want the letter agreed to by the committee to stand as it is – do I use the same approach? Yes, as the language has not yet changed. Agency is okay with parts 1 and 3. Part 2 causes some consternation. Our revised language, **"The director shall appoint at least 7 members representing sport fishing interests to the committee from the list of applicants and recommendations from recognized recreational fishing organizations to ensure broad and effective representation of the recreational fishing community. The director shall recognize the importance of nominations from recognized recreational organizations in selecting advisory committee members."** We are saying that we will recognize the importance, but not saying we will have deference. That is our recommendation back to CCA to make that palatable to the agency.

| | |
|-------------|--|
| CONCLUSIONS | Use the original testimony and get more in-depth and discuss via email as to whether to support this new language. |
|-------------|--|

| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
|---|--|----------|
| Discuss via email | Clint Muns | |
| DISCUSSION | 2011-13 Biennial Budget – | |
| <p>At the December special meeting the committee voted to accept the Department's response to the recommendations of the committee to take the \$125,000 reduction only at Soos and not consider Icy and/or Chambers/Lakewood complex. Jim had given an assignment to a number of us to describe what a reduction at any of those facilities would look like. We have not made much progress at accurately describing those reductions, and, basically, he has asked us to go back to the drawing board. Jim asked for a number of things he wants to see in an evaluation: 1) to make sure what our appropriate level of staffing for the number of fish being raised in each of these facilities; 2) what any hatchery reform implications of a cut at any particular program; 3) maintaining the highest value programs to the agency so one of the considerations is that if we were take a cut at Icy Creek we could lose a steelhead program where does that steelhead program fit in with the department's values? How much value do we have on that program? There are these interacting factors that occur and you guys that have been around are well aware that hatcheries don't run just off PSRE dollars, there is a lot of an interaction between those. He asked me to go back and not only look at contribution to the Puget Sound marine sport, but wants to see the blackmouth sport as well as all Puget Sound fisheries. Obviously, there are some tribal implications to any changes that we make, so we need to make sure that we have appropriate funding level for all sources of revenue at each facility, and again, this idea of maintaining a diversity of release strategies of PSRE program. The alternatives that had been developed and presented to Phil or the evaluation to Jim, and how they were going to affect those programs were not analyzed very well. The committee's request has not been rejected, but it has not been accepted either. What he wants is for staff to make a decision whether is it just at Soos or will he have to go against the committee's guidance and recommendations and do it somewhere else. So at this point, I can't tell you what his or the agency's final decision will be on where that \$125,000 ends up.</p> <p>The coordinator position is slated to have six months' salary paid through the PSRE and the other six months would be from another source. Interpretation was that because the agency was trying to come up with something easier to sell to OFM to get the position accepted. This is a group process to provide the information to Jim; it involves regional staff, and hatchery staff. That group did not provide information for this decision. Jim asked us to go back again and provide that information so that he could evaluate it.</p> <p>When budget cuts were being made, did you look at the evaluation piece of coded-wire tagging, fish marking because a lot of these groups have been them for several years and it seems like we could maybe skip some years, save some money. Response: in the last biennium we actually cut that in half. As we have gone through this process of trying to figure out contribution rates, I personally was feeling like half of what we had the previous year was probably going to make that more difficult. It is believed that the CWT data is going to be more valuable. This provides good information when you are evaluating these programs, and when you are missing information it is tough.</p> | | |
| CONCLUSIONS | Meeting scheduled with Jim [Scott], Heather Bartlett (our Hatchery Division Manager), and regional staff to go over these alternatives in a much more thorough manner than before. | |
| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
| Meet with Jim and hatchery personnel | Steve Thiesfeld | ASAP |
| DISCUSSION | Full-time Coordinator. | |
| <p>On the full-time position for combined DJ & PSRE money for the PSRE/Puget Sound Recreation assistant, the OFM request was denied. We are back to the drawing board on trying to beef it up. The director's office is going to go over to OFM and do what he can to try to get that approved. I have already been assigned new tasks and they are not going to go away. They say that it does not meet legislative exemption criteria. Now with the bill that came through in the last session, it's very specific exemption for a position - how does that position generate revenue or meet the public safety criteria? They are</p> | | |

scrutinizing everything about - you have to tell them everything about that position. The legislation just approves the position number; there is no description what the position is. It is stated that the Department shall identify a coordinator, and this should be the opening comments when they go to OFM to justify the position; and that we need to fill it as a full-time position in order for that person to continue to supervise the program and continue to generate the millions of dollars that salmon creates for the state's economy. Those were a lot of the sentiments that were put forth. This has now been tied a lot stronger with revenue generation, but I am not sure that they see that. I believe when they think of revenue generation, they think of new revenue generation. At this point, there is nothing we can do, but allow Joe Stohr to try to convince OFM that we need this position.

It was asked if we could not use an FTE, or could we use a contract to have the coordinator position filled? This is unknown, but there may be a restriction in personal services contracts. It was suggested that we take this in as an alternative. The reason for staying within the agency is so that they would have access to push topics through the agency easier than others. It was thought that we would prefer to have an assistant rather than just a full-time coordinator. We should keep all our options on the table, but give Joe a chance to resolve this. Dave Croonquist suggested using the Governor's Salmon Recovery Board as a building block to this end.

| | |
|-------------|--|
| CONCLUSIONS | There is a meeting on Wednesday. Joe Stohr is walking it through to OFM to try to gain approval. Clint believes at this point we need to wait and see how Joe's input fairs. |
|-------------|--|

| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
|--------------|--------------------|----------|
| | | |

| | |
|------------|------------------|
| DISCUSSION | Ling Cod Update. |
|------------|------------------|

Jon Lee provided an overview for the new members on board, then an It is a research project to try to find out the costs and benefits of releasing hatchery lingcod in the wild. The biggest benefit is fishery contributions, but I want to focus on the impacts of wild fish. We are planning on doing a before and after control impact study. The idea behind that is that we will have two control sites where no hatchery lingcod are release and two that have hatchery lingcod releases. We will do transects with either divers or ROVs and look at the effects of hatchery lingcod on wild fish abundance and diversity. Before we can have a before/after comparison, we need to be able to release fish and have them stay there. In the last couple years we have been doing small scale releases of sub-yearling and yearling lingcod. These are really small scale releases of less than 50 fish – four releases of lingcod that are 9 months, 11 months, 17 months, and 21 months old. These are small scale releases but they are tagged with acoustic tags that send out pings that we capture so we can find out where the fish went. We track at 3 weeks, 36 weeks, 44 weeks, and 52 weeks after release. We are finding that the youngest fish have the lowest fidelity – sub-yearlings released at 9 months and 11 months of age, hardly any of them remained one year after release, whereas 25% of the 17-month old fish still remain, but not the 21-month old fish. It appears that the 17-month old lingcod stay close to release – perhaps because the release was in July and there is more food source at the location at that time of year. We are seeing the 9-month old and 11 month-old fish in other areas. What we think is happening we are releasing and they don't have a structure yet. Either they don't have a preference and they wander or they are looking for something else so they move away and when they get older they start to prefer a structure and go the nearest one. We have learned not to release 9- and 11-month old fish if you want to a control before/after impact because they scatter. What we will do is release 17-month old fish in the summer, July or August. These are hypothetical release sites and we need to do some surveys on habitat. Now, we are moving on to collecting eggs for larger scale releases. We started in mid-January and have collected from 33 egg masses so far; the target is 19 so we are getting there. These egg masses can be about the size of a watermelon, and we take about a softball to a softball and a half size of eggs. We are collecting from a number of masses to try to extract the genetic composition. We are also taking portions of those egg masses so that some can remain in the wild to grow up naturally. In the near future we will start surveys at the future control and impact sites, and in 2012 we are planning larger scale releases. We will use genetics to find out what they are eating. Will fish for tagged fish to see what they are eating as well. Will provide larger-scale releases in increments to see how well they stay in the area released. The tags have depth sensors on

| | | |
|--|---|----------|
| <p>them and if they are at the bottom we will know. So far we have not had that happen. This is occurring because it is thought that the populations are depleted. Investment of recreational enhancement dollars is best spent on the study of the practicality of culturing lingcod. When we looked at Pacific cod, we are at the southern-most portion of their area, whereas with lingcod we are right in the middle of their area.</p> | | |
| CONCLUSIONS | Would like to use ROV and transects for surveys on larger-scale releases. | |
| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
| DISCUSSION | Puget Sound Harvest Management Plan (PSHMP) | |
| <p>At this point, NOAA is not approving anything beyond 2012. Not approving the 5-year plan. We are lucky to get approval for the 2-year plan. We don't know what their thinking is as far as approval. In addition to the coalition of recreational groups, they are saying that it doesn't meet the hatchery reform criteria, Wild Fish Conservancy. The other piece that has been added lately is killer whales. It is believed that they are going to revisit the US/Canada Treaty to study the impacts on the killer whales. They are going to meet with the Pacific Salmon Commission next week and give a presentation about what they are really thinking in terms of killer whales. They are pretty much pointing to the fisheries as taking enough Chinook salmon to limit the recovery of the killer whales and are looking at places where the fisheries could be reduced to leave more Chinook out there. That has a potential to be huge. They cannot tell you why or when they are dying, but they say it is the lack of Chinook. They have found that their diet is 6-8% of groundfish. Our groundfish populations are horrible. They state that they are eating the chum because the Chinook are not available.</p> | | |
| CONCLUSIONS | We will have the 2-year plan, and then it is back to the drawing board. It may just be a coincidence that the killer whale subject came up, as there are so many other things going on currently. Presentation on killer whales next week. We will have a better take on their stance then. | |
| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
| DISCUSSION | Questions from members or the public | |
| None. | | |
| CONCLUSIONS | | |
| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
| OBSERVERS | Michael Schmidt and Art Tachell | |
| RESOURCE PERSONS | Colleen Desselle | |
| SPECIAL NOTES | Next meeting to be determined. Tentative schedule: Manchester in July; Wallace in October. Three months puts us in May. Will have a Doodle Poll after Friday (Soos Creek). Then July at Manchester, and the next one in October at Wallace (tentative schedule). | |
| Adjourned | 8:39 p.m. | |