

MEETING SUMMARY

Hatchery Scientific Review Group July 16–18, 2002, Coast Bastion Inn, Nanaimo, BC

Agenda: The purpose of this meeting was to review draft recommendations for the Skagit and Nooksack/Samish regions; to make revisions to the *Scientific Framework and Hatchery Review Program* document; and to discuss a number of other Hatchery Reform Project-related issues.

In Attendance:

1. HSRG members John Barr (vice chair), Lee Blankenship (vice chair), Don Campton, Trevor Evelyn, Connie Mahnken, Lars Mobernd, Lisa Seeb and Paul Seidel.
2. Facilitation team members Barbara Cairns, Kathleen Hopper, Michael Kern, Bj Mirk, Michael Schmidt and Jim Waldo.
3. Brian Anderson, Greg Bonnell, Carol Cross, Doug Loftus, Sue Lehman, Don McKinley, Brian Pearce and Al Shank of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada (DFO) joined the Scientific Group on July 16 for a discussion about the Hatchery Reform Project and DFO's upcoming hatchery review process.

Discussions/Presentations:

On July 16, Jim Waldo welcomed Scientific Group members to the meeting and reviewed the agenda. Michael Kern reviewed the meeting materials. Barbara Cairns provided a communications update. Barbara said that the facilitation team will focus communications efforts in the coming months on building support for implementation of the Scientific Group's recommendations.

The Scientific Group made several decisions about upcoming meetings, agreeing to hold the January 14–16, 2003 Research Review meeting in Olympia; and to hold February 11–14 and March 19–21, 2003 as the tentative dates for the Hood Canal Regional Review meetings. These latter dates will be finalized by the September meeting, pending a review of other schedules.

The Scientific Group held an informal discussion with members of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada (DFO). The session began with a PowerPoint presentation, delivered by Lee Blankenship, on the Hatchery Reform Project, the Scientific Group and the regional review process. In the discussion that followed, DFO members expressed a great deal of interest in the project and in what the Scientific Group thought were the most important elements of the project's success to date. Scientific Group members pointed to the project's "four-legged stool," consisting of an independent science panel, a committee of top-level decision makers, a third-party project management/facilitation/communications team, and the support of key elected officials. They also mentioned the early agreement by all four entities on the project's twin goals of helping to conserve naturally-spawning populations and supporting sustainable fisheries. Also highlighted was the regional approach to reviewing hatchery programs in the context of the

HSRG Meeting Summary
July 16–18, 2002

watersheds in which they operate, including regional conservation and harvest goals, stock status and habitat conditions.

After the DFO personnel departed, the Scientific Group discussed the upcoming Central Puget Sound Regional Review. The group made a few minor revisions to the stock list for this region, reviewed briefing book material assembled to date, and discussed how best to acquire any information that had not yet been provided by the co-managers. The Scientific Group also discussed the field tour that would occupy the August meeting, agreeing what sub-regions to view on what day, and what facilities and features are the most important to see first-hand.

The Scientific Group then held a discussion on desired outcomes for implementation of hatchery reform recommendations. The group agreed that some of the recommendations included in their 2001 report will require only programmatic changes. Progress on implementing these changes should be tracked and synthesized into a coherent story to communicate to the public.

The Scientific Group agreed that monitoring and evaluation was the key to determining the overall success of hatchery reforms and assigned a task team to delineate what outcomes should result from these monitoring and evaluation efforts. The focus will be on what a manager needs to know to make informed decisions and what questions need to be asked to produce that data. The result should be a useful management tool. The Scientific Group decided to suggest that a pilot monitoring and evaluation effort be conducted in one or more of the regions reviewed.

Lastly, the Scientific Group agreed that there would be a continuing need for an independent science and reporting function after the regional reviews are completed, in order to ensure implementation of the reforms. This role should be less rigorous and time-consuming than the regional review process, and more focused on compliance assessment and monitoring/evaluation.

On July 17, the Scientific Group spent most of the day making a series of specific revisions to the draft recommendations for the first two regions reviewed in 2002. The group spent most of this time on the Skagit region, since the Nooksack/Samish participants have yet to provide feedback from the June informal review session.

At the end of the day, task teams were assigned to revise the various chapters of the *Scientific Framework and Hatchery Review Program* document. The Scientific Group then spent July 18 working as task teams and then gathering in plenary session to review the teams' products. Various individual and task team assignments were made to ensure that all the revisions planned for the document are ready for incorporation at the end of the year, after the Central Puget Sound regional review.