

TRRP MEETING SUMMARY – FISH WG

Meeting Summary: FWG met to develop recommendations for the FY12 work plan concerning fisheries related projects. The WG reviewed the updates assessment/project spreadsheet that was developed since the Oct 5 FWG meeting. Following some adjustments to this spreadsheet the WG discussed prioritization of the assessments and was not able to reach consensus. Following this, the FWG used the FY12 work plan and made adjustments to it. The WG also rearranged projects according to the bundling that was used in FY12.

Date: October 18, 2011
Time: 9:30am-3:30 pm
Location: Conference Call
Number: N/A
Password:

Coordinator: Joe Polos (FWS)

Note Taker: Joe Polos

Desired Outcome: Develop recommendations for fisheries related projects to be incorporated into the FY13 TRRP work plan.

Attendees: Seth Naman (NOAA), Aaron Martin for Tim Hayden (YT), Nina Hemphill (BOR), Wade Sinnen (CDFG), Joe Polos (FWS), Ernie Clarke (FWS)

Minutes

Agenda item: Updates

Presenter: Group

Discussion:

1. Adult Fish monitoring review work shop to be held Oct 26-28 at CDFG office in Arcata
2. Comments on Phase I review of due tomorrow (Oct 19)
3. Knowledge assessment – suggestions from FWG were sent to Andreas on Sept 30.
4. Performance Measures – tech editor still working on the “one-pager” documents. These will be circulated for review by about mid-Nov. Ernie will send out actual dates later.
5. Briefing Statements – outreach person will be working on these.
6. Big Questions – ESSA will deliver these to the IDT on Friday (Oct 21). FWG members are encouraged to join in on the call. There will be a chance to provide input on these.
7. Coordinator – there was a brief discussion concerning the selection of a new coordinator. This will be deferred until the next meeting.
8. Work Plan development process – the prioritized list from the IDT and the Big Questions will be sent to the SAB and then the Program will get recommendations from the SAB to consider in finalizing the work plan for FY13.

Conclusions: N/A

Action items: Ernie to get dates for review of performance measures when he gets them back from the tech editor.

Person responsible Ernie

Deadline: TBD.

Agenda item: FY13 TRRP fisheries work plan.

Presenter: Group discussion.

Discussion:

An update was given on what had occurred since the last WG meeting. Following-up on the Oct 5 FWG conference call, Joe talked with Ernie on Oct 6 concerning the FWG’s desire to develop a list of assessments from the list of assessments/projects and provide those in a prioritized list to the IDT. Ernie said this was OK but then information needed to be provided before the IDT meeting on Oct 21. Following this, Joe provided the FWG an updated spreadsheet with the projects the projects grouped by the categories identified during the Oct 5 conference call (Habitat, Juvenile, Adult, and Other). Once projects were linked to a category, the list was prioritized using the listing developed in the IAP and used for the FY12 work plan as guidance. Projects were not combined into complete assessments but they were prioritized with supporting projects immediately following the initial project of a given assessment. This spreadsheet was provided to the FWG members on Oct 10.

FWG member discussed the information provided in the updated spreadsheet and additional suggestions were made during the morning part of our meeting and the spreadsheet was modified with these new groupings. Following this exercise the WG members began discussing which priorities they thought each grouping should have. There were basically two different positions/opinions expressed by WG members which precluded meeting a consensus recommendation. In a general sense, the two approaches to prioritizing were: (1) adult assessments should receive the highest priority since the program has numeric goals (at least for spawners) and increases harvest and spawning escapement are the ultimate goals of the program and (2) habitat and juvenile projects should receive the highest priority since these provide quicker feedback to management actions. There were some variations of these two approaches also put forth but not to the extent that the group was going to reach consensus.

We then reverted back to the FY12 work plan prioritization and modified it by: (1) re-prioritizing some of the assessments, (2) removing assessments/projects from the list that are being addressed by other work groups (they are still listed in the worksheet but at the bottom of the list of assessments/projects), and (3) removing assessments/projects from the list that are being addressed by FWG subgroups (they are still listed at the bottom of the list of assessments/projects).

The WG decided that assessments/projects that were bundled for the FY12 work plan should also be bundled for FY13 since these assessments/projects are addressed through the execution of the primary project.

The meeting concluded and Joe was tasked to finalize the bundling of projects and provide them to Ernie. This entailed the following: Once new locations reprioritized projects were identified (these projects are highlighted in blue in the worksheet titled "FY13 ranking" send to the Ernie and the FWG on Oct 18/19) all remaining projects were sorted. Then project bundling based on the bundling that occurred for FY12 was done to develop the list found in the work sheet titled "FY13 bundled with all projects".

Conclusions: WG could not reach consensus on revised prioritized list that had projects bundled into assessments.

WG then reverted back to the FY12 work plan and review the assessment/project rankings and used the bundling of assessments/projects that was used in FY12 to develop the FY13 fish work plan.

Action items: Complete the spreadsheet, with bundling, and sent it to Ernie and the FWG.

Person responsible Joe

Deadline: ASAP - at latest before Oct 21 IDT meeting

Other Information

Observers:

Resources:

Special notes: