

# MEETING SUMMARY

## Hatchery Scientific Review Group Courtyard by Marriott, Tukwila, Washington February 11–13, 2002

---

**Agenda:** The purpose of this meeting was to receive oral reports on activities of the WDFW and NWIFC agency science teams during 2001; make decisions on which research projects to fund in 2002; continue assembling the *Scientific Framework and Hatchery Review Program* document; receive an update on project communications activities, including an upcoming news conference; and to prepare for upcoming regional reviews.

### **In Attendance:**

1. HSRG members John Barr (vice chair), Lee Blankenship (vice chair), Trevor Evelyn, Connie Mahnken, Lars Mobrand (chair), Lisa Seeb, NWIFC alternate Paul Dorn and WDFW alternate Geraldine Van Der Haegen. Bill Smoker was in attendance on February 12 and 13.
2. Facilitation team members Michael Kern, Bj Mirk (not in attendance on February 11) and Michael Schmidt (not in attendance on February 13). Barbara Cairns and Jim Waldo were in attendance on February 13.
3. Darrell Mills and Jack Tipping of WDFW and Ken Currens of NWIFC joined the Scientific Group on the morning of February 11 to provide agency science team updates.

### **Discussions/Presentations:**

On February 11, Michael Kern welcomed Scientific Group members to the meeting and reviewed the agenda and meeting materials. The Scientific Group finalized a draft letter to the Past Presidents Council of the American Fisheries Society, requesting nominees for the independent scientist seat being vacated by Bob Piper. Lee presented Geraldine Van Der Haegen as his alternate from WDFW.

The Scientific Group received a presentation from Darrell Mills and Jack Tipping describing WDFW agency science team activities for 2001. Darrell said that hatchery reform implementation projects are already getting underway at WDFW, guided by the Scientific Group's early recommendations and the Department's best approximation of how the Scientific Group's philosophies would be likely to apply to regions not yet reviewed. The Scientific Group cautioned WDFW to be very clear about the distinction between these two types of projects, so that there be no chance of projects being wrongly attributed to the Scientific Group that they have not reviewed.

Darrell went on to say that the Department is beginning to develop cooperative implementation relationships with agencies like the Corps of Engineers, and that the Governor has set aside \$8 million in his proposed economic stimulus package for hatchery reform implementation projects.

**HSRG Meeting Summary  
February 11–13, 2002**

Jack provided a description of equipment provided to certain hatcheries that will reform hatchery practices at those facilities.

Ken Currens made a presentation to the Scientific Group on NWIFC agency science team activities for 2001. He said the Hatchery Reform Project process has been helpful in bringing focus to tribal hatchery reforms beyond chinook and Endangered Species Act compliance, also in giving the state and the tribes an opportunity to revisit their management goals and processes. He said the resulting recommendations have been very useful.

After discussion, ranking proposals individually and as a group, and considering several options, the Scientific Group unanimously approved a set of research proposals to fund in 2002 (for a list of these projects, please contact the facilitation team). The group directed the chair and vice chair to send a letter to all research proposal applicants explaining the decisions. The Scientific Group also expressed dissatisfaction with being able to fund relatively few research projects this year and decided to put a higher priority on research in the 2003 budget request.

The Scientific Group devoted much of the meeting to completing its Monitoring and Evaluation Criteria, first in task teams and then as a group. The criteria are structured to ask, “What needs to be evaluated in order to monitor the Scientific Group’s Operational Guidelines?”

The Scientific Group made a series of assignments for completion of its *Scientific Framework and Hatchery Review Program* document. The group agreed that the December 2000 version of the *Scientific Framework for the Artificial Propagation of Salmon and Steelhead* will be used for this document and can be made available immediately on the web site. All other chapters will be added to the web site as they are completed. The document will not be published in hard copy until all chapters are completed. Significant additions to the Framework will be made via the *Emerging Issues in Hatchery Reform* chapter.

Barbara Cairns led a discussion of the news conference that will be held on February 19 at REI in Seattle to present the 2001 Hatchery Reform Recommendations report. She explained that the purpose of the conference is to provide an update on the project’s accomplishments to both early supporters and a larger audience. The Scientific Group asked the chair to emphasize a series of points in his remarks at the new conference, including the project’s new goals for hatcheries and that hatcheries do have a role to play in achieving these goals; and a focus on the Scientific Group’s Area-Wide Recommendations. They also asked him to emphasize that this is a scientific approach to reducing risks and looking for benefits and opportunities; that implementation of these scientific recommendations remains the job of the managers; and that this process and the tools created are models that can be used elsewhere on similar problems and should be used by the managers for future adaptive management of this process.

The Scientific Group agreed that the facilitation team should work with the chair and vice chairs to draft a Hatchery Reform Project budget request for 2003. The budget should be emailed to the Scientific Group, to see if it is acceptable, and to the Hatchery Reform Coordinating Committee, to ensure the information they provided is incorporated accurately. If further discussion is needed, a conference call may be set up.

**HSRG Meeting Summary  
February 11–13, 2002**

The Scientific Group asked Michael Kern to email the draft revised policies and procedures, including draft publications policies. Unless there are issues that cannot be resolved via email, Michael will finalize the policies and put them up on the web site.

The Briefing Book for the Skagit Regional Review was delayed because materials for it were late in arriving. The book will be distributed (probably by email with hard copies available at the meeting) as soon as they can be completed. As in the past, a task team will meet prior to the March meeting to draft the goals section of the Benefit/Risk worksheets. The Scientific Group agreed to have an introductory lunch for the Nooksack/Samish region on March 7 in Mount Vernon, during the Skagit Regional Review.

The Scientific Group selected the Grays Harbor region as the fourth to be reviewed during 2002, pending confirmation that this works for WDFW and the relevant tribes. The Scientific Group and facilitation team selected meeting dates through January 2003. They are as follows:

- March 5 (evening) –8, Mount Vernon (Skagit Regional Review)
- April 3–5, Mount Vernon (Skagit Regional Review)
- May 7 (evening) –10, Bellingham (Nooksack/Samish Regional Review)
- June 19–21, Bellingham (Nooksack/Samish Regional Review)
- July 16–18, Nanaimo, BC (catch-up)
- August 13 (evening) –16, Seattle (Central Sound Regional Review)
- September 10–12, Seattle (Central Sound Regional Review)
- October 16–18, Seattle (Central Sound Regional Review)
- November 12 (evening) –15, Aberdeen/Hoquiam or Olympia (Grays Harbor Regional Review)
- December 17–19, Tukwila? (catch-up)
- January 14–16, Aberdeen/Hoquiam or Olympia (Grays Harbor Regional Review)