Appendix VII-Process Facilitation Report

Coastal Multi-Species Conservation and Management Plan

Facilitator's Report

Prepared for:

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Prepared by:

COGAN OWENS COGAN

April 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

Cogan Owens Cogan, LLC (COC) has been retained by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) to facilitate the design and implementation of a program of stakeholder and public engagement for the Coastal Multi-Species Conservation and Management Plan (CMP). This report summarizes the engagement program used to develop the CMP and catalogues the input received to date. It includes:

- Summary of the stakeholder and public engagement process
- Observations by the facilitator about the process
- Reporting of input received at public open houses
- Inclusion of other input received

The CMP has been prepared by ODFW to address conservation and management of those salmon and trout species on the Oregon coast that have not been addressed in previous planning efforts, e.g. coastal coho. This Plan is unique from other conservation plans in that it addresses six distinct groups of fish species, none of which are listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), and it addresses both conservation and utilization of these fish. The CMP is intended to provide long-term management direction for species which are relatively healthy to ensure they remain so and to ensure the continued existence of wild fish and the fisheries which wild and hatchery fish support. The Plan strives to achieve a balance between hatchery programs and fishing opportunity with wild fish conservation by accepting higher risk to wild fish in some locations and lower risk in other locations based on wild fish range, diversity and productivity. Overarching goals are to avoid additional ESA listings and ad-hoc species-by-species, basin-by-basin, and year-by-year management, as well as to provide certainty to interested parties for how wild and hatchery-produced fish will be managed.

Overview of Public Engagement Process

A multi-faceted public engagement process has been used to prepare the CMP. In addition to the Stakeholder Team process and general public outreach detailed in this report, CMP development has been informed by Salmon and Trout Enhancement Program (STEP) groups and the Salmon and Trout Advisory Committee (STAC), a scientific opinion survey, habitat experts, and the Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team (IMST). The key elements of the CMP public engagement process have included:

- Four volunteer stratum ***Stakeholder Teams*** were formed by ODFW to provide feedback on draft management actions and other CMP elements. The Stakeholder Teams represented a range of coastal interests including watershed councils, conservation groups, STEP members, fishing guides, angler groups, commercial fishers, resource producers, local governments, Native American tribes, and the public-at-large. Non-voting state and federal natural resource agency staff also participated. Development of recommended management actions was led by the Stakeholder Teams, who generally operated by consensus. (Details on the Stakeholder Team process are provided in Section III below.)

- Formed by ODFW to provide initial feedback on habitat components and strategies in the CMP, two meetings of ***Habitat Technical Work Groups*** (HTWG) were conducted in November 2012 to receive input on what analyses the CMP should include to help prioritize habitat actions and projects and to identify what other habitat assessments and prioritizations are already in use. Members included representatives of the Stakeholder Teams, watershed councils, soil and water conservation districts, tribes, state and federal land management agencies, forest and agricultural landowners, and other interests.

- ODFW contracted the Survey Research Center at Oregon State University to conduct a scientific ***Opinion Survey*** of the general public (1,500 surveys mailed; 28.5% response rate) and licensed anglers west of the Cascades (6,000 surveys mailed; 36% response rate). Both groups generally supported efforts to conserve wild salmonids while allowing limited harvest. *The survey process and results are reported in a separate report to the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission (OFWC).*

- The ***Independent Multidisciplinary Science Team*** (IMST) is a scientific review panel charged with advising the State of Oregon on matters of science related to the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds. IMST provided a comprehensive review of the CMP, with numerous suggestions but no formal recommendations. *IMST comments and ODFW's responses are available in a separate report to the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission (OFWC).*

- ***General Public Outreach*** was extensive and occurred through meetings with interested groups and individuals throughout the planning process, consultation with the Coastal Caucus and individual state legislators and local government representatives, comment opportunities at Stakeholder Team meetings, public open houses, and a formal public comment period. In addition, information about the CMP process, draft recommendations, and opportunities for comment were provided the project website. In addition, public comment opportunities are being provided by the OFWC. (Details on the public engagement process are provided in Section V below.)

II. OBSERVATIONS

COC appreciated and enjoyed this opportunity to work with ODFW and the coastal community to develop conservation and management direction for non-ESA listed fish species on the coast. We greatly value the relationships we've built with Department staff and Stakeholder Team members. We continue to be impressed by the dedication of staff to produce the best possible product, to attempt to inform and respond in a timely and helpful manner, and to accept suggestions and criticism without engaging in debate. Similarly, we are impressed by the incredible commitment and dedication among Stakeholder Team members to both the process and to striving to achieve consensus among their various interests. Finally, we note the high level of passion that coastal participants bring to the discussion of fish management. Additional observations address a variety of aspects of the planning process.

- ***From a public engagement perspective, the CPM process was very successful*** for a variety of reasons:

- The process brought together a variety of disparate interests to engage in challenging policy discussions and to actively collaborate toward consensus-based outcomes.
- Given the highly-charged nature of fish management on the coast, Stakeholder Team representatives and members of the public for the most part displayed admirable respect and appreciation for the Department's efforts, as well as generally respectful behavior toward divergent opinions among their fellow participants. The process entailed considerable give-and-take and learning about each other's issues and interests.
- The Commission Review Draft CMP has been significantly molded, and in many cases improved, by both Stakeholder Team and general public input.
- The public's understanding of the complexities associated with managing six distinct groups of fish species across four stratum is substantively improved, as is the recognition of the pragmatic challenges in balancing improved conservation and expanded fishing opportunities for these species.
- As detailed in Section V below and evidenced by the 700 pages of comments, interested parties were provided a variety of opportunities to engage throughout the process. All who wished to have been provided the opportunity to be heard.

- ***The CMP process was intentionally different***. COC has been directly involved in or observed a number of ODFW's conservation planning processes, which typically have been characterized by sequential chapter-by-chapter vetting of draft products and a three-year or longer planning process. To expedite CMP development, the standard planning process was modified in several key ways:

  - Prior to circulating a draft plan for public review, a focused Stakeholder Team process (as described below) was used to develop a portfolio of management actions that on balance could be expected to have general support of constituent groups. This included developing a relatively complete "strawman" portfolio of management actions that was vetted, revised and re-vetted with the Stakeholder Teams before developing a public review draft.
  - Rather than starting with a "blank slate," Current Status information and preliminary management actions were drafted by ODFW for review, reaction and recommended modification by the Stakeholder Teams.
  - In lieu of a series of monthly or bi-monthly meetings, initial Stakeholder Team meetings in each of the four stratum were compressed into a short period of time (two or three consecutive days), moving from one stratum to the next. Later Stakeholder Team meetings were combined into north and south coast strata to facilitate cross-strata communication and reduce demands on staff and Stakeholder Team members.

- Noted above is the impressive commitment and dedication among Stakeholder Team members over the past 18+ months to a collaborative planning process. Achieving the right mix of interest group representatives to enable constructive participation is always a challenge in a multi-interest process. Representatives of the four stratum teams were selected through a district-to-State Office vetting process that resulted in ***groups that were generally well representative of the key interests in their specific geographic areas***. The four stratum teams ***functioned collaboratively and respectfully and consensus was generally achieved*** (with some exceptions) on group recommendations at each phase in the planning process. The shortcomings of the process occurred primarily between and not at meetings:

- The ***agreements to compromise made at meetings often disintegrated post-meeting*** as representatives advised their groups of the result of the Stakeholder Team deliberations. As a consequence, consensus recommendations developed at one meeting were frequently revisited and modified at the next.
- Stakeholder Team members were expected to serve as liaisons with their representative groups to help avoid surprises and misunderstandings associated with release of draft CMP products. While many members executed well this responsibility, open house and written comments suggest ***numerous interest groups were either not briefed on or did not understand or accept the Stakeholder Teams' consensus recommendations***.

- A portfolio approach was used to identify areas subject to different emphases on wild fish, hatchery fish and fishing opportunity, with the goal to achieve a balance in each stratum and coastwide between conservation and fishing opportunity. ***While the Stakeholder Team recommendations represent, for the most part, an honest attempt to achieve this balance, interest groups and the general public did not seem to buy into the need to achieve a balance, with objection to change to the status quo dominating much of the public comment on the CMP.*** There is also a general lack of understanding of why the CMP is needed, suggesting that the "whys" of the CMP and what is different versus remains the same could have been better articulated.

- Of some surprise has been the ***level of misinformation disseminated*** intentionally and unintentionally (in some cases due to not reading Plan details) about what the CMP proposes. For example, some individuals and groups fueled a perception that the CMP proposed to shut down or significantly curtail certain hatchery facilities, which was not the case. Irrespective of proposed increases in hatchery releases in all stratum, the Department was repeatedly criticized for having an anti-hatchery bias. Seemingly minor changes in specific hatchery programs were often characterized as major program shifts.

- Unsurprisingly, ***the question of how much of a threat hatchery fish are to wild fish dominated much of the Stakeholder Team and public conversation***. For all except a handful of parties who deny such a threat exists, the debate centered on how significant that threat is and how prepared ODFW is to monitor and respond to it in specific locations.

- Numerous parties expressed ***frustration with the Plan's approach to management of predation and habitat.*** The Department's limited ability to manage predators is poorly understood. Despite convening a variety of habitat experts in two Habitat Technical Working Group meetings, for many the Plan's approach to habitat restoration and protection has been both disjointed and non-substantive, despite having some very progressive strategies included in the Plan. ***In the future, the Department should better characterize opportunities and limitations on its authority up-front.***

- While Stakeholder Team representatives understood and appreciated an accelerated process (in comparison to other planning processes), some members of the public raised ***concerns about a secret Stakeholder Team process, inadequate public notification, and an overly aggressive planning process.*** These parties also typically objected to any proposed changes to the status quo in

their area. ***Given that, outside of OFWC deliberations, there are no statutory or procedural requirements for public meetings on the Plan, it is ironic that these concerns were often raised in public open houses which the Department voluntarily conducted*** to provide public information and receive input.

- As a public policy-setting exercise, ***the value of senior management participation and leadership*** in all phases of the project cannot be overstated. Having the Fish Division Administrator consistently present as the face of the agency has been especially critical in public open houses and interest group negotiations. Also essential to the success of the process has been the ***sustained commitment of expert staff*** to the project in the face of competing needs.

- Convened to provide information and receive input on a draft CMP, the series of ***six open houses were both well attended and generally well received*** (see details in Section IV below). The open houses were intentionally designed to begin with an informational presentation followed by an open house forum in which participants could review CMP details and meet with staff, before convening for a public comment session. Combined with a trained facilitator managing the public testimony and ensuring that all who wanted had the opportunity to speak, ***the format served to ameliorate the amount and tone of public comment shifting it from potentially negative and confrontational to constructive and respectful.***

III. STAKEHOLDER TEAM PROCESS

As part of the process to develop the CMP, ODFW established four stratum Stakeholder Teams to assist and advise the Department on management programs and actions for inclusion in the CMP. Stakeholder Team roles included:

- Provide recommendations on hatchery and harvest programs/actions in the context of their risk to wild populations and effect on fishing opportunity and, to a lesser degree, predator and habitat issues.
- Facilitate communication and gathering and exchange of information needed to develop recommendations in response to ODFW proposed management programs and actions.
- Bring the concerns and perspectives of stakeholder constituencies to the Stakeholder Team meetings for discussion and consensus building.
- Communicate with their respective constituencies on the substance of discussion, activities occurring, and decisions to be made at the Stakeholder Team meetings.

State Office staff, in concert with District Managers, recruited candidates to serve on four groups organized to correspond to species stratum comprising the Coastal Species Management Unit: North Coast, Mid-Coast, Umpqua and Mid-South Coast. Each Stakeholder Team was comprised of 10-12 representatives of a broad range of coastal interests including watershed councils, conservation groups,

STEP members, fishing guides, angler groups, commercial fishers, resource producers, local governments, Native American tribes, and the public-at-large. Non-voting state and federal natural resource agency staff also participated on the Stakeholder Teams. A roster of Stakeholder Team members is provided as Attachment A.

The Stakeholder Teams met four times during CMP development, including:

1) Two orientation sessions in August 2012 to explain expectations and ground rules for participation in the planning process, review the current status of the six species addressed, and identify management issues to be addressed. A Roseburg session focused on the Umpqua and the Mid-South Coast strata and a Gleneden Beach session focused on the North Coast and the Mid-Coast strata.

2) In September-October 2012, an initial round of workshops was conducted in each stratum to develop CMP goals and Operating Assumptions, and identify preliminary management actions. These meetings were conducted over 2-3 consecutive days and resulted in general consensus on portfolio objectives and identification of preliminary management actions.

3) In June-July 2013, combined North Coast/Mid-Coast and Umpqua/Mid-South Coast startum meetings were held to review a draft "strawman" portfolio developed by ODFW prior to the agency developing and distributing a draft CMP for public review. Outcomes of these meetings included support for: (a) Proceeding with a portfolio approach that includes balancing both conservation and harvest opportunities; (b) Reconvening the Stakeholder Teams to attempt to resolve outstanding issues and to achieve a balance along management actions at both the stratum and coastal levels; (c) For meeting purposes, combining the North Coast and Mid-Coast strata together and the Umpqua and Mid-South Coast strata together; and (d) Assisting ODFW in messaging with interested parties that:
    - A pause is being taken in the process to address concerns and areas of disagreement before proceeding with developing and distributing a document for public review;
    - The Plan is neither anti-hatchery nor anti-wild fish
    - No STEP programs are being shut down or drastically reduced; and
    - There will be multiple opportunities for public input following completion of the Stakeholder Teams' deliberations.

4) Combined stratum meetings were held in September-October 2013 to review the Department's recommendations for a balanced portfolio. After considerable discussion and compromises among different interests, an adjusted portfolio of management actions was generally approved by consensus of all four groups for public review. Stakeholder Team recommendations are incorporated into the CMP and not repeated here.

Key outcomes of the Stakeholder Team process included:

- Improved understanding among stratum constituent groups of the current and desired status for the six species in the planning area, as well as for current conservation and fishing programs.

- Consensus on Operating Assumptions that formed the basis for the development of CMP management actions.
- Support for a portfolio approach that balances conservation and harvest opportunities.
- General consensus on management actions in each stratum.

IV. HABITAT TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP PROCESS

ODFW convened two meetings of a Habitat Technical Work Group (HTWG) in November 2012 to provide initial feedback on habitat components and strategies in the CMP. The purpose of these groups was to provide input on what analyses the CMP should include to help prioritize habitat actions and projects and to identify what other habitat assessments and prioritizations are already in use. Members included representatives of the Stakeholder Team, watershed councils, soil and water conservation districts, tribes, state and federal land management agencies, forest and agricultural lands, and other interests.

The purpose of the meetings included: 1) Objectives: explain the objectives of ODFW's habitat assessment and how it fits into the Plan and subsequent implementation; 2) Data: describe the data that were used in ODFW's draft analysis to date, get feedback on its appropriateness/completeness, and understand other habitat assessments and prioritizations that have occurred (i.e., what data or results are already in use; 3) Methods: describe and get feedback on the draft methodology ODFW used to summarize and score HUC's for current habitat quality, intrinsic potential, and relative importance for protection and future restoration actions; and 4) Describe the next step for the work group, using example results.

Based on input from the meetings, ODFW revised and distributed updated habitat assessment results (i.e., "scored" maps), and asked work group participants for HUC/location-specific feedback about the validity of those results based on their local knowledge.

Background information and meeting summaries are included as Attachment C.

V. GENERAL PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

As summarized in Section I, a multi-faceted public engagement process has been used to prepare the CMP, with four volunteer stratum Stakeholder Teams, Habitat Technical Work Groups, a scientific opinion survey, and public open houses as its key components. In addition to these elements, Plan information was disseminated and opportunities to comment were provided through:

- All Stakeholder Team meetings were open to the public and included public comment opportunities.
- Meetings with interested groups and individuals throughout the planning process and consultation with the Coastal Caucus and individual state legislators and local government representatives.
- 60-day formal public comment period, with the additional opportunity to provide comment at the OFWC's April and June meetings.

- Information about the CMP process, draft recommendations, and opportunities to comment on-line provided on the project website.
- Posting and distribution of an Executive Summary.

The majority of public input was obtained through open houses or during the public comment period, during which more than 750 pages of comments were submitted. The open house process is summarized below, followed by a cataloguing of input by open house. As an attachment, copies of all input received during the public comment period are provided. Of note is that almost 700 form letters were received as on-line comments, with about 45% from out-of-state addresses.

Open Houses

In January 2014, a series of six public open houses were conducted as an opportunity to share the details of the CMP and to obtain public comment.

LOCATION	DATE	ATTENDANCE*	COMPLETED COMMENT FORMS**
SALEM	JANUARY 16	49	8
TILLAMOOK	JANUARY 21	108	15
NEWPORT	JANUARY 23	79	5
ROSEBURG	JANUARY 27	128	11
COOS BAY/NORTH BEND	JANUARY 28	134	17
REEDSPORT	JANUARY 29	129	7
TOTAL		**627**	**63**

*Approximate based on sign-in sheets; not all attendees signed in.

** Completed and returned at the open houses; additional comment forms may have been delivered directly to ODFW offices.

Each workshop was approximately three hours in length and facilitated by Cogan Owens Cogan. In each session, ODFW presented background information in a brief plenary session, followed by an opportunity for the public to visit several open houses stations, and then to provide comment to the full group assembled. The open house stations were designed to enable participants to obtain more in-depth information on proposed management actions, speak with ODFW staff and record comments on flipcharts at each station. In the group comment portion of the open houses, individuals had the opportunity to ask questions and/or offer comments on any aspect of the CMP. Comments were recorded at the front of the room for all audience members to view.

It has previously been noted that the structure of the open houses worked well to encourage constructive dialogue and input. Other observations:

- Stations on management topics (harvest, hatcheries, predation and habitat) facilitated the presentation of more detailed information than could be presented in a general plan overview presentation.

- Staffing the stations with State Office and District representatives enabled participants to ask questions and engage in relatively detailed conversations about proposed management actions, which often resulted in an improved understanding of the "whys" of what was being proposed.
- The participation of District staff was extremely valuable, particularly the engagement of on-the-ground implementers with local constituencies.
- Having assistance in taking notes enabled the facilitator to better engage the audience and to keep the process flowing. Reviewing the notes as they were being taken helped affirm that comments were heard and understood.

Input at each open house session is reported below in three forms:

A. Facilitated Group Discussions
B. Open House Station Notes
C. Comment Form Results

1. LOCATION: SALEM

Date: January 16, 2014
Attendance: 49

A. Facilitated Group Discussion

- Against hatcheries. Long- term look at hatchery situation in Oregon. Dependence on wild stock in long-term. 10, 15, 20 years switch from hatcheries to wild.
- Has seen decline in stock quality. There are no native rivers in Oregon and there are impacts such as logging. Without hatcheries there will be no fishing. Streams cannot produce enough eggs, reduction of cormorants is needed including through a bounty. Sculpins in the bays are an issue.
- Cannot look at harvest and hatchery alone to bring back native fish.
- Chum.
- Need hatcheries. Siletz deadline should be moved to original / emergency closures i.e. Moonshine.
- Concern with cutting smolts number in hatchery on Siletz. Make hatchery fish catchable. Don't breed stock that are trapped / non-biters. Use biters for stock. Careful with where smolts are planted – need to be in good holding water.
- Driving force behind decisions is that we are being sued.
- Thanks for great work putting plan together. Object to changing north coast bag limits. Keep 2/10 Fall Chinook.
- Read the real language in full plan before you sign off on it.
- Measurables – needed in the plan. Plan not that much different. No measurables – what are the goals? Habitat defines future of fish. DEQ controls this. Where are the teeth?

- "Wild Salmon" supports the plan. Hatcheries do impact but realize their place. Plan recognizes Wild Fish Emphasis areas. Need better monitoring.
- Hatcheries provide opportunities. Need to be creative about fish release. Consider what fish do when they hit ocean. Plan does not address ocean fishing. Ocean catch is based on forecast – makes sense. Manage based on forecast for rivers and ocean.
- Very few native fish left – extremely rare.
- Siletz is unique. Need conservative protection of summer steelhead. Interagency approach. Should have summer hatchery season / program.
- Commercial harvest – what do we do to curtail it? Scientific justification for 2/10. Economic effects of 1/5.
- Improve habitat. Involve other agencies. Reduce bag limit.
- Mechanism to reevaluate plan part way through?
- Goal was to return to native levels. Unfair to limit harvest level on healthy runs.
- Crash years – should have catch and release with one fish limit. Does not like having to quit fishing when you get limit. Smallest percentage of predators on fish in rivers is the fisherman. Easiest to curtail is sport fisherman but it's not fair. Work on big picture to deal with all predators.
- Applaud this effort. Increase monitoring and evaluation and funding.
- Balance between conservation and opportunity areas are out of sync for focused watersheds i.e. Nestucca.
- Production of hatchery is same but recreation fishing is being reduced. Shift production from some rivers to others. No retention of wild fish until we have measurable numbers.
- Timber company impacts on the Siletz – need to work with them.
- Line up different entities. Bring focus on certain watersheds.
- Come to Siletz Watershed Council meetings.
- Limit fishing on Siletz spawning grounds. Support for the deadline as compromise.
- Consider closing upper quarter of most coastal rivers to protect all species.

B. Open House Stations

Hatchery Station Comments:

- How do we ensure that our conservation efforts will not just boost southeast Alaska commercial harvest?
- Are our wild steelhead populations truly in a place (even with sliding scale) for harvest? Predicted runs don't always materialize.
- On Nehalem, rather than 2 / day bag limit. OK with reduced seasonal bag to achieve conservation goal.
- Did a good job on plan overall.
- Siletz River – Mill to Ojalla open for fall Chinook to November 1.
- Siletz River open for Chinook to moonshine.

- Siletz – 90,000 winter steelhead.
- Maintain 80,000 summer steelhead smolt release. Don't go to 50,000 release.
- Siletz – 3 fish / day bag limit on summer / winter fish to reduce number of fish that end up in trap.
- Siletz – keep Mill Creek to Ojalla open for fall Chinook on good return years.
- Siletz – Chinook open Illahee to mouth.

Harvest Station Comments:

- How will ChS releases in Yaquina work?
- Release sites of Nestucca ChS – suggest release up higher in main stem.
- The proposal to release ChS in Yaquina and Coos is an excellent idea. Take the 30,000 Siletz summer smolts and add to Siletz winter.
- The effect of this plan on opportunity for ocean fishing is not mentioned anywhere that I saw when I read the plan online.
- Remove ChS and STS from Wilson equals reduction in fishing area. Do not do it.
- The public needs to understand who the governing bodies of habitat are – list them and how they interact.

Habitat Station Comments:

- [No comments provided.]

Predation Station Comments:

- Find ways to release hatchery smolts so that predation does not take a high percentage of the released fish.
- Predators increase salmonid diversity and resilience. How do we take this dynamic into effect?
- Possible steps to protect beaver in Coho spawning tributaries.

Monitoring and Adaptive Management Station Comments:

- How do you plan to monitor and enforce fisheries with wild steelhead retention? These areas are already difficult to enforce. Allowing retention will result in more illegal harvest in adjacent streams.
- ODFW should take one population and remove all hatcheries and harvest and see how the wild fish respond.
- Glad to see chum included in the plan.
- Glad to see cutthroat included in the plan.
- What is the timeframe for adaptive management given that this is a 12-year plan? Is there space to change actions within the plan's implementation period?
- ODFW needs to monitor the effects of shifted hatchery programs on the wild fish in the receiving populations.

C. Comment Forms

Eight comment forms were submitted.

1. ***Does the draft Plan appropriately balance hatchery operations and fishing opportunity with wild fish conversation?***
   - Yes: 5
   - No: 0
   - Uncertain:3
   - No response: 0

If not, what actions are needed to achieve an appropriate balance?

- I would like to see more emphasis on opportunity – the opportunity discussed is a bit of a shell game – moving allocations. Breeding a better hatchery fish and utilizing specific release strategies could have an impact.
- I checked yes, but in some instances more hatchery fish would not harm wild fish and would provide more opportunity.

2. ***What specific management actions (in any area) do you feel are most critical to successful Plan implementation?***
   - I would like to see serious consideration to acclimation ponds – this could have direct tangible benefits: release timing-run returns, straying, etc.
   - I approve of the idea to realize CHS in the Yaquina and Coos; this is a creative approach to increase angler opportunity.
   - Return the Chinook fishing deadline on the Siletz River to Moonshine Park. Raise the winter steelhead stocking on the Siletz.
   - Cormorant numbers have increased. If you plant more fish the birds will just eat them. The bird population needs to be controlled.
   - Make charter fishing in the ocean count on the commercial.
   - Similar harvest reductions by SE Alaska commercial fishing fleet. Reduction of predation.
   - Habitat protection. Clear and obvious notification of regulations.

3. ***Are there specific management actions that are of concern? Why?***
   - I have serious concerns opening up harvest to wild steelhead – I would like to see very stable and sustained population quantified before we open.
   - Deal with predators of fish other than fisherman. Fish are killed by birds, seals, commercial fisherman and sports fisherman. We are limiting the least effective killer.
   - You need to partner with timber companies. They clear cut to the edge of streams. They use heavy amounts of herbicides that limit reproduction of fish and animals.
   - Cutting the 2/20 bag down the fishery manager told me most anglers only get five fish per year so no need to cut limits.
   - Harvest levels being reduced to 2/10 on average years while SE Alaska doesn't reduce their harvest by same amount. 2/10 to 2/10 – 50%.
   - Closing the Siletz River for Old Mill to Ojalla – enforcement would be difficult, clustering users into a limited area (town loop) will cause conflict, closing upstream of Illahee preserves spawning areas.

4. ***What's missing in terms of management actions?***
   - More teeth in predation issues. Needs to be mitigated. I would like to see hatchery increases.
   - Ocean fishing opportunity isn't considered in the plan and it could and should be considered.
   - You want native fish but there are no native rivers left. You must compensate for that with better hatchery programs.
   - Hazing methods need to be posted in regulations. Most sportsmen don't know it is legal to haze or even how.
   - Have to manage all aspects of harvest.
   - How to set harvest levels. If we increase abundance then the average will increase and reduce harvest to 2/10.
   - Continue balancing environment, social, economic concern.

5. ***What are the highest priority monitoring and research actions to pursue?***
   - I would like to see solid, quantifiable evidence of the deleterious effect hatchery has on wild fish – seems to me that it's an assumption that may or may not be the case, foundation of plan – better be true.
   - Predator control and methods of releasing hatchery fish that reduce predator concentration and predation of and on the hatchery fish.
   - Predation – how to manage effectively.

6. ***Other comments about the plan?***
   - Good work to this date. Good attempt at balancing stakeholder groups.
   - We need to regulate SE Alaska. The more we help the runs the more Alaska gets.
   - It appears that the economic impact of sport fishers is not being weighed in the plan. Why are we limiting the Siletz River access? Ojalla is tough to launch at for older/disabled fisherman. Needs to be in town.

7. ***How did you learn about this evening's open house (check all that apply)***
   - Through ODFW: 1
   - Through my organization: 1
   - Media: 1
   - Other (please specify): 2
     - Word of mouth
     - Guides

8. ***Did you find this open house to be useful? If yes, why, if no, why not?***
   - Yes: 4
   - No: 0
   - Uncertain: 1
   - No response: 0

9. ***What was the most useful part of the open house?***
   - Opportunity for discussion and listening.
   - Hearing the variety of opinions and concerns.
   - It's a good start.

10. What was the least useful part?

- The redundancy at the beginning we were told the same thing too often, both by the same speaker and then it was repeated by the next speaker.
- It appears the ODFW has their own opinion of what needs to be done and is not open to other thoughts.

11. Other comments about the open house?

- Thank you for hosting this. I truly hope the goal was to solicit input and it will be heard and considered.
- The fish biologists need to be more open to suggestions.

2. LOCATION: TILLAMOOK

Date: January 21, 2014
Attendance: 108

A. Facilitated Group Discussion

- Want Wilson to continue to provide miles of fishing opportunity. Why eliminating summer steelhead on the Wilson? What info?
- If it's not broke, why fix it? Continue programs in Wilson and Kilchis. Any studies looking at economic impact of fisheries? Concern with predators.
- How are going to protect hatchery smolts – predators eat a lot.
- Ocean might be part of the problem. Thought ODFW did a good job with the plan.
- Kilchis fall Chinook have been going down for the last 15 years. Start releasing more unfed fry.
- What brought on this plan and changes?
- Fish numbers are going down – low survival.
- Need to have public listen and talk to each other. There are things in common. Changes proposed are substantial. Need more emphasis on funding monitoring. Need more involvement in Salem – public. Hatchery releases causing cormorants to gather. Used to be lots of chum – loss of habitat. Plan does not do enough on habitat.
- Used to have lots of hatch boxes. Why did ODFW cut those out?
- Tillamook fall Chinook numbers went down after hatch boxes dropped. Trask has limited access for bank angling. There will be lots of boats with increased releases.
- Like wild fish – good for guiding business. Support taking winter steelhead out of Kilchis.
- Like wild fish – need them for hatchery fish. Support shifting hatchery fish releases and wild fish emphasis areas. Need to do more to reduce risk from hatchery fish.
- More planting fish is better. Pushing fisherman to few places equals congregating / overcrowding. If stop stocking – close to fishing and see if wild fish respond.
- Nestucca should be last place to stock more fish. Put in Wilson / Kilchis instead. Wild fish – winter steelhead "gone." Have conservation problem on Nestucca.
- No hatchery fish in 4 / 5 rivers is ridiculous. Wilson – pounded. Something wrong with hatchery program now – fishing is better on south coast. We are not happy. Don't want Kilchis to be wild. North coast equals catch and filet. Need more hatchery fish in all rivers.
- Take all fisherman (spring Chinook) on Wilson and move to Trask – no difference in effort and worth it to get more spring Chinook smolts.
- Floods cause fish loss. Why are hatchery fish bad? Put more hatchery fish in steams. There are no 40-50 pound fish anymore.
- Problem with plan is the plan. Hatchery reductions occurring for decades. Can't show hatchery reductions equals more wild fish. Show measurable benefit from past reform before implementing anything.

- Hatchery hole (Trask) doesn't open to December – need better access to those fall Chinook. Need to address angler access to get return on hatchery fish.
- Need anti-predation organization to deal with all predators. Need method to accept funding.
- Changes / reductions occurred slowly overtime. Increase today's hatchery production – still less than 20 years ago.
- Two fish / week is not enough. Streams no longer producing fish. Need to do more work with habitat.
- How has ODFW addressed stray rate goals especially in areas where more hatchery fish are to be released?
- Release more/some fall Chinook in Tillamook River.
- Put them where we can get to them. Extend spring Chinook season on hatchery fish other than hatchery hole. Increase Necanicum winter steelhead to 60,000 – increase 20,000 overall production. Don't take winter steelhead out of Kilchis without monitoring to see effect.

B. Open House Stations

Hatchery Station Comments:

- Increase brood stock production to the Kilchis River.

Harvest Station Comments:

- [No comments were received.]

Habitat Station Comments:

- ODFW should monitor all water permits before WRD. ODFW should demand that WRD issue and certify in-stream water rights to all north coast streams.

Predation Station Comments:

- Do research on Native Americans along coast and how they kept "slings" of cormorants and other birds in check. One bird bone found in shell mounds along coast – California through Washington. Lots of info online and in books.
- Hazing cormorants is working – keep it up.
- Change laws to allow lethal control of predators.

C. Comment Form Results

Fifteen comment forms were submitted.

1. ***Does the draft Plan appropriately balance hatchery operations and fishing opportunity with wild fish conversation?***
   - Yes: 3
   - No: 10
   - Uncertain: 1

- No response: 0

If not, what actions are needed to achieve an appropriate balance?

- Emphasize habitat enrichment to assist with wild recruitment and survival. Create more access for anglers by keeping production and increasing it instead of subtracting production from some rivers and increasing it on others which will increase angling pressure.
- Keep planting Kilchis spread it out to keep diversity.
- Determine wild fish production, add same amount of hatchery smolts, wild fish brook stock program.
- Restore and protect habitat. Stream that use to produce good habitat fish and don't anymore.
- More protection needs to be afforded for wild fish. A decrease in hatchery production is needed.
- Do more. More fish.
- More hatchery fish.
- Leave it like it is. Has anyone taken into consideration the financial impact to Tillamook County. Where are your algorithms? Why this plant? Where is your empirical data?
- More hatchery fish, less fear of the "wild fish Nazis."
- Not on the Wilson.
- The best available science demonstrates that hatchery fish present significant conversation risk to wild fish. There is no debate on this issue. ODFW should be curtailing and /or eliminating hatchery releases and focusing on habitat restoration.

2. What specific management actions (in any area) do you feel are most critical to successful Plan implementation?

- Increasing production. Get chum populations to sustainable and keepable levels.
- Kilchis.
- Do not remove all hatchery fish from sterile streams.
- No fish in the Kilchis.
- Increased monitoring of wild populations and hatchery / wild interaction.
- Management of seals, sea lions, cormorants and turns. Legal actions and laws to protect smolts and salmons.
- Kilchis vs. Trask – moves too many fisherman to Trask.
- Keep fin clipped and wild as it is.
- Eliminating hatchery releases across the Oregon coast where they present risk to wild fish.

3. Are there specific management actions that are of concern? Why?

- Bottlenecking fishing opportunities for spring Chinook. Not addressing habitat improvements more thoroughly.
- Having the hatchery fish on spawning beds limited to only 10%. We need more fish on spawn beds.
- Increase / maintain planting hatchery.
- Putting all fishing pressure on one stream and bay causing more enforcement and control issues as well as quality of fishing issues.
- What scientific studies or tests have been done to show hatchery fisher are inferior to native fish?
- Spring Chinook to the Trask not enough access.

- Increased pressure from hatchery fish on the Nestucca in particular and the entire coast in general.
- In wild fish only streams. No fishing.
- If wild fish only then no fishing at all. Damage to wild fish.
- Return ODFW to where it is used for what it was meant for and not the general fund.
- Over the past 50 years chf's have gone downhill badly, yet habitat has improved. The volume of wild chf fry underseeds the estuary, so why not bring back hatch boxes.
- My sons and I enjoy fishing for summer steelhead and spring Chinook on the Wilson River. We have caught limits of summer steelhead on several days in the past two years. We are not looking forward to the Wilson being a dead river all spring and summer.
- Increased release of hatchery fish. They are a known conservation risk and should be reduced. Harvest – ODFW has no way of ensuring that harvest stays below 10%.

4. ***What's missing in terms of management actions?***
   - More emphasis on increasing funding for hatchery programs. Emphasis on implementing more wild genetics in all coastal Chinook programs – both fall and springers.
   - Remove coast Coho from being listed.
   - Too concerned about being sued by eco-terrorist groups.
   - This plan doesn't focus on habitat.
   - Access.
   - More certain segregation of wild and hatchery fish. Efforts to minimize the effects of hatchery fish on wild fish.
   - More fish.
   - Studies to show hatchery fish bad versus wild fish.
   - Everything. No data, no showing of how data was arrived at. No proper notification of persons. My fear is that the plan proposed is a done deal and you are just following a legal notification for input.
   - Too much worry about so-called wild Chinook and steelhead that have interbred for over a century.
   - Fully assessing impacts of hatchery fish or wild populations. Eliminating more hatchery programs, especially on rivers where pHUS is above 10%.

5. ***What are the highest priority monitoring and research actions to pursue?***
   - More cost effective research both in the office and field.
   - Updated creek and stream survey techniques.
   - Adaptive management, don't carve in stone a 10 year plan then decide it didn't work.
   - Tillamook Kilchis.
   - Wild fish populations on rivers influenced by hatchery fish.
   - Make returns more successful.
   - Public empirical data shared with the public and impact. Have you done it?
   - Fully access impacts of hatchery fish on wild populations, especially before increasing releases on rivers like the Trask and Nestucca.

6. ***Other comments about the plan?***
   - Need a genetic research study done on hatch boxes to conclude its ineffectiveness.

- I would like to see more evidence that hatchery fish are a threat. Please have the opportunity to change the plan down the road. So few people fish Wilson summer steelhead and Kilchis winter steelhead it isn't going to matter if you pull the plug on them. Either that or plant more of those fish. The Nestucca has a lot more access than the Wilson. Let's open Trash Hatcher Hole earlier in the fall than December 1.
- This plan doesn't focus on habitat.
- Stock the Tillamook for Chinook.
- I would suggest that if we are not in crisis mode that we should be. These populations are at 10-25% of historic levels.
- Improvements in hatchery operations e.g. stage releasing of smolts. More wild stock in hatchery.

7. How did you learn about this evening's open house (check all that apply)

- Through ODFW: 6
- Through my organization: 5
- Media: 4
- Other (please specify): 3
  - NW Guide Anglers Facebook
  - NW Steelheader
  - A person told me

8. Did you find this open house to be useful? If yes, why, if no, why not?

- Yes: 8
- No: 2
- Uncertain: 3
- No response: 0

9. What was the most useful part of the open house?

- The open forum from all user groups.
- A chance to oppose CMP. South coast has dramatic fishing because they plant millions of salmon.
- Not focusing on habitat.
- Learning about no stocking on the Tillamook River.
- Mr. Bowles' overview and explanation.
- Other fish lovers / hatchery fish.
- Question by public.
- To satisfy a legal requirement for public input.

10. What was the least useful part?

- People taking too long with their talk.
- Local opinions seldom matter.
- To technical for laymen's terms.
- All. Your minds are already made up.
- Having the executive summary of the plan read to me.

11. Other comments about the open house?

- More questions needed to be answered at the first part of the meeting.
- Some of these guys have a very small over all perspective. Too many rabbit trails.
- If we don't work more on habitat problems the plan will fail. Watershed people are in it for the money only and turn away volunteers. Many other problems with watershed programs. STEP should be doing a lot more habitat work with volunteers. Any information about what I'm talking about just ask Mr. Rick Klump.
- Great presentation.

3. LOCATION: NEWPORT

Date: January 24, 2014
Attendance: 79

A. Facilitated Group Discussion

- Like protecting life history patterns. Coho amendment 13. Deal with full seeding issues. Respond to IMST comments. More habitat equals more fish – document this.
- Fisherman blamed for fish numbers. Need a conservation plan – this is a good plan. Chum – need more info. Concerned with Alsea bag limits.
- Science needs to be there. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. Consider socioeconomic impacts. Concerned with effects of bag limits reduction.
- Echo – chum. Consider with sport fishing regulations when there isn't a problem i.e. Alsea. Support 2/20 on Alsea.
- Look at economic impacts on ocean fishery. 40-50% fish caught off the coast. Focus on stocks that help coast.
- Disappointed in not aggressive enough / not bold. Missed opportunities to increase numbers in population. Habitat improvements/restoration aspiration goals. Potential to bring back to higher levels – not just good. Landscape for restoration. Overstating case on how good things are i.e. stating chum or early run Chinook instead of calling them spring Chinook.
- Need more focus on economic impacts. Alsea has robust run – why cutting bag limits? Where is Alsea hatchery? Stop thinking hatchery fish is "alien." Need more hatcheries – increase the number of them.
- Hatcheries and harvest are two threats. No fall Chinook – reduce risk to wild fish.
- Plan is economic disaster. No biological justification. Effects of reducing daily bag limit. Lack of Port involvement in development of the plan. Retain 2/20 limit for Alsea.
- Economic effects of reduced limits. No assessment of socioeconomic effects.
- CCA supports hatcheries. CMP – past hatchery reforms adversely effected. Need to demonstrate adverse effects of hatcheries before changing. Need ongoing monitoring.
- Bag limits low for Alsea could be raised.
- Salmon River – concern with proposal for harvest of wild steelhead. Enforcement is an issue. Over estimation of fish population. Underestimation of fisherman. Where's the science for this?
- Cost of hatcheries not considered. Who will pay for more hatcheries?
- Lean toward liberal side of bag limits on Alsea and monitor numbers. Sliding scale limits / cut back if problem.
- Only half hatchery cost is tax dollars. Hatchery has good return on investment. Science, economy and sociology – three-legged stool to dictate policy. Socioeconomic effects of bag limit reduction.
- Disagree with low cost of hatchery fish. Higher due to survival rates of smolts.

- Doesn't address fish disease. It's a habitat issue and also hatchery concern. Water diversions. Will be increase in demand for water extractions. Water temperature effects (warm water). Disease happens when stressed.
- Spring Chinook program in Yaquina is not good – temp, flow, disease issues.
- Concerned with not having opportunity to catch fish.
- Compliments amount of literature in plan. Must care for wild fish to take care of hatcheries. Support for adaptive management. Need to plan for climate change. Lack of regulatory mechanisms to trigger action.
- Focus on function not just status. Need to see affects of restoration. Need hard data. Absent of monitoring program.

B. Open House Stations

Hatchery Station Comments:

- Consider spring Chinook brood stock in Siletz to make up for 30,000 summer steelhead reduction.
- Return to early winter steelhead program in Alsea 120-150,000 smolts and unfed fry.
- Hatch box program to enhance wild winter steelhead in Alsea.
- Where is bad habitat in Alsea?
- ChS hatchery program in Yaquina is a bad idea, even as an "experiment." Will divert funds and staff from more productive efforts on habitat and wild fish protection and monitoring, and it creates numerous ecological risks (disease, predation, water quality and competition after release) for wild native fishes.
- SCH on the Yaquina will be a wonderful new spring fishery and with its lower estuary release will have virtually no impact on upper river habitat. Financial resources from the local community will help defray cost. A springer in the bay brings salmon fishing in May.
- Consider benefit to Oregon near-ocean fishery when choosing ChS stock (Yaquina, Coos).
- ChS will cost $600 / caught fish in Oregon (Bay and ocean).
- Would like to see the Siletz summer steelhead reduction of 30,000 smolts moved to the Siletz water steelhead to achieve the no net loss of plants and opportunity.
- Against moving Chs from the Wilson to Trask – just moves fishing pressure to the river that's too much pressure to handle – especially for the fish.
- Hatchery stray rate – are we in compliance with WFMP?
- Not supportive of ChS in Yaquina.
- Plan needs improvement in ChS and chum assessment.
- Priority for fall Chinook escapement goals – consistent with Canada and California.
- No net loss - more summer steelhead 30,000 and winter steelhead 30,000 for Siletz to 50,000 summer steelhead and 80,000 winter steelhead.
- Siletz River fall salmon deadline – keep it at Ojalla Bridge – 1,000 feet above for protection of spawning grounds.

Harvest Station Comments:

- If healthy runs of fall Chinook and Coho we shouldn't limit harvest.
- A13 – needs to be updated to full seeding – relation between independent and dependent reviewed.
- No support for wild winter steelhead without solid population estimates – current / historic.
- Protect spawning areas – consistent coast wide.
- Protect salmon spawning grounds on Siletz River above Ojalla Bridge.
- For Alsea maintain a 2 fish daily limit under all run size and keep at 20 annual limit under most run sizes.
- Draft Creek Siletz deadline at upper Concrete Bridge – Sept 1 – Dec 31 closed to all angling above this point.
- Keep the Big Elk winter steelhead hatchery program. Supported by many local landowners.
- Drift Creek (Siletz) deadline at entrance to canyon. Contact Conrad for RM.
- Siletz River – protective period for wild spring Chinook effective Skunk Creek upriver – bottom 5 miles open for early wild fall Chinook – lower Tide water.
- Siletz River – protect spawning grounds 1,000 feet above Ojalla Bridge for fall Chinook.
- Siletz River – maintain Ojalla deadline depending on water height. Possibly raise deadline for native Coho harvest.
- No wild steelhead harvest.

Habitat Station Comments:

- Disease as a limiting factor needs some attention in the plan, particularly in relation to stream flow and stream temperature as affected by growing human demands for water. Also it needs to be addressed in relation to warming and drying due to climate change.
- Use 303 delisted streams/ temp sed – PVA when impaired.
- What are the metrics for monitoring habitat effects?

Predation Station Comments:

- Allow aggressive cormorant harass on selected waterways.
- Aggressively dead with small mouth bass / straying increase.
- Protecting and restoring habitat (especially "hiding cover") is very important to limiting predation.
- Monitor seal populations – the Alsea seems like it has exploded over the last 16 years.
- Is there a means of managing cormorants that is non-lethal? Why hasn't it worked?

Monitoring Station Comments:

- Basin plans not revisited on established schedules; will CMP really be reviewed in timely manner?

- Why combine spring Chinook and fall Chinook for overall assessment? Population disparities are great. Does data from both parallel in reliability? Suggest environmental (ocean conditions) may skew number for one or the other.
- Longer acclimation period of winter steelhead on Big Elk to avoid straying back to Alsea hatchery.

C. Comment Forms

Five comment forms were submitted.

1. Does the draft Plan appropriately balance hatchery operations and fishing opportunity with wild fish conversation?

- Yes: 0
- No: 4
- Uncertain: 1
- No response: 0

If not, what actions are needed to achieve an appropriate balance?

- If it's not broken – don't change it.
- Not conservative enough. Hatcheries should be in compliance with the NFCP / less than 10% straying. Need an assessment completed.
- Before any changes can be made in any stratum the science needs to be in place first. Effects on the economy and the social systems must, by law, be considered. None of this has yet been done.
- Wild steelhead should not have to suffer to reduce hatchery plants. Trying to monitor a 10% take seems impossible with the amount of private land.
- More detailed analysis of how the efficacy of this plan will be monitored / measured.

2. What specific management actions (in any area) do you feel are most critical to successful Plan implementation?

- Control predators.
- Habitat protection and restoration should be more emphasized.
- The effects of altering the Spring Chinook and winter steelhead runs on the North Coast will dramatically alter the angling dynamics and high/low water opportunity. Potentially altering the annual / daily limit on the Alsea is an incredibly poor decision.
- Wild steelhead retention should not be allowed. Don't use them as guinea pigs for economic gain. Let the runs build.
- Addressing where hatchery programs are helping (or at least not hurting) recreational fishing and wild runs vs. where hatchery programs are more harmful than helpful.

3. Are there specific management actions that are of concern? Why?

- Coho – A13, needs to be updated – fall seeding, independent/dependent, population relationship reviewed. Cannot support a wild steelhead fishery – ODFW does not know population and the basins are on the 303dlist – the plan should be consistent with Native Fish Conservation Policy.

- Any minimizing on the South Coast of hatchery operations is unacceptable. None of the streams with proposed changes hold runs that are in peril. It's not broke – don't fix it.
- Retention of wild steelhead sends the wrong message. Especially on a small system like Big Elk Creek.
- Concerned about the reduction in harvest limits because it may cause a reduction in purchased fishing licenses equals decreased funding for ODFW which equals a decrease in funding for the monitoring of this plan.

4. What's missing in terms of management actions?

- Specific predator control – not just hazing.
- Clear direction to incorporate beaver management into the plan. Pacific Sol. Treaty – huge implication for Chinook. Address issues identified by IMST / science panel comments.
- Simply using a few additional fish moved from other streams as bait to nullify anglers with a slightly improved opportunity is another divide and conquer tactic. This CMP is not ready for prime time. Do the science and then come back tons.
- Science. True and accurate knowledge of the amount of wild steelhead in these systems.
- It seems that it is still uncertain how the success of this plan will be assessed over the long run i.e. how will we know if a positive / negative impact was a result of the plan or from a change in water quality, habitat change or increased/decreased logging.

5. What are the highest priority monitoring and research actions to pursue?

- Monitor predation and make a plan to control it.
- There is no assessment on hatchery programs not in compliance with stray rates.
- Enough money needs to be available to adequately determine spawning and carrying capacities before any changes are made.
- Monitoring wild steelhead and knowing exactly what 10% equals.
- Habitat. If habitat is the largest factor limiting SMU's then perusing coalitions (DEQ) to better assess impacts of changing habitat should be a priority.

6. Other comments about the plan?

- Need economic analysis. The preservationists (Englemeyer, etc) want full seeding – that's not necessary to have ample harvest of fish.
- Spring Chinook and chum info should be updated – ignoring significant data. Deal with non-native warm water predators i.e. bass.
- Overall it is ill conceived and ill implemented on proposed. On the South Coast several of the best steelhead and salmon programs are on the block. These talks have proven history of success ODFW could and should emulate.
- Wild steelhead retention sends the wrong message across the state and country. Losing hatchery protection on Big Elk Creek seems pointless when it's been in place for years, how pure could wilds be?
- Including monitoring into this plan seems ambitious given the current state of knowledge on the "health" of these rivers. It may be a long time before we know if this plan is working but I would eventually like to know what "success" look likes.

7. How did you learn about this evening's open house (check all that apply)

- Through ODFW: 3

- Through my organization: 0
- Media: 0
- Other (please specify): 2
    - Grapevine (a friend)
    - By a lot of digging

8. Did you find this open house to be useful? If yes, why, if no, why not?

- Yes: 4
- No: 0
- Uncertain: 1
- No response: 0

9. What was the most useful part of the open house?

- Hearing audience comments.
- Good discussions. Seeing old friends.
- Local folks will and are providing necessary feedback. The break out into groups. Divide and conquer.
- Obtaining details about the plan. Getting to talk one on one.
- To clarify what the plan proposes in terms of habitat management and monitoring, as well as predation management. Info stations – being able to ask specific questions to ODFW plans and goals. Could have used more time at stations – maybe two breakout sessions.

10. What was the least useful part?

- Lack of key science perspective.
- We appreciate the opportunity to speak. Hopefully sanity will prevail.
- Justification of economic consideration. May have been better to say that socio/economic pros/cons weren't addressed in a way that satisfied the public.

11. Other comments about the open house?

- Comfortable setting, ample opportunity to give input.
- May want to post goals for the evening so that they could be seen by all throughout the meeting.

4. LOCATION: ROSEBURG

Date: January 27, 2014
Attendance: 128

A. Facilitated Group Discussion

- No consensus on winter steelhead.
- Winter steelhead issue isn't settled.
- Public is the stakeholder.
- Minimum escapement numbers on North Umpqua winter steelhead – more flexibility to keep ½.
- Wild winter steelhead – very valuable fish.
- Social vs. biological decision making. Guides are the big problem.
- Special interest swayed decisions on harvesting wild steelhead.
- Flawed process – needed public involvement earlier in process.
- Survey – how many completed? Low level of return? Please extend the public comment period.
- Broad stock on North Umpqua needs to be diversified.
- Economic element is important. Angling does not always equal killing fish – catch and release is important too. Umpqua is not a secret anymore. Increase number of fisherman. Also more efficient.
- How will you know when 10% of wild winter steelhead have been harvested?
- Bag limit – whatever caught whether kept or not.
- How do economics play into this plan?
- Why are fall Chinook opportunities being cut in half? Consider economics. Number are increasing – why cutting bag limits?
- Communities are suffering. Survive based on fishing and sand dunes.
- Appreciate tourism dollars but what about the local residents.
- Wild steelhead – plenty to harvest. Limit take of wild steelhead to non-guided boats.
- "Floating baseline. Hatchery impacts on wild fish. On cusp of declining numbers of wild fish.
- Ability to keep dying fish. Dam is tool to track and record fish.
- How can you tell difference between native and hatchery fish after they spawn? Not all wild are native.
- Limit number of guides on Umpqua. Catch and release fish do die.
- When water is right – higher stray rate.
- Winter steelhead numbers have been higher last 10 years at Winchester dam. Only catching fish through the dam.
- Winter stocking program? Like up north.
- "Rivers of lost coast". Please watch this documentary. We have greatest wild winter steelhead run. Avoid crisis before it happens. Tilimetry study – flawed.

- Predation – hazing will do nothing. What does it accomplish? Birds are not just on coast.
- No difference in number of fish. Difference is that we cannot keep them.
- Sea lions and seal number increasing 100% every 7.5 years. Hazing needs to become more serious.
- Hatchery program should increase on North Umpqua for spring Chinook. Low water conditions should be shut down.
- Spring Chinook on North Umpqua issue. Wildlife belongs to the people.
- Private landowner impacts / loss of habitat. Declining numbers. Allow landowners to protect / save our land.
- North Umpqua spring Chinook – does not agree with reduction of bag limit; five fish / year is way too few.
- Main stem Chinook fishery – timing with take of south run.
- Concern with fall bag limits. Economic impacts on local businesses – loss of tourism dollars.
- Support not killing wild steelhead. Average summer steelhead run numbers have declined in wild runs.
- Wasn't clear that take of wild steelhead was still on the table.
- Limited areas for bank fisherman. Need more hatchery fish. People come here become they can keep a fish. Economic impacts all along the coast.
- Winchester Bay is in economic trouble. Need sustainable fish population.
- Food supply for fish in ocean? Are we doing any follow-up?
- Plant more fish. If using Umpqua fish in Umpqua won't have a genetic issue.
- Strongly oppose take of wild steelhead on Umpqua. All these pressures add up on the system: more efficient at fishing, more fisherman, and flood of guides. Suggest more restrictive gear.
- Fukushima impacts? Fish won't be safe to eat.
- South Coast – Elk River hatchery added tremendous amount of fish. No such thing as a wild fish. Lower Umpqua – smelt, herring?
- Increase in pressure – number of fisherman. Technology is more efficient at catching.
- ODFW feels economic impact as well – selling tags, licenses. Cannot generate adequate funding locally to fund hatcheries.
- What happened to stripers?
- Too much pressure on North Umpqua from guides. Limit number of days fishing is allowed for guides.
- ODFW establish communication with guides, anglers, etc. Explore options i.e. no take of wild steelhead on guide. Education. Tag limits. Would like to sit at the table.
- Does not like to see all of X and none of Y and vice versa. Sees quality ethic of protecting fish from recreation fisherman and guides. Use resource in wise way to protect it. We all care about the fish.

B. Open House Stations

Hatchery Station Comments:

- STS increase from RCH. Approximately 300,000 from the 80s and 90s.
- CHS 18's – more research and monitoring. Creel/spawning etc. Meeting objectives.
- Increase CHS 151 x 2 to offset wild decrease of harvest. Based on South Umpqua.
- Wild genetic vs. hatchery brook.
- Unfed fry releases from hatchery.
- Increase STS.
- Increase STW? Main stem acclimation? – Wolf/Calapooya
- Smolt releases to bypass predation.
- Make use of returning hatchery adults – brood stock, food bank, etc.
- Hatchery program on South Umpqua for CHS.
- Hatchery fish equals fish for fishermen.
- Maximize opportunities for fishing.
- It is important to the economies of our coastal regions and to the small businesses across our county.
- Fishing is an important part of our culture and our social values.
- Remove all hatchery programs (summer and winter) from North Umpqua then you'll have a comparison with South Fork.

Harvest Station Comments:

- Want more natives on South Coast. Don't keep wild fish (Sixes – Elk). Commercial fishing in ocean?
- Re-evaluate wild steelhead harvest to Main stem Umpqua, if you can open up the Salmon River and the Big Elk Creek for winter wild steelhead you should open up the Umpqua where there are many more winter wild steelhead.
- Change regulation for spring Chinook, stay at 10 fish quota. No confidence in sliding scale. ODFW can't judge abundance with any certainty, ocean condition, and weather.
- Delay any take on main stem spring Chinook until after April 1 to protect South Umpqua spring chum.
- Angling pressure on the Umpqua system is increasing exponentially and will not be able to support a harvest.
- Fish numbers support current harvest rates on spring Chinook in all of the Umpqua system. Spring Chinook on South Umpqua is viable at the 95% level and stable. No need to restrict harvest further. Already has happened when we went to 20 wild.
- Public has been basically left out until now. Stakeholder groups handpicked by ODFW. Public should have been involved at the very start with basic info meetings and workshops with public's proposals etc. Increase harvest of spring Chinook in North Umpqua over plan recommendations.
- Spring Chinook wild stable in South Umpqua. No capacity to improve, don't change harvest.
- Allow more liberal harvest of spring Chinook once enter the North Umpqua.

- Re-establish release of STS and Whistler, Paige, Amacher for smolts.
- Re-establish trout releases for North Umpqua for a kid fishery.
- Increase spring Chinook release back to previous levels – 2005.
- Re-establish chum salmon on lower river for catch and release fishery.
- Fall Chinook – make sure not just mark selective.
- Fall Chinook – make sure low sliding scale is only in bad years.
- TNUS supports wild steelhead release – no harvest.
- Supports current plan – well balanced.
- Wants STW hatchery program on North Umpqua if no wild STW harvest and in line with wild fish policy.
- Delay spring Chinook harvest until April 1 – allow South Umpqua to escape through.
- South Fork Coquille – access is the issue. Need better access. More dispersal of anglers.
- Supports no harvest of wild steelhead on Umpqua system.
- STW should have some harvest.
- Include study of Smith River and Scholfield response to restrictions on harvest. Use to inform decisions.
- Wants separate bag / possession limits for steelhead and salmon.
- Wants wild steelhead harvest.
- Double hatchery CHS releases due to offset South Umpqua CHS bag limits.
- South Umpqua not enough habitat to support CHS – elevation, runoff.
- No scale in wild Chinook limit.
- CHS – acclimate and release down by county club.
- Umpqua Valley Flyfishers support no harvest on wild winter steelhead.
- What data to support implementing wild STW harvest on East Fork Coquille, Big Elk and Salmon?
- UFA supports 1/5 for STW.
- Supports mandatory tag turn-in.

Habitat Station Comments:

- Priorities for in-stream habitat restoration need to be based on available science.
- Get the cattle out of the river (North Umpqua.) Use water gaps and fencing like on the Deschutes.
- Clean up South Umpqua, fishing and harvest of spring Chinook is not the problem.
- Recognize the tremendous habitat restoration work that has been done on the Umpqua system. We are not starting from zero. This should mitigate a degree of risk.
- Incorporate more gravels in upper North Fork Umpqua to replace those held back by dams.
- Was South Umpqua spring Chinook considered for prioritization process – i.e. added points for non-viable population.

Predation Station Comments:

- Birth control – mammals i.e. sea lions.
- Remove catch limits on small mouth bass.

- Reducing small mouth bass limits will destroy a world class fishery.
- Redistribute smolts pass main Umpqua, bass population.
- Open season on cormorants, harbor seals and sea lions.
- Be honest with public about small mouth predation.
- When you say this is not an emergency regarding the fish population. It is an emergency for the economy of Salmon Harbor / Reedsport / Winchester Bay.
- Native Fish (lamprey, Umpqua chub, smelt, and sturgeon) are being eliminated by small mouth bass.
- Need to include cormorants in the duck hunting season.
- Increase limit on cormorants so still shoot ducks.

C. Comment Forms

Eleven comment forms were submitted.

1. ***Does the draft Plan appropriately balance hatchery operations and fishing opportunity with wild fish conversation?***
   - Yes: 1
   - No: 5
   - Uncertain: 3
   - No response: 0

If not, what actions are needed to achieve an appropriate balance?

- There should be more emphasis on conservation. Learn from our neighbors to the north who "doubled down" on hatchery fixes and have driven most of their wild populations to near extinction.
- Winter steelhead harvest is sustainable lands. Coho harvest lands.
- If you are going to take away our wild fish you need to provide more hatchery fish.
- We need hatchery production for spring salmon on the South Umpqua – use of wild fish eggs in hatch box programs; smolt release programs; serious predator control "birds."

2. ***What specific management actions (in any area) do you feel are most critical to successful Plan implementation?***
   - Start managing the fishing guides.
   - A change of mind set I think is critical to a change in results. We easily buy into what I would call a "floating baseline" whatever now becomes the "new normal" and we tend to work from there. Historically most of our runs are at a small percentage of what they could be.
   - No harvest of wild winter steelhead on the Umpqua River and North Umpqua.
   - Harvest cormorants. Increase hatchery smolts.
   - Seals/sea lions and avian predation. Limit harvest in appropriate areas.
   - Habitat restoration and predator control in all areas.
   - Umpqua – control of predators equals higher escapement for both wild and hatchery. Personal opinion: more stocked fish steelhead last year was 10-1 wild – a lot of fisherman caught nothing but natives. Fun but nice to take home a hatchery once in a while. Also, cost to run boat/truck but no hatchery fish to keep.

- Predation and habitat benefit.
- Not sufficiently aware of ramifications to do a critique.
- More planted fish. Predator control – kill ratios set for birds. We now have cormorants all the way above Canyonville on the South Umpqua River.

3. Are there specific management actions that are of concern? Why?

- Limits on bass – non-native predator. Remove limits.
- The comment our two main weapons are hatchery and harvest. I think this is indicative of a mindset that is essentially anti-conservation and a sign that wild fish in this state will continue to be undervalued and eventually take the same path Washington wild runs have gone – no longer viable. Think service, conservation, habitat repair and "the people" will get on board.
- Yes, although harvest of wild steelhead seemed to be off of the plate so to speak it is moot. I would like to reiterate my opinion of not harvesting wild winter steelhead on the Umpqua River System.
- Harvest of winter steelhead might be enacted again – unique runs needs to be protected.
- The restriction of wild spring Chinook take, on the Umpqua concerns me. This does not appear necessary and I do not think it would help achieve your goal.
- No.
- Limiting numbers of outfitters. Umpqua becoming congested with outfitter boats coming from all over. Limiting numbers by regulation numbers of permits issued by area. Local guides have a different view of maintaining their fisheries. Outside guides area here for profit and not looking for longevity of fisheries.
- Not that I see.

4. What's missing in terms of management actions?

- 0/0 of hatchery vs. wild fish taken in "bubble" season in ocean.
- Recognition of the difference between small and medium to large watersheds in regards to pinniped degradation on fish species. Small river systems like Alsea, Siletz, and Elk etc can have entire runs of fish removed by large groups of congregated seals living in their estuaries. Just no room for the fish to avoid these predators. We should seek a release to completely remove them from the estuaries on these smaller rivers. Larger systems (Umpqua) they at least have a chance.
- Address fair handling procedures in catch & release. No taking the fish out of the water. Closing the river when it's to low below Sawyers rapids.
- Plant millions not thousands of fry not smolt and let folks keep a few of the new multitudes of "natives."
- Addressing concern of explosion of guides on the river and what the impact of catch and release might be having on winter steelhead on the Umpqua.
- More public involvement earlier in the process.
- I'm not familiar enough with all of them to make it judgment.
- Fishing guide pressure and regulating them.

5. What are the highest priority monitoring and research actions to pursue?

- Pursue the best science and be willing to drive policies in directions dictated by the facts. We need to move past "greed" and personal desires to consider what is best for fish and people on the long haul. Someone down the line will thank us if we can accomplish.

- Habitat, habitat and more of it. Not taking the fish out of the water during catch and release. Enforcing this rule.
- Economic considerations for our economically deprived communities.

6. Other comments about the plan?

- You have put a lot of time and effort into this, it shows. It's easy(er) to sell status quo than implement best policy but if we are all going to work so hard let's do it to have a CMP in place that will make serious strides in the right direction. Recapturing healthy wild fish runs on as many rivers as possible.
- What about North Umpqua summer steelhead are they not of concern? There are very few of them in the big picture.
- Weak on pinniped plan. "Seek position to help evaluate and reduce impacts of predation" – say what?

7. How did you learn about this evening's open house (check all that apply)

- Through ODFW: 1
- Through my organization: 2
- Media: 5
- Other (please specify): 2
    - Friend

8. Did you find this open house to be useful? If yes, why, if no, why not?

- Yes: 7
- No: 0
- Uncertain: 1
- No response: 0
- Comments:
    - Probably not – preconceived ideas and closed minds overrule thinking "outside the box" and "inside the hatch box."
    - Stations / comments not too workable with this number of people.
    - Learned a lot on subject made aware of the many facets pertaining to the question.
    - My impression is that from your standpoint it is easy to set catch limits. But not to get serious about predator control.

9. What was the most useful part of the open house?

- Chance to talk with other stakeholders; get a better grasp of overall plan.
- The first section and discussion.
- Comment period.
- Comment form.
- Good visual presentation – at start.
- Learning more of the system.
- Overview of plan.
- Getting information from source.

10. What was the least useful part?

- N/A.

- Stations / comments not too workable with this number of people.
- None.

11. Other comments about the open house?

- Thank you.
- Please address North Umpqua summer steelhead, proper catch and release and habitat.
- Excellent closing statements and explanation especially sliding limits. Guides and public have been mislead thinking winter steelhead harvest off the table and didn't show up.
- I found it informative and well presented.

5. LOCATION: COOS BAY/NORTH BEND

Date: January 28, 2014
Attendance: 134

A. Facilitated Group Discussion

- Do not agree with the concept of the CMP. Agree with some but there is confusion. Request to suspend plan due to lack of local science and needs assessment of socio-economic impacts. Area is poverty stricken and relies on fish. Relevant science to determine plan not politics.
- Echo above comments. There is no crisis in fish populations. South Fork of Coquille River is crowded already. Middle Fork Coquille River no hatchery – issues with this.
- Need science based management not political. Premise that hatchery fish damage wild – science is not there to prove this.
- Local residents rely on fish for food. Does not agree with bag limit reduction. Defer sliding scale until 100% fin clipped.
- Tired of all these studies. No lack of "native" steelhead. Do not agree with pressure on South Fork / or the move to the East Fork. Increased pressure associated with this shift.
- Echo all comments. Production problems in Bandon / Coquille. Issues with disease. Less hatchery steelhead available. Want more fish / more opportunities.
- Tourism is main economy in Bandon. Don't reduce hatchery production – acclimate in Lower river. Fix Coal River hatchery problems.
- Coquille Basin – hatchery release in lower river for harvest. Brood stock – returning to native spawning ground – applaud this. Use genetically compatible indigenous fish.
- Frustration with predators – it is out of balance. Need more options to mitigate.
- 2/20 limit has worked well. 100% marking promised. Throwing back a lot of unmarked hatchery fish. 1/day is not worth it for tourists. Limit only after 100% marking – after 5 years at 100%. Habitat is problem for wild fish so is predation – focus on these first.
- Tide water fisherman – allow them to keep 3 wild / year. Lucky to have local district staff. Wild fish may be second or third generation hatchery. Acclimating where catching is not good. Need good practices to start with. Hall Creek was a disaster.
- Water quality issues at Cunningham have prevented release. Quality of return depends on water quality and acclimation site. Don't take away 50,000.
- No significant difference between hatchery and native fish. Plan needs to be reviewed with local communities and has not coordinated with Coos County. Oppose limiting hatchery releases. Increase hatchery releases. Oppose plan for mid-south coast.
- There is science that ODFW has that hatchery fish are not good for wild fish. Politics are getting in the way.
- Put more fish in river. Consider the age demographic of local fisherman.

- Releases on Coquille moved to Bandon instead of eliminated. "Sidewalk" fishing.
- Need to show more science. Johnson Creek study example.
- Quit focusing on short term fixes. Preserve genetic heritage and apply good science. Need more studies. Hatchery program is part of problem as is habitat.
- Take time to check the science since there is no crisis here.
- Not all rivers got hatchery fish as promised in early 1990s. Need more hatchery fish. East Fork Coquille elimination is bad policy.
- Socioeconomic impacts of East Fork Coquille elimination – need to keep it going.
- What are the impacts of future court decisions? Do we have capable attorneys at ODFW?
- Pressure from Native Fish Coalition?
- China Creek acclimation site – how long has it been there?
- Lot of fisheries diversity here. Keep ever river we can available for hatchery to keep diversity.
- STEP is opposed. Want suspended until certain things can be done. Lots of opposition for multiple groups.
- Morgan Creek hatchery practices are in violation of your own law i.e. too many returning /dying in natural habitat and doesn't help fisherman because they can't fish there anyway. Hatchery fish competing for spawning ground with native fish on Morgan Creek. Why allowing hatchery on Morgan Creek? Release those fish elsewhere. Read Native Fish Coalition policy.

B. Open House Station Notes

Hatchery Station Comments:

- ODFW tries too many things… you mess things up i.e. introduced LB to Ten Mile.
- How long has East Fork Coquille been stocked with winter steelhead and what science could come out of wild fish emphasis area?
- East Fork winter steelhead into South Fork Coquille – just fish food for small mouth bass.
- East Fork Coquille winter steelhead – if increase in wild steelhead let tidewater fishers keep wild winter steelhead.
- ODFW: poor practices of where you collect winter steelhead brood stock – catch second generation hatchery fish and call it wild.
- Release West Fork Millicoma fall Chinook at Deton Creek – just below Rooke-Higgens. Still use Rooke-Higgins.
- Elk creek fish (East Fork Coquille) are hatchery origin… hatchery fish released there.
- Concerned about spring Chinook program for Coos not happening for lack of funding and permitting.
- Hard to catch fall Chinook on the Coquille. Reducing number of hatchery fish not the right approach.
- Would like science to have more influence than public comment.
- Fall Chinook from West Fork Millacoma – keep high in system i.e. Rooke Higgins.
- If go to sliding scale 1/10 – impact hard hit economic – important food source.

- Don't go to sliding scale until 100% of marked fish return.
- Explore other options for acclimation sites on East Fork Coquille – low wild catch.
- Concerns about impacts of farm-raised salmon in Washington impacting Oregon (Atlantics.)
- Glad increasing Ten Mile winter steelhead releases. Want more increases in future.
- South Fork Coquille is too crowded for East Fork shift.
- Wants Coho releases (hatchery) on Ten Mile.
- Instead of putting East Fork Coquille fish in South Fork, put in North Fork Coquille.
- Benefit lower bay fall Chinook in Coquille by moving fish to bay instead of eliminating.

Harvest Station Comments:

- Increase impact on South Fork Coquille wild winter steelhead by adding 20,000 hatchery fish.
- Major concern – all Coos basin fall Chinook are approximately 50% fin clipped.
- 3 / 4 years all Chinook return will be 100% fin clipped. And how it may affect wild fall Chinook harvest if numbers are low.
- Not in favor of wild winter steelhead harvest.

Habitat Station Comments:

- [No comments were received.]

Predation Station Comments:

- [No comments were received.]

C. Comment Forms

Seventeen comment forms were submitted.

1. ***Does the draft Plan appropriately balance hatchery operations and fishing opportunity with wild fish conversation?***
   - Yes: 1
   - No: 6
   - Uncertain: 9
   - No response: 0
   - Comments:
     - Yes, it is a good start without actions.

If not, what actions are needed to achieve an appropriate balance?

- Need to understand what is involved.
- Fin clip all hatchery fish. Utilize sound non-political scientific research.
- I think the Lower Umpqua River is unique among area streams in its dependence on unclipped fish stocks.
- More biological proof of damage to wild strains from fin clipped.
- More fish.

- Find a problem before giving us a solution – CMP.
- Predator control.
- More hatchery releases in those rivers that currently have releases.
- Why only Ten Mile winter steelhead – why not increased hatchery silvers in Lower Ten Mile i.e. Eel Lake and OR Saunders.
- Quit this plan – do not worry about wild fish as the last 80 years of hatchers has eliminated wild fish.
- What is wrong with past management of these species? Public needs to know what has ODFW done to correct "errors" in management? Why hasn't ODFW done predation control of introduced species? Need action not just "study."
- No CMP.
- Predation management. Better controls in upstream management – water quality, temperatures, LWD. Spawning habitat on Coos and Coquille.
- Realize there are no real or true genetic wild fish. All these populations Coos and Coquille have received plants from other river stocks in the past. Check your records.
- How do you count wild fish when the hatchery only clips 1 in 5 fish?
- Catch and release only on wild steelhead. Barbless hooks only. Strong reduction of hatchery plants conflicting with wild fish.

2. ***What specific management actions (in any area) do you feel are most critical to successful Plan implementation?***
   - Need to be less political use more science. Is there a DNA difference between native and hatchery fish?
   - Use the research center.
   - Maintaining fish populations on rivers so as not to reduce catch limits.
   - More fish. Locally adapted. More wild steelhead. Slow because of hatcheries.
   - Study rivers before implementing.
   - Increase releases, predator control.
   - Habitat improvement and increased predation management actions.
   - I do not agree with this plan.
   - Predation control. Continued hatchery programs.
   - Give the Mid-South Coast the same increases that other areas in the coast of Oregon will receive. Cuts are not acceptable.
   - "Wild" fish need good habitat to be successful. Hatcheries need modified to "enriched environments."
   - Oppose increase hatchery plants on South Fork Coquille River. No scientific data to certify that current wild populations are viable under current situation and can withstand increase pressure from hatchery.

3. ***Are there specific management actions that are of concern? Why?***
   - Politics in the fish and wildlife department's management practices.
   - Elk and Sixes River.
   - Maximum fishing opportunity. Production problems at both Bandon and Coler.
   - Process flawed starting in "strawman."
   - Predator control. Keeping fish available to feed families and improve healthy eating.

- Stopping the release of fish in rivers that have a history of releases. It will increase fishing pressure on the rivers with remaining releases.
- Do not change West Fork Millicoma stocking to Blossom Creek – keep it the way it is.
- Build more hatcheries. Implement the net pens in Lower Coos Bay as proposed by Salmon for Oregon.
- Over the years ODFW has advised doing certain habitat actions that affected landowners and community. Now landowners that did those actions are suffering the consequences. What are the long term adverse effects to the community, fishing and landowner? What are the actual funding costs when you're looking at budget reductions?
- No science. No economic impact of reduced smolt releases. Overcrowding of fisherman on South Fork Coquille because of elimination of East Fork Coquille smolt releases.
- Predation management. Increase of overwinter habitat – Coquille. Spawning habitat. Water quality.
- Elk River Chinook reduction – it would be easy to move acclimation sites lower in river to prevent strays. Rogue Spring Chinook – let's try. It has already been done with the fish farm in Coos Bay.

4. What's missing in terms of management actions?

- How about predation of smolts and adult fish? Why is nothing substantial being done? Why doesn't ODFW sell hunting license to take a limited number of seals, sea lions and cormorant for net gain in dollars and not hire trappers for a net loss of funds?
- Sound science conducted on the South Coast.
- I think the ODFW is unaware of how many ocean-based salmon trips are made to Winchester Bay with the understanding that if the Umpqua River Bar or ocean is too rough, they can still fish the river (as long as they haven't filled their angling tags.)
- Why all the politics.
- More fish. Agree no sliding scale.
- Consult with community rather than "stakeholders."
- Predator control – promoting the health of eating fish and making as much as it available as possible.
- Increase releases.
- Habitat improvements.
- Bring back STEP hatch boxes on local streams from the 80s.
- Pre-project management / monitoring for a period of time post to determine effects.
- No significant difference between hatchery and wild fish. OAR 660-015-0000 (6)(a)(6) ODFW has not coordinated their plans to reduce salmonids in the Mid South Coast.
- Predation management – management of both sides of the equation.
- Adequate scientific studies – 60% hatchery mixing on Elk. How large was the river sample – how many times? Who did it? How far up river?
- Need broader jurisdiction i.e. critical habitat. ODFW must be able to regulate fishing especially number of boats on the river.

5. What are the highest priority monitoring and research actions to pursue?

- Getting the low percentage (30%) of smolts fin clipped to 100% in Coos and Coquille systems.
- More fish.
- Habitat and predation.

- Define what a wild fish is and the status of those fish. Define specifically the damage done by hatchery fish. Scientific peer reviewed research.
- Actual costs / loss in numbers due to all predation and how controlling predation affects species.
- Research of genetics of salmonids of "native" (non-clipped) fish vs. hatchery (clipped.)
- Spawning success – predation effects. Overwinter and rearing habitat. Water quality.
- Adequate funding to monitor effects of hatchery plants on wild populations.

6. Other comments about the plan?

- It does not address predators nor their impact on the fish.
- The Umpqua River smallmouth fishery seems to be a cause of great concern – yet the recent small increase in the daily bag limit was woefully insufficient. Raising the daily limit to 25 would be more effective. However limiting the take of larger smallmouth's to 3 or 5 over 12 inches in length would help preserve this world-class fishery. In reducing smallmouth's impact on the Umpqua System.
- Need more time to study.
- More fish.
- Reduction of fall Chinook on Coquille – why? Already tough on Coquille.
- Leave things alone.
- ODFW definition of "native" salmonids is not clipped. Very inaccurate scientifically.
- Continued path to extinction – with current and proposed policy.

7. How did you learn about this evening's open house (check all that apply)

- Through ODFW: 4
- Through my organization: 6
- Media: 9
- Other (please specify): 2
    - Word of mouth
    - Fisherman

8. Did you find this open house to be useful? If yes, why, if no, why not?

- Yes: 9
- No: 2
- Uncertain: 1
- No response: 0
- Comments:
    - Don't understand all of the issues.
    - We have already said no reductions.
    - We learned ODFW is good at PR.
    - Experiential bias and unspoken agenda government employees are implementing.

9. What was the most useful part of the open house?

- Open discussion.
- Hearing other viewpoints.
- Good discussions from locals. Initially no changes necessary.
- Community response.
- Examination of proposed plan.

- Presentations. Q/A period to see how others view plan.

10. What was the least useful part?

- People not focusing their comments on what is actually up for discussion.
- Nothing.
- Waste of money.
- All the charts – who knew if they are accurate.

11. Other comments about the open house?

- Good presentations – oral, written and posters.
- Waste of time and money.
- We know the outcome was predetermined from the outset.
- ODFW needs to prioritize funding to fund needed programs which have been in existence for years.

6. LOCATION: REEDSPORT

Date: January 29, 2014
Attendance: 129

A. Facilitated Group Discussion

- Appreciate ODFW coming to Reedsport. Imbalance between conservation and opportunities – too much on conservation. Sturgeon opportunity. No crisis right now – issue with bag limit reductions. Economic impacts.
- $1.75 / smolt is worth $300 / fish.
- Want more hatcheries to protect wild. Economics of fishery / tourism is important. More hatchery fish on South Fork. Issue with bag limit reduction. Wild fish are backbone of good fishery. No summer program. Put to winter program on Umpqua. Siuslaw – more hatcheries as well.
- Adaptive management – how will you do this?
- Impacts of humane society need to be considered. One fish equals one kill and done for the day. No catch and release.
- Echo all these comments above. Need to base on local, relevant science. Do research and studies now. You won't fight law suits without science.
- Economic impacts of reduced bag limits. Consider fish that come in the river and go back out.
- Oppose CMP in terms of suspension. Socio-economic concerns. Need local science.
- Politics too involved. Would like 1/5 wild steelhead back on the Umpqua. No crisis so increase limits.
- Too drastic for current numbers. Look at specific closure dates or location. Look at other options before reduced take. Ok with 10 Chinook limit / person.
- Need more hatchery fish in South. Wild winter steelhead need to be saved – no kill. Habitat issue for summer steelhead in North Umpqua. Require guide log books. Education – fish handling practices for guides.
- Allow wild steelhead catch and keep if it would survive.
- Nothing in nature is ever wasted.
- No wild winter steelhead keep on North Umpqua. Low water closures. Proper catch and release.
- Agree with last comments. Big Elk – no business fishing rather than short time. Fall Chinook impacted by predators and high fishing numbers. Protect wild Chinook on Siletz. Best spawning habitat. Higher return because of deadline higher up river.
- Deadline should remain as 2013 on Siletz. No catch and release on spawning grounds.
- Strongly oppose to any wild steelhead kill. Genetic diversity in Umpqua makes it strong – need to keep. Run cannot sustain the kill. Economic impacts – people come knowing its catch and

release. Mandatory turn in of harvest cards and guide numbers. Pressure on fish because of number of fisherman and modern technology. Mortality rates of catch and release. Ok with hatchery fish for recreational opportunities.

- Poor fish handling impacts with catch and release. Don't remove from the water.
- Catch and release regulations are needed.
- Catch and release is harassing the fish.
- Balance with catch and release practices.
- Catch and release safe nets and other measures.
- Low water impacts on run.
- Socioeconomic impacts of low bag limit.
- Seals and cormorants are a big issue. Issue with release predation.
- Science says wild winter steelhead is sustainable. Remember the balance for the Umpqua. Stop on low water years.
- What is actual sustainable harvest of wild? Error on the fish side – conservation. Will depend on high water vs. low water.
- Winchester – more interested in salmon. Umpqua – catch and release steelhead. Reasonable quota based on actual numbers not history or forecast. Be careful with decreasing the bag limits.
- Cut back on guides allowed.
- Allow 1/5 wild steelhead. Problem with catch and release – mortality concerns.
- Limit number of guides allow per day.
- Umpqua has better info on wild steelhead. Agree with 1/5. Consider time and quantity taken. Allow opportunity for catch and release.
- Too much take on springers. Bad years don't allow. Happy with Rock Creek hatchery to allow harvest . Average years 2/5 or 2/10.
- Pressure from the number of guides, efficiency. 1/5 will add up due to number of fisherman.
- Keep in mind the economic impacts when you finalize this plan. People need to fish for food.

B. Open House Stations

Hatchery Station Comments:

- Increase to three / day on winter steelhead.
- Take summer hatchery numbers and move to winter steelhead plant. Increase winter remove summer.
- Increase hatchery output or add additional hatchery for all species. The need for more fish to accommodate the increase in fisherman on the Umpqua is extremely important to our local economy. This does apply to a major degree to the fall Chinook harvest.
- Increase Chinook hatchery. If it is a low count year and we are only able to keep five, how are we suppose to fill the rest of our tag when you're considered lucky to catch just one clipped Chinook.

- Increase incubator hatch boxes at Soda Springs Dam.
- Big Elk – concerned about keeping wild steelhead – should be catch and release.
- We need more hatchery fish produced than 300,000 due to increased pressure over the years and a catastrophic occurrence.
- Put hatch boxes back in the rivers.
- Create more terminal hatcheries where appropriate.
- Put more hatchery fish boxes in the river – we are not allowed.
- Rock Creek hatchery – if stray rate for spring Chinook is not acceptable find another area lower in the Umpqua system to release smolts.

Harvest Station Comments:

- No kill of wild winter steelhead.
- Higher bag limits in lower estuary.
- Pilot guide log book.
- Cuts in spring Chinook harvest is too much.
- Better education for release of fish.
- Mandatory education of releasing fish alive.
- No wild winter steelhead harvest.
- Main stem 1/ 5 on wild winter steelhead.
- Wild winter steelhead harvest – 1/3 when abundance is no problem, like now.
- Reduce harvest opportunity. Reduce cost of license.
- Limit harvest to one and done when in low category – 1/5.
- Keep Siletz deadline for fall Chinook at Ojalla to protect spawners.
- Make higher annual limit 15 not 20.
- Deal with birds.
- Open North Fork Siuslaw to retain one wild 1/5.
- Two – five cutthroat per day.
- Siletz deadline – Ojalla.
- Take Siletz summer smolt and move to winter fishery.
- Increase bag limit to three per day on Siletz.
- Implement guide book to record numbers.
- Increase hatchery on South Umpqua.
- Nobody needs more than 10 fish / year.
- No kill on Umpqua wild winter fish – but put more hatchery fish in the South for harvest.
- Eat wild fish.
- Consider daily/annual bag limit on fall Chinook of 2/15.
- Why can't we keep wild winter steelhead on Umpqua – 1/5.
- Close loophole on guides passing off pole to client.
- Increase cutthroat harvest to 5/day.

- Fill bag limit on first two fish then they are done.
- Guides – eggs go with clients.
- Zero harvest on wild winter steelhead on Umpqua.
- Catch one and go home for Chinook and Coho.
- Harvest first fish – wild or hatchery.
- Open winter steelhead in Smith River, Umpqua.
- Reintroduce wild winter steelhead 1/5 harvest on Umpqua – main stem only.
- No harvest of wild winter steelhead on main Umpqua and North Umpqua.
- Enforce proper catch and release.
- Definitely consider low-water closure when fish are consolidated.
- Increase law enforcement – particularly during Coho and fall Chinook seasons.
- What is the process to modify the plan?
- Fishing is catching fish and eating them.
- Why is main Umpqua different from Chetco, Rogue, and Sixes for wild steelhead take?
- Keep deadlines to protect spawning ground.
- Need education on wild fish release – many handle roughly, leads to mortality.

Habitat Station Comments:

- When focusing on the South Umpqua habitat is probably the greatest deterrent to increased populations. Support or incentives to landowners to improve stream bank stabilization would seriously help.
- South Umpqua is too warm for spring Chinook. A waste of time to put them there.
- Need stream enhancement on North Umpqua for STS asap.
- South Umpqua is too polluted – low D.D, high pH and too warm to sustain spring Chinook.
- Smith River – where did all the loads of boulders and logs go? Was that a habitat project?
- Improve habitat for summer steelhead in North Umpqua River.

Predation Station Comments:

- Why have a limit for small mouth on the Umpqua? Non-native, don't protect them.
- Brown trout should not be on the predator list. Great to catch, very adaptable.
- Take out sea lion – not endangered anymore.
- We need cormorant hunting season. Use revenue to increase fishing opportunity.
- Lower populations of non-native pinnipeds.
- Help volunteers get special license to haze pinnipeds with firecrackers, etc. while fishing so don't lose fish to predators while landing fish.
- Eliminate limit on small mouth bass.
- 600 seals on Seal Island – four mules up Umpqua. Numbers are increasing.
- What are legal ways to haze seals and sea lions?
- Get public behind you to get feds to change position on seals and cormorants.

- Striped bass and small mouth should not be protected by ODFW – non-native and they eat salmon and steelhead.

C. Comment Forms

Seven comment forms were submitted.

1. ***Does the draft Plan appropriately balance hatchery operations and fishing opportunity with wild fish conversation?***
   - Yes: 2
   - No: 3
   - Uncertain: 0
   - No response: 0

If not, what actions are needed to achieve an appropriate balance?

- There are no wild fish (salmon.) Only unclipped hatchery fish.
- Establish the wild fish emphasis areas, make them more than the absence of hatchery fish and add wild fish emphasis areas in watersheds selected specifically because of high quality habitat. Include areas above hatcheries. Make conservation a priority, hatchery management purpose so hatchery protection adds to the natural production base rather than replacing it.

2. ***What specific management actions (in any area) do you feel are most critical to successful Plan implementation?***
   - Convincing public of need to focus on maintaining a wild population sufficient to preclude becoming endangered. If feds take over control everything will be much worse with little likelihood of improving.
   - Address habitat even if it means no more than identifying what ODFW will do with ODF, ODA, OWEB & NOAA to protect and restore habitat.
   - Within 18 months of CMP adoption, ODFW should initiate a pilot project in at least two rivers. One in the southern end and one in the northern end of the plan area. One of the two rivers should have a population in trouble (non-viable) and with a hatchery program. Both should have good habitat, good restoration potential, and strong, local engagement. Pilot actions to include estuary / low gradient habitat restoration, hatchery management / operational upgrades and monitoring / adaptive management with action triggers to track improvements and trends. Clip all hatchery releases.
   - Cormorant management (see feds.)

3. ***Are there specific management actions that are of concern? Why?***
   - Feel hatchery release levels should increase over time – if feasible.
   - Single release spots for hatchery fish.
   - Put cormorants in the game bird synopsis with a bag limit like crows or ducks or geese.

4. ***What's missing in terms of management actions?***
   - Need to significantly lower populations of seals, sea lions and cormorants on Umpqua.
   - This plan is an important one, it has some great goals, but it is not yet a conservation plan.
   - Eliminate a lot of harbor seals and cormorants.

- Limits on guides and commercial fishing.
- Predation and the federal government. ODFW has to pursue this issue harder. We know it's tough. Keep on this and work at establishing a means to kill cormorants and seals / sea lions. Forget hazing – that's nuts.

5. ***What are the highest priority monitoring and research actions to pursue?***
   - Hatchery impacts on wild populations. Wild fish escapement numbers. Hatchery spawners stray numbers. Establish pilot project and monitor results.
   - Interact ion of hatchery and wild spawning fish.

6. ***Other comments about the plan?***
   - [No responses to this question.]

7. ***How did you learn about this evening's open house (check all that apply)***
   - Through ODFW: 2
   - Through my organization: 2
   - Media: 3
   - Other (please specify): 2
     - STEP
     - Through a friend

8. ***Did you find this open house to be useful? If yes, why, if no, why not?***
   - Yes: 4
   - No: 0
   - Uncertain: 0
   - No response: 0

9. ***What was the most useful part of the open house?***
   - Getting info on plan and explanation of aspects of plan.
   - Openness of ODFW staff.
   - An openness with ODFW.

10. ***What was the least useful part?***
    - People arguing with ODFW staff.

11. ***Other comments about the open house?***
    - Comment the Department on proactively attempting to address this difficult problem of many personal and economic factors.
    - I don't like your program it piss me off so bad I left. You people already have decided what you are going to do.
    - Thank you.

7. COMMENT FORMS RETURNED TO ODFW DURING COMMENT PERIOD

In addition to the comment forms submitted at the six open houses, 13 members of the public returned completed comment forms to ODFW's State Office or district offices between January 30 – March 10, 2014.

1. ***Does the draft Plan appropriately balance hatchery operations and fishing opportunity with wild fish conversation?***
    - Yes: 1
    - No: 12
    - Uncertain: 1
    - No response: 0

If not, what actions are needed to achieve an appropriate balance?

- Split number of fish between Trask and Wilson, use only brood stock native fish, clip a percentage and release.
- The Department needs to address predatory species with action not just words.
- More brood fish stock in all 5 rivers in Tillamook County.
- More hatchery fish, trapped wild fish, eggs, and sperm with hatch boxes on side channels or ponds in all rivers including Siletz, Alsea, and Salmon. Mid coast receives fraction of hatchery releases compared to units north and south.
    - Have Fall Creek research operations study best way with best results; have volunteers or landowners monitor sites.
- More focus on hatchery fish on North Umpqua for winter steelhead; better system for smolt.
- Increase rather than decrease hatchery spring Chinook.
- Better habitat in all rivers.
- Balance would occur if hatchery program and STEP produced more fish so fish were more protected; % of hatchery fish would be more plentiful allowing wild fish not to be targeted.
- Opportunity to keep 2 native steelhead during surplus years on Umpqua; guides should also be limited to how many native fish are kept by clients.
- Assuming wild fish pop is healthy without knowing if wild fish is sustainable; very little data to support contention and existing info not provided at meeting; back off hatchery plants, especially on North Fork in summer to see if wild fish respond; great opportunity to show difference between wild and hatchery mgt by devoting one fork to hatchery emphasis and other to wild fish emphasis.
- The spring Chinook on S. Umpqua are stable, viable of the 95% confidence level by your own data; absolutely no need/purpose for reduced harvest regulation on Umpqua system; also including N. Umpqua system in structure proves what is really behind plan; an elates bias philosophy on wild fish coming out of head of fish division from Ed Bowles; firmly believe your goals are no take of wild fish and elimination of hatchery stock; take of no wild steelhead is another example and no support from fish division on stocking N. Umpqua winter steelhead.

- Main Umpqua below forks: hatchery fish released in south fork not good biters in main river; wild run strong enough for limited harvest; this would enable fishermen to keep a badly hooked fish and use resource instead of it dying. During very low water there should be temp closure to protect wild and hatchery fish (Sawyer Rapids); large number of released fish are going to have more mortality.

2. ***What specific management actions (in any area) do you feel are most critical to successful Plan implementation?***
   - Install hatchery on Wilson; it has the most access and opportunity
   - Do not implement without more studies and better data for sliding scale.
   - Stop "native" fish groups from taking over rivers.
   - Better management of all fish stock.
   - Open more habitats on lower rivers.
   - Wild steelhead should never be harvested.
   - Establishing time/date when allowable to fish and possess fish.
   - Closure would protect young while allowing anglers to fish and retain within reasonable limits.
   - Emergency closures should be used to limit steelhead fishing on lower Umpqua during dry years.
   - After fixing section of stream, seed stream with wild or unfed smolt from hatchery to see how rehab worked instead of waiting years for straying pair.
   - Have sliding scale mgt option for winter steelhead on main stem like salmon so fishing pressure can be shut down during dry weather pattern like this winter.
   - Find out how to circumvent smallmouth predation on smolts going down main stem of Umpqua; smallmouth seem here to stay, are invasive; other states net and poison them to favor trout; chubs were killed in Diamond Lake to favor trout.
   - Plan is flawed from very start with little or no public involvement until very end; Oregon State survey shows 60% want harvest of wild fish; this was over broad spectrum of people; while other areas have vowed a no take of wild fish, evidence left of take strategy; "hand-picked" stakeholder groups may have represented no take of wild fish, but wonder if all members really wanted a no take of wild fish; in last night's meeting Umpqua fishermen's group was divided in public testimony.
   - Need hatchery release area on main Umpqua; lots of money and time spent; Wolf Creek, Calapooa, Yellow Creek, Hubbard Creek good places to consider.

3. ***Are there specific management actions that are of concern? Why?***
   - Raising smolt on Trask system and releasing on Wilson; fish get lost.
   - Loading Wilson with more steelhead could cause overcrowding of drift boats.
   - Loading Trask with more spring Chinook with limited access could create combat fishing at the few good places.
   - Actions seem to be more on conservation of wild fish; there are not many true wild fish left. When did hatchery begin, 1854 I think?
   - Work with Oregon, Washington, Alaska, and Canada and big commercial fishing fleets to set lower harvesting of fish so coast can have better fish return, otherwise no fish for anyone.
   - Failure to control salmonid predators such as birds and seals on rivers like Umpqua; lobby State and Fed reps to lethally remove diver duck cormorants year round; or issue hunting tags to trained permit holders.
   - Measures such as bounty should be taken to control small mouth bass.

- Sliding scale big area of concern and needs to be reviewed again.
- Concern about anglers targeting fishery, e.g., Sawyer Rapids is a target on low water in Umpqua River. Completely closing this area would allow fish to continue to spawning grounds and kill rate caused by guides would not be issue. Same for Smith River; closure close to falls allows refuge for fish.
- People complaining about reducing native catch are those that catch 20+ per year and are game hogs; support for 10 fish native limit on spring salmon on Umpqua because it is sufficient.
- Do not discontinue old winter steelhead hatchery run on Alsea; it worked good for decades; why fix if not broken.
- Still allowing fishing for summer steelhead above Moonshine Park in summer; suggest deadline at first bridge above Moonhsine so summer streelhead and few springers have refuge on Siletz. This is only other coastal river with summer steelhead run and harassment is allowed all summer long when they are like goldfish in fish bowl.
- I and organization (Steamboaters) against taking of winter wild steelhead in Umpqua; reaping now what another generation sowed; man up and work for recovery in your generation; what's right for fish and politics be damned. Folks like to fish even if they don't take one home, plenty of testimony last night.
- Yes, Mr. Ed Bowles grabbed a run of fish (S. Ump. Springers) and is using small numbers to further his and Depts. Agenda of ultimately no take of wild fish anywhere in State of Oregon; Umpqua system is last stronghold for take of wild fish and this is now Fish Division's goal by way of this plan; Bowles and crew using this run to further his agenda; this run is stable, viable of 95% level and is self-propagating with current habitat over 50 to 60 years of reported data.
- Number of guide boats keeps growing; they consistently hook and release large numbers of wild steelhead; no matter how careful, mortality rate high in sheer volume, then ordinary fishermen keeping 1 fish a day or 5 per year. This is not conservation, it is business; their days and hours need to be limited. The money they bring in from out of state and area clients is not worth pressure they put on our resources; nowhere close to what fisherman who live here contribute, we pay taxes, live, and spend money here.

4. ***What's missing in terms of management actions?***
   - Proof that this plan is necessary.
   - What is or can be changed in the plan; impression it will not be changed for 16 years.
   - Predation management, such as seals, sea lions, and cormorants; these species are increasing and need to be controlled.
   - Guts to stand up to "native" fish groups and tell them to back off.
   - Develop common sense regulations to improve fishing on coast.
   - Board not listening to ODFW biologists.
   - Sliding scale for spring Chinook should not include North Umpqua.
   - Consider using Rock Creek Hatchery for North Umpqua winter steelhead.
   - Need to increase spring Chinook hatchery fish.
   - Consider Winchester Dam for acclimation site for winter steelhead.
   - Ability to enforce regulations to make people respect State laws.
   - Report card of violators available to public would help with enforcement.
   - Instead of conservative, use aggressive approach to rebuild numbers of fish in river; have mindset more is better and don't be afraid to try something new; what is being done now is lame, weak, and mediocre.

- No alternatives given in case this wild vs. hatchery fish issue isn't resolved; backing off habitat improvement issue and letting general public do it; at least get into fray and state specific habitat priorities. General public doesn't know if you are/aren't being involved. Lever federal agencies to improve habitat, even in lower tribs, to improve spawning potential.
- Looking at real substantial facts; you have 95% confidence level on S. Umpqua spring Chinook; that is extremely high rates but not good enough, for Ed Bowles and crew want 99% level; with current habitat that likely is not attainable, then you want to throw same reduction on N. Umpqua that has nothing to do with S. Umpqua run; motives are very evident.
- Pay attention to ordinary fishermen; special interest groups pressure causes management to be swayed their way. Years ago fishing log book was filled out for ODFW for winter steelhead on main Umpqua; logged days, hours fished, where, day and caught. The biologist doing survey was amazed at results; about 14 wild to 1 hatchery, even though some told him in beginning it would be that way; never seen or heard anything about survey being used.

5. What are the highest priority monitoring and research actions to pursue?

- Need a 5 year study on impact of this management plan before decisions are made.
- Better fish tracking from specific stream to ocean locations and back with better technology.
- If no hatchery steelhead put in Kilchis, why not close it to steelhead fishing and monitor native fish.
- Salmon are great economic impact on South Coast.
- Develop hatchery programs to grow fish in wild and natural environment.
- Salmonid food sources in ocean.
- Wild winter steelhead, hatch winter steelhead, hatch spring Chinook, hatch summer Steelhead.
- Cormorant population, seals, and sea lion predation effects on smolts and fish eaten. Cormorants not native so why are they protected by Feds.
- Reseeding streams and tribs with none or very few fish.
- Use latest DNA methodology to work on wild vs. hatchery fish issue; showing hatchery fish aren't significantly impacting wild populations will open door for more flexibility to use hatchery fish; need better data on where fish spawn, and distribution of a run.
- None, in this region need to see ODFW staff out on water understanding what is really going on with anglers and public at large utilizing our fisheries; last year we tried to revise new angling regulation that was put on Umpqua system and did not succeed in getting it revised; in process it was very evident that local staff really did not know impact of regulation change and how poorly it impacted the legal angler; potentially no common knowledge in local ODFW office of what is really going on out in water.
- Provide enough hatchery fish for harvest; monitor and research in regards to what is really happening on Umpqua and Coquille river system.

6. Other comments about the plan?

- Start over.
- Contact Nez Pierce Tribe about how they manage on the Columbia River.
- Need to compromise and work with State Marine Board how wild winter steelhead are harvested by limiting guide vessel tags.
- Coastal lakes are stocked with trout throughout year; birds move in and clean out within 3-4 days; they do same with salmon smolt.
- It is not crime to review what worked 10-20 years ago.

- Appreciate Dept. taking effort to raise issues; pay more attention to what stakeholder groups suggested, or why use them.
- I and other strongly against plan and process to this point; believe my comments on this sheet and numerous emails display the sentiments of many of the common anglers that has been left out till now; I and others will continue to challenge plan/process right up to the Commission.
- As to mandatory reporting, why would I trust ODFW to use info to benefit the common anger; ODFW continues to take away; went from 40 to 20 annual fish; to no wild steelhead; need to repair trust and confidence before approving reporting; as to guides, can't speak for them but same would apply; for businesses, Oregon has reputation for very difficult to operate in state with all regulations in place; proposal on guides is prime example of philosophy; get staff out of offices and gather needed data.
- Too much info to really absorb in short time; needed to get info and plan to general public 1 or 2 weeks before meeting; new notice and make available at ODFW offices; plan seems to use a lot of scientific opinions; remember not all scientific opinions and studies not necessarily facts, and science is constantly changing; we have been burned by past science many times.

7. How did you learn about this evening's open house (check all that apply)

- Through ODFW: 6
- Through my organization: 3
- Media: 6
  - Article from coastal release; Roseburg area, was poor in importance of meeting.
- Other (please specify): 3
  - Friends
  - Guys at the plunkin shack
  - Other anglers

8. Did you find this open house to be useful? If yes, why, if no, why not?

- Yes: 8
  - Learned a lot and saw interaction between commercials, guides, and citizen anglers.
  - Information presented; sharing ideas has good result.
  - Gave more insight into economic issues and position Dept. is in to satisfy various interest groups.
- No: 2
  - Ed Bowles, Administrator, did not care about facts but rather demonstrated his bias on wild fish and his unwillingness to recognize their own data and past performance on these issues; he came across smug, self-serving and wanting to argue rather than build consensus; whole plan full of bias and actions based on emotion and ideology, not facts; facts are the S. Umpqua springers are viable, stable and have been through 50+ years of recorded data; the Dept. is only using it because of small numbers to further their case of getting no take of wild stock.
- Uncertain: 2
  - Most of the people that spoke were against plan.
- No response: 0

9. What was the most useful part of the open house?

- None.
- Finding that others think it is a bad plan.
- All good information and meeting well controlled.
- The discussion and hearing overall plan.
- Making opinions and ideas useful in plan.
- People gathering from central coast to talk and voice thoughts and ideas.
- Dialogue at issue stations and public response period.
- Really not very much and came across as most meetings do with ODFW.

10. What was the least useful part?

- Listening to Ben Hathaway.
- Mr. Owen's jokes.
- Breakout session too crowded; should have had break out rooms.
- Lame, conservative tone by ODFW; great waters available to work with.
- Hearing from Ed Bowles the Agency solution-American society is getting tired of edicts from some public agency; If you want to go certain way need to present data, i.e. what makes the run healthy.
- Too much time with Owens and Stahl at the front of the meeting; want to see more discussions on specifics and why the groups and department came to conclusions.

11. Other comments about the open house?

- Hard to have an open house meeting when one side has mind made up.
- If it wasn't for hatcheries 100 years ago, native or wild fish would not exist today. Fish numbers abundant from 60's to mid 80's. From mid 80's to now, numbers dropped to almost nonexistent. Something needs to be done.
- If Umpqua opened for wild fish retention, should be only deep hooked fish (honor system) retained by juvenile anglers only. Important to let kids, their dads, and grandpas share experience.
- Please write me letter explaining why we don't use Rock Creek for North Umpqua hatchery winter steelhead.
- Were you guys really listening or are minds already made up; Bob Buckman wasted years not trying new and old, just don't touch. Put smiles back on fishermen's faces, stop grumbling.
- This open house same old thing; decisions have been made; satisfying expectations to Commission that they took "road" to the public; prejudice, demeanor, and lack of wanting to really look at facts from Ed Bowles was particularly evident at meeting. Meeting only strengthened desire to challenge plan and process; facts, evidence, past plans and actions are being ignored for bias ideology, emotion and philosophy with no sound factual basis; spring Chinook run in S Umpqua should not be an issue and proof biologists treated it as such and the evidence and data have not changed from then to now.
- ODFW staff did good job of running meeting and explaining plan, but info stations were too crowded to get questions answered. However, staff deserves big pat on back; they were organized, professional, fair, and honest in presentation; not easy job with many different opinions. Feel strongly that Commission decision such as few years back on keeping wild steelhead in Umpqua should have been in Roseburg instead of Salem; this makes it hard on ordinary people to attend, resulting in unfair advantage for special interest groups who get expenses and tax credit for attending.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Stakeholder Teams Rosters
B. Sample Open House Agenda
C. Habitat Technical Working Groups – Invitation, Agenda, and Summary Notes
D. Written Comments Received: January 3 – March 10, 2014

Coastal Multi-Species Conservation and Management Plan
Stakeholder Roster
September 26, 2013

Stratum Group	Stakeholder Name	Organization	E mail	Alternate
North Coast	Ray Monroe	Commercial fishing	doryfreshfish@embarqmail.com	
	Jack Smith	Fishing Guide	jackandtina@centurylink.net	
	Mike Herbel	Coastal Conservation Association	mrherbel@aol.com	
	Ian Fergusson	Assoc. of NW Steelheaders	ian.fergusson@comcast.net	
	Allan Moore	Trout Unlimited	AMoore@tu.org	
	~~Shawn Reiersgaard~~	~~Tillamook Creamery~~	~~SReiersgaard@tillamook.com~~	
	Melyssa Graeper	Necanicum Watershed Council	necanicumwatershed@gmail.com	
	Kelly Dirksen	Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde	Kelly.dirksen@grandronde.org	
	Garry Bullard	City of Manzanita	manzbch@nehalemtel.net	garrybullard@charter.net
	Mark Labhart	Tillamook County	mlabhart@co.tillamook.or.us	
	Sara LaBorde	Wild Salmon Center	slaborde@wildsalmoncenter.org	
	Gary Kish	NW Sportfishing Industry Assoc.	4salmon@gmail.com	
Mid-Coast	Bob Spellbrink	Commercial fishing	allied1@hughes.net	
	Stan Steele	Alsea Sportsmans Association	riverrunguide@yahoo.com	Tom Davis
	Grant Scheele	Fishing guide	gscheele@farmersagent.com	
	John Sanchez	Central Coast Fly Fishers	JAllenSanchez@Gmail.com	
	Corby Chappell	Fish conservation	Chappell@teleport.com	
	Wayne Hoffman	Mid Coast Watershed Council	mcwc@midcoastwatershedscouncil.org	
	Stan van de Wetering	Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians	Stanvandewetering@yahoo.com	
	Ron Gerber	Public-at-large	Drongerber@yahoo.com	
	Joe Rohleder	Public-at-large	rohleder@teleport.com	
	Mike Laverty	NW Sportfishing Industry Assoc.	mlaverty@mortonandassociates.net	
	Catherine Pruett	Salmon Drift Creek Watershed Council	sdcwcdirector@gmail.com	Don Larson
	Brian Hudson	Florence STEP/STAC	hudson65@q.com	
Umpqua	Wayne Spicer	Umpqua Valley Fly Fishers	wspicer2@gmail.com	Craig Cowgill, craigcowgill@rocketmail.com
	Paul Heberling	Umpqua Fishermen's Association	pgheberling@gmail.com	Mike Brochu, mbrochu@fronteirnet.net
	Steve Godin	GRWB STEP	stevegodin@rconnects.com	
	Joe Ferguson	Steamboaters	j-fergusonpls@comcast.net	Jeff Dose, Peter Tonquet
	Greg Haller	Pacific Rivers Council	greg@pacificrivers.org	John Kober, john@pacificrivers.org
	Eric Riley	Partnership for Umpqua Rivers	eric@umpquarivers.org	
	Cameron Krauss	Douglas Timber Operators	cameron.krauss@swansongroup.biz	Audrey Barnes, audreyb@douglasfast.net
	Walt Barton	Douglas County SWCD	walt.barton@oacd.org	
	Kelly Coates	Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe	Kcoates@cowcreek.com	Amy Amoroso, Aamoroso@cowcreek.com
	Susan Morgan	Douglas County	tina@co.douglas.or.us; morgan@co.dougl	Dave Loomis, dwloomis@co.douglas.or.us
Mid-South Coast	Scott Cook	OR Alliance for Sustainable Salmon Fish	cooktimber@hotmail.com	
	Aaron Longton	Port Orford Ocean Resources Team	aaron@oceanresourceteam.org	Nick Bordelon, posalmon@yahoo.com
	Dick Stroud	South Coast Anglers/STEP	rstroud@stroudconsultants.com	Bruce Bertrand, bertrand_bp@charter.net
	Mary Wahl	Kalmiopsis Audubon Society	marywahl1980@gmail.com	
	Joe Furia	The Freshwater Trust	furia@thefreshwatertrust.org	
	Tom Hoesly	The Campbell Group	thoesly@campbellgroup.com	Eric Farm, Scott Starkey
	Scott McKenzie	Resource producer	scottmck@seaviewcranberries.com	
	Kelly Sparks	Curry Watersheds Partnership	Kelly.sparks@currywatersheds.org	
	Jason Robison	Coquille Indian Tribe	jasonrobison@coquilletribe.org	Kelly Robbins
	John Schaefer	Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians	jschaefer@CTCLUSI.org	
	Jim Pex	Coos County	jimpex@charter.net	Larry Robison, lgrobison@co.coos.or.us

ATTACHMENT B: SAMPLE OPEN HOUSE AGENDA

AGENDA

COASTAL MULTI-SPECIES CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLAN
PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE

6:00 – 9:00 PM

Schedule	Topic	Presenter
6:00 pm	Registration	
6:15	Welcome/Introductions Overview of Planning Process • Purpose of Open House – Sharing Information, Gathering Input • Why Plan Now • Goals and Operating Assumptions • Type of Input Being Solicited • Next Steps	Ed Bowles, Fish Division Administrator
6:30	Overview of Plan • Plan Scope and Structure • Plan Development Process • Proposed Management Actions	Tom Stahl, Plan Manager
6:50	Information Stations • Purpose of Stations	Jim Owens, Facilitator
6:50-7:30	Circulate Among Information Stations/Provide Comments	
7:30-8:50	Discussion Sessions – How to Achieve an Appropriate Balance • Comments About Proposed Management Actions • Identification of Alternative Management Actions	Facilitated Group Discussions
8:50	Reconvene/Recap	Ed Bowles
9:00 pm	Adjourn	

From: Jim Owens

To: kelly@pacificrivers.org; mark@nativefishsociety.org; dpickering@tnc.org; pengelmeyer@peak.org; lphipps@oregoncoast.com; Wolniakowski@NFWF.ORG; jim.b.muck@noaa.gov; ken.phippen@noaa.gov; lance.kruzic@noaa.gov; ken.phippen@noaa.gov; rob.walton@noaa.gov; deborah.virgovic@wa.usda.gov; FENN Kevin J; apple.bruce@deq.state.or.us; Waltz.David@deq.state.or.us; pam.blake@deq.state.or.us; johnson.york@deq.state.or.us; kwilliams@ODF.state.or.us; DENT Liz F; ken.h.cannon@odot.state.or.us; Katie.Duzic@state.or.us; jt.peterson@oregonstate.edu; Kevin.McDonnell@oregonstate.edu; grenbemer.mark@deq.state.or.us; tshafer@peak.org; franrecht@centurytel.net; renichols@fs.fed.us; chirsch@fs.fed.us; cstreet@fs.fed.us; jmwilcox@fs.fed.us; rgmcmullin@fs.fed.us; sburns@fs.fed.us; kellingson@fs.fed.us; kcottom@fs.fed.us; greeves@fs.fed.us; Howard_Schaller@fws.gov; Marci_Koski@fws.gov; Madeleine_VanderHeyden@fws.gov; 5rivers@pioneer.net; jsouder@cooswatershed.org; kelly_miles@frontier.com; lnwc@nehalemtel.net; nnwc@oregoncoast.com; erik@oregonwatersheds.org; jjones@columbiaestuary.org; siletzwatershedcouncil@gmail.com; coordinator@siuslaw.org; swift@smithriverwatershed.org; harry@currywatersheds.org; tlbp@presys.com; tillamookbaywatershedcouncil@gmail.com; maggie@nehalem.org; chris@ofic.com; dvanslyk@blm.gov; SNOW Patty; acastronuevo@ctclusi.org; eirik.thorsgard@grandronde.org; aamoroso@cowcreek.com; strask@casco.net; office@bentonswcd.org; officecswcd@iinet.com; information@columbiaswcd.com; info@coosswcd.org; liesl.coleman@currywatersheds.org; walt.barton@oacd.org; siuswcd@qwestoffice.net; indo@lincolnswcd.org; debbie.miller@polkswcd.org; ray.monroe@or.nacdnet.net; ronda@umpquasoilandwater.com; allied1@hughes.net; doryfreshfish@embarqmail.com; Chappell@teleport.com; gscheele@farmersagent.com; jackandtina@centurylink.net; rohleder@teleport.com; Drongerber@yahoo.com; scottmck@seaviewcranberries.com; riverrunguide@yahoo.com; ian.fergusson@comcast.net; mrherbel@aol.com; JAllenSanchez@Gmail.com; garrybullard@charter.net; jschaefer@CTCLUSI.org; kelly.dirksen@granderonde.org; Stanvandewetering@yahoo.com; lgrobison@co.coos.or.us; jasonrobison@coquilletribe.org; Kcoates@cowcreek.com; Kelly.sparks@currywatersheds.org; tina@co.douglas.or.us; walt.barton@oacd.org; cameron.krauss@swansongroup.biz; hudson65@q.com; stevegodin@rconnects.com; marywahl1980@gmail.com; mcwc@midcoastwatershedscouncil.org; necanicumwatershed@gmail.com; 4salmon@gmail.com; mlaverty@mortonandassociates.net; cooktimber@hotmail.com; greg@pacificrivers.org; eric@umpquarivers.org; aaron@oceanresourceteam.org; sdcwcdirector@gmail.com; rstroud@stroudconsultants.com; j-fergusonpls@comcast.net; thoesly@campbellgroup.com; furia@thefreshwatertrust.org; mlabhart@co.tillamook.or.us; SReiersgaard@tillamook.com; AMoore@tu.org; pgheberling@gmail.com; wspicer2@gmail.com; slaborde@wildsalmoncenter.org

Cc: Jim Owens; David Jepsen; Stahl, Tom; Robert.C.Buckman@state.or.us; Chris.J.Knutsen@state.or.us; Dan.J.Avery@state.or.us; Laura.S.Jackson@state.or.us; Michael.E.Gray@state.or.us; Rick.L.Klumph@state.or.us; Russell.P.Stauff@state.or.us; Timothy.R.Walters@state.or.us; Todd.A.Confer@state.or.us; Alisha Dishaw

Subject: ODFW"s Coastal Plan Habitat Technical Work Group - Invitation and Meetings

Date: Monday, November 05, 2012 12:38:21 PM

Greetings,

ODFW is refining a habitat assessment framework for inclusion in the *Coastal Multi-Species Conservation and Management Plan* which is currently under development. This assessment is being done at a 12-digit/6th Field USGS hydrologic unit (HUC) scale and is ultimately intended to help guide and prioritize entities and individuals conducting restoration and protection work in the Coastal planning area, which extends from the Elk River to the Necanicum River.

ODFW is convening a Habitat Technical Work Group to further refine the habitat assessment framework. You are invited to participate as a member of this work group. Participants will be asked to a) attend one of two meetings and b) provide some written, follow-up feedback after the meeting. We hope to achieve the following for these two different components of this work group:

A. Meeting(s)

1) Objectives: explain the objectives of ODFW's habitat assessment and how it fits into the Plan and subsequent implementation

2) Data: describe the data that were used in ODFW's draft analysis to date, get feedback on its appropriateness/completeness, and understand other habitat assessments and prioritizations that have occurred (i.e., what data or results are already in use; *NOTE: please be prepared to speak to this at the meeting and, if possible, send information about these to Dave Jepsen [david.jepsen@oregonstate.edu] before the meeting*)

3) Methods: describe and get feedback on the draft methodology ODFW used to summarize and score HUC's for current habitat quality, intrinsic potential, and relative importance for protection and future restoration actions

4) Describe the next step for the work group, using example results (which will be draft and will

not have incorporated feedback from the meeting)

B. Follow-Up
5) Results: based on input from the meetings, ODFW will revise and distribute updated habitat assessment results (i.e., "scored" maps), and ask work group participants for HUC/location-specific feedback about the validity of those results based on their local knowledge

If you are interested in participating, please e-mail your RSVP to Dave Jepsen (david.jepsen@oregonstate.edu) and myself by November 19th. Within the RSVP, please indicate which one of the following two meetings you will attend:

- **Monday, November 26th, 9:30 AM – 2:30 PM, Douglas County Library, Ford Community Room** (1409 NE Diamond Lake Blvd., Roseburg)
- **Tuesday, November 27th, 9:30 AM – 2:30 PM, Oregon Coast Aquarium, Gleason Event Room** (http://aquarium.org/finding-us)

(*NOTE: lunch will be provided to those who RSVP, although those who do not RSVP are welcome to attend and participate as well; also, a draft write-up of the habitat assessment methodology will be distributed prior to the meeting to those who RSVP, and available to others at the meeting*).

Thank you for your interest in habitat protection and restoration! We look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Jim Owens
Facilitator, ODFW's Coastal Plan

JIM OWENS, Principal
P 503.225.0192 x 204 | C 503.201.4205 | F 503.225.0224

Cogan Owens Cogan, LLC
Engaging people to create and sustain great communities
813 SW Alder Street, Suite 320 | Portland, Oregon 97205-3111 | www.coganowens.com

Coastal Multi-Species Conservation and Management Plan

Habitat Technical Work Group Meetings

9:30 AM to 2:30 PM

Nov. 26, 2012 - Douglas County Library

1409 NE Diamond Lake Rd.; Roseburg 97470

Nov. 27, 2012 - Oregon Coast Aquarium, Newport

2820 SE Ferry Slip Rd.; Newport 97365

AGENDA

9:30 AM – 9:45 AM	**Welcome, Introductions, and Objectives**	**Jim Owens**
9:45 AM – 11:00 AM	**Context and Methodology**	**Dave Jepsen / Tom Stahl**
	Habitat within Conservation Plan Context - Objectives - Major habitat components of Plan - Proposed HUC approach to Threat Assessment - Use of HUC approach in Plan implementation - Discussion/feedback	
	HUC GIS Data Layer Description - Salmonid Ecosystem Value criteria layers (SEV) - Degradation/Vulnerability criteria layers (DV) - Discussion/feedback	
11:00 AM - 11:15 AM	**Break**	

11:15 AM - 12:15 PM	**HUC Scoring Methodology** - SEV and DV - Combined SEV/DV: protection & restoration classes - Discussion/feedback	**Dave Jepsen / Tom Stahl**
12:15 PM – 12:45 PM	**Working Lunch**	
12:45 PM - 2:00 PM	**Preliminary Results and Next Steps** - Next Steps/Schedule - Discussion/feedback	**Dave Jepsen / Tom Stahl**
2:00 PM - 2:30 PM	**Wrap up**	**Jim Owens**

OREGON
Fish & Wildlife

COASTAL MULTI-SPECIES CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLAN
HABITAT TECHNICAL GROUP TEAM MEETING

Monday, November 26 • Douglas County Library, Roseburg

Name	Affiliation	E-mail Address	Phone
DAN JENKINS	ODFW	daniel.j.jenkins@state.or.us	541-440-3353
Lauren Sattler	ODFW		541 440 3353
PETER TRONQUET	STEAMBOATERS		541 261 5041
DAN AVERY	ODFW	dan.j.avery@state.or.us	541-264-0300 x235
Tom Stahl	ODFW		
Jim Owens	Facilitator		
Jason Brandt	ODFW		

OREGON
Fish & Wildlife

COASTAL MULTI-SPECIES CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLAN
HABITAT TECHNICAL GROUP TEAM MEETING

Monday, November 26 • Douglas County Library, Roseburg

Name	Affiliation	E-mail Address	Phone
Eric Himmelreich	ODFW	eric.p.himmelreich@state.or.us	
Steve Godin	GRWB STEP	stevegodin@RCONNECT.com	
Kelly Coates	Cow Creek Umpqua Tribe	kcoates@cowcreek.com	
Alan Bunce	PUR / UW	UMPQUATRUTH@GODUCKS.com	
Mike Gray	ODFW		
Tim Walters	ODFW		
David Waltz	DEQ	waltz.david@deq.state.or.us	
Bob Rumel	CCBUTT		
Eric Riley	PUR	ERIC@UMPQUARIVERS.org	

ATTACHMENT C: HABITAT TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS - INVITATION, AGENDA, AND SUMMARY NOTES

OREGON
Fish & Wildlife

COASTAL MULTI-SPECIES CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLAN
HABITAT TECHNICAL GROUP TEAM MEETING

Monday, November 26 • Douglas County Library, Roseburg

Name	Affiliation	E-mail Address	Phone
Pat Quinn	Umpqua Watersheds Coquille Watershed Assoc.	jquinn@jeffnet.org	541 445 2325
STAN PETROWSKI	SURCP.ORG PUR	STANLEY@SURCP.ORG	541-825-3070
Madeleine Vander Heyden			
Kristle Volin	Coquille Watershed Association	kvolin@hotmail.com	541-572-2541
Steven Mazer	ODFW - Gold Beach		541-247-7605
Kelly Sparks	Lower Rogue Watershed Council	kelly.sparks@umpquawatersheds.org	541-247-2755
BRYAN DOGGAN	Coquille Indian Tribe	bryanduggan@coquilletribe.org	541-217-5483
Mary Wahl	Wahl Ranches KAS	marywahl1980@gmail.com	971-242-9654
PAUL HEBERLEIN	UFA	pgheberling@gmail.com	541-440-3791
Kelly Robbins	CIT	kellyrobbins@Coquilletribe.org	541-217-8477
Jim Muck	NMFS	J.M.B.Muck@Noaa.gov	541-957-3948
Ken Phippen	NMFS	Ken.phippen@noaa.gov	541-957-3385
STEVE BURNS	UMPQUA N.F.	SBURNS@FS.FED.US	(541) 957 3354
Mark Trenholm	WSC	mtrenholm@w.wdscinnovation.org	503-312-9255

ATTACHMENT C: HABITAT TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS - INVITATION, AGENDA, AND SUMMARY NOTES

OREGON Fish & Wildlife

COASTAL MULTI-SPECIES CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLAN
HABITAT TECHNICAL GROUP TEAM MEETING

Tuesday, November 27 • Oregon Coast Aquarium, Newport

Name	Affiliation	E-mail Address	Phone
Michael Northrop	Siuslaw National Forest	mnorthrop@fs.fed.us	541-271-6045
Jon Souder	Coos Watershed Assoc.	jsouder@cooswatershed.org	541-888-5422
Marci Koski	USFish & Wildlife Svc	marci_koski@fws.gov	360/604-2521
Ron Rhew	USFWS	Ron_Rhew@fws.gov	360/604-2500
Kevin Fenn	Oregon Dept. of Agriculture	kfenn@oda.state.or.us	(503)986-6486
Wayne Hoffman	Midcoast WC	mcwc@midcoastwatershedscouncil.org	541-265-9194
Christine Hirsch	Siuslaw Nat'l. Forest	chirsch@fs.fed.us	541-750-7034
RICHARD STROUD	South Coast Anglers	rstroud@stroudconsultants.com	541-751-0901
~~Wayne Hoffman~~	MCWC		
Greg Haller	PRC		
Bob Buckman	ODFW		
Mark Meleeson	ODF		
Paul Engelmeyer	Aud., NFS		
Ron Gerber			

ATTACHMENT C: HABITAT TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS - INVITATION, AGENDA, AND SUMMARY NOTES

OREGON Fish & Wildlife

COASTAL MULTI-SPECIES CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLAN
HABITAT TECHNICAL GROUP TEAM MEETING

Tuesday, November 27 • Oregon Coast Aquarium, Newport

Name	Affiliation	E-mail Address	Phone
Dick VanderSchaaf	TNC	dvanderschaaf@tnc.org	503-802-8136
Joe Rohleder		rohleder@teleport.com	541-563-3973
Melyssa Graeper	Necanicum WC	necanicumwatershed@gmail.com	503 939 5210
Liz Vollmer-Bahl	Siuslaw Watershed Council	coordinator@siuslaw.org	541-268-3044
Rob Markle	NMFS	robert.markle@noaa.gov	503-230-5419
Chris Knutsen	ODFW	—	—
Conrad Gowell	Native fish society	Cgowell@alum.ups.edu	971-237-6544
DAVE PLAWMAN	ODF	dave.l.plawman@state.or.us	503 842-2741
DON LARSON	SILETZ WATERSHED COUNCIL	bullelk0@hotmail.com	541-444-2846
Stacy Polkowske	ODFW	Stacy.a.polkowske@state.or.us	
~~Chris Knutsen~~ Dan Avery	"		
Kevin Goodson	"		
Tom Stahl	"		
Jim Owens	C.O.C.		

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
Coastal Multi-Species Conservation and Management Plan
Habitat Technical Work Group – Comment Summary

November 26, 2012 - Roseburg
November 27, 2012 - Newport

NOTE: comments are in no particular order and responses or discussions (if any) at the meetings are excluded

Alternative Approaches

- scale of distribution different for SMUs and assessment of all 12HUCs may not be appropriate for all species (chum/Chinook vs coho/steelhead/cutthroat): map important habitat for each species and define how to best protect and restore these (especially overlapping locations/"hotspots")
- see Beechie 2012 for 12HUC prioritization method (*NOTE: follow-up reference provided by Paul Engelmeyer: Beechie et al. 2012*)
- not all HUCs are the same (river continuum) so shouldn't assess as if they are; see 14HUC similarity analysis (classification) completed by OSU (?) for CWA (*NOTE: follow-up reference provided by Jon Souder: Whittier et al. 2011*)
- see USFS Tier I and II Assessments and Watershed Plans; Aquatic Restoration Strategy; Watershed Condition Framework (also possible to incorporate as **Additional Data**; *NOTE: follow-up references provided by Mike Northrop: FS-977 and FS-978*)
- do not complete 12HUC assessment: call for a process to do it during implementation (= action for Watershed Councils, etc…), provide data for it (HabRate, IP, species "hotspots"), and/or provide "formula" to prioritize (including practical considerations?)

Data Drawbacks

- document how historic fish distribution above artificial barriers is included in the SEV/potential assessment (fish distribution layers include historic information which has recently been added but not in a systematic or comprehensive manner)
- DEQ 303d listing is not comprehensive or systematic (only where monitored, which is limited), and the absence of listing does not necessarily indicate standards are being met (monitoring limitations; listing "random")
- check data layer used: make sure most recent 303d layer was used, as well as sites which have a TMDL in place (these are removed from one layer when a plan is adopted even though standards are not met)
- there are better disturbance layers than temperature (see CLAMS)
- AQI habitat survey data are being applied beyond the inference scale of the sampling design/rate
- how were non-wadeable streams scored for HabRate?
- IP has practical drawbacks at lower gradients (consult Kelly Burnett)

Additional Data

- do not add Watershed Assessments (many are dated or inconsistent, and they are not complete across Coastal area; these should be incorporated through professional judgment of reviewers [see **Method Modifications**])
- passage barriers and access potential (see note on historic fish distribution in **Data Drawbacks**)

- DEQ macroinvertebrate community (a general water quality condition index with known relationships to temperature and sediment; *NOTE: follow-up references provided by David Waltz: Reports 10-LAB-004 and 08-LAB-010*)
- DEQ 319 monitoring data for DO, biological contaminants, and toxics (combine with temperature for a water quality score; sedimentation also possible but may be duplicative or less comprehensive than AQI surveys and HabRate results; *NOTE: follow-up reference provided by David Waltz: Report DEQ07-LAB-0081-TR*)
- are AREMP data and Watershed Council data uploaded to ODFW habitat dating clearinghouse included in HabRate assessment?
- geology
- riparian condition
- non-native predators
- point source pollution
- dike/levee and road constraints/density layers (larger systems)
- land ownership or adjacency to public lands (connectivity)
- CLAMS datasets for potential or condition (e.g., vegetation type, unstable slopes)
- cold water refuges (Ebersole's new work)
- NatureServe information or methods

Method Modifications

- after SMU-wide assessment is done, standardize results within population areas (Coast-wide 12HUC results may affect funding)
- reduce the number of 12HUCs that are Class #1 to better identify "best" and allow for more restoration options (i.e., create more yellow than dark green)
- does the southern portion of the SMU get weighted lower because there are fewer chum populations? how does the lack of historic chum distribution maps affect results?
- for summation of HabRate scores, are all 3 species ranked even if they are not present and how would this affect scoring? if they are not all ranked then how does this affect scoring? divide sum by # species present?
- weight criteria by certainty/quality of data
- by summing IP scores, primary habitat may be "masked" by "different" (but important) watershed geomorphologies (e.g., great mainstem habitat for Chinook may score low due to numerous steep tributaries); the relative proportion of HIP should be standardized
- normalize distance to account for different sized 12HUCs (they vary in size quite a bit)
- limit IP extent by current distribution?
- should all estuaries be ranked the same (DLCD has estuary rankings that could be used)? how were estuaries delineated (tidal?)?
- how were break points for scoring defined (D/V scores skewed low?; SEV skewed high?)? this needs to be documented and biologically and scientifically defensible
- add human dimension or feasibility to prioritization
- unique life history variants or water features (e.g., lakes)
- incorporate professional judgment review in assessment (i.e., send revised maps with spreadsheet identifying each 12HUC's name and criteria category scores along with column for local, knowledgeable professional judgment to modify, with documentation/justification/comments/references; or, rather than modifying scores, add this as another ranking factor for a weight of evidence approach)

Other Considerations

- how will funding entities view this multi-species approach, which entails a shift from the current focus on coho work given the lack of additional staff and funding to expand restoration efforts? assessment should be discussed with OWEB and integrated into their long term funding strategy discussion
- a funding strategy that focuses on priorities but does not preclude other work is needed
- spring Chinook variants may be dependent on nearby independent spring Chinook population in some locations (e.g., Coquille and Rogue), rather than on the fall Chinook population in the same basin
- see AFS comments (Jeff Dose) on coho plan relative to Umpqua demes
- the term "protection" will cause confusion if used at the 12HUC scale; protection and BMPs are needed everywhere good habitat exists per ODFW Habitat Mitigation Policy, not just certain 12HUCs; characterizing SEV and DV as "potential" (or "value") and "condition" may be more appropriate than emphasizing protection vs restoration; r.e. "protection": Plan should state that habitat quality in all locations of all HUCs should be maintained per ODFW's Habitat Mitigation Policy in regulatory processes and through voluntary conservation easement/ land use designations in outreach efforts
- Class #1 ("protection") 12HUCs also need significant restoration
- Class #3 is for "restoration" (typo)
- remove triangle graphic and only use table
- maps: 1) SEV and DV should have a gradation of only one color (different for each) that does not match the colors in the final map; 2) roll-up table should be added to poster for display purposes; 3) adjust quartiles to get more even result distribution; 4) remove hatching; 5) label some locations for reference (e.g., population areas) and; 6) add mainstem of rivers
- overall concept good: appropriate scale and good idea to assess/prioritize while leaving finer scale assessment/prioritization for implementation
- Google Maps is a good tool (i.e., simultaneously compare remote imagery with mapped results)
- methods peer reviewed?
- can this be dovetailed with Nearshore Plan and marine reserves effort?
- how will this be incorporated into hatchery and harvest portion of Plan? will results limit fishing opportunity?
- need way for new restoration ideas to be shared
- how are downstream effects addressed? how are the habitat functions of high gradient tributaries (cold water, LWD, gravel) taken into account when no IP (potential fish presence) exists for them?
- when does re-assessment/re-prioritization happen and what is the process for it?
- some/many preliminary results presented are not consistent with local knowledge of habitat status; possible that entire scale should be shifted to indicate little "good" habitat