

The subgroup decided the 2nd trigger was defined as (12/TAF * Exports) based on Erin Chappell's Table 2 analysis used to develop the Salmon Decision Tree. The rationale for choosing 12/TAF is that it fell roughly in the middle between 8 and 15 (range of fish densities based on historical salvage data). Table 2 calculated loss density (fish/TAF) in color coded ranges based on historical loss. The density ranged from 8 to 15 fish/TAF. The trigger of 12 was picked as an average based on the historical take limit for each year (2% of the JPE) relative to where salvage had occurred in the past. Total loss is a factor of how much water is being pumped. The goal of the salvage triggers in the Salmon Decision Tree were to standardize fish loss at different export rates through the use of fish densities.

Tasks: 1) Sheila said she would redo the graphs

2) Bruce to check with Jim White, DFG on rationale for trigger

Summary of DOSS Subgroup Meeting regarding the BO second criteria starting in January (Sheila Greene 10/6/10)

The sub group met to discuss the second salvage based criteria in the BO starting in January. The criterion is on page 649 of the BO and is written "2) daily loss is greater than daily measured fish density divided by 12 taf (daily measured fish density / 12 taf). The equation associated with this criterion is $LOSS > LOSS\ DENSITY / 12\ TAF$. This criterion was added to the Salmon Protection Process document in 2007. The salvage based salmon criteria had not been implemented in several years because delta smelt criteria were limiting export reductions. In 2010, the salmon criteria were discussed and the group discovered that the second salvage based criterion in the BO for the time period January through June 15th was not functioning as expected. DOSS convened a sub group meeting to evaluate the criterion. It was obvious to the group that the criterion must have been written incorrectly, because the criterion is exceeded every time a salmon is salvaged. To the best recollection of those people present at the meetings when the criterion was developed, no one tested the criterion by applying it to the historical data to determine if it made sense. The criterion was developed quickly and not documented at that time. One of the DOSS group members that was at the meeting when the criterion was developed had some ideas about how the criterion was developed and thought what was meant was a constant loss density criterion in addition to the JPE or population based criterion to avoid large losses of salmon. That is about as far as we got that day. NMFS wrote a summary of our DOSS sub group meeting form WOMT and concluded the second criterion would be disregarded for the rest of the season while the DOSS group further evaluated the second criterion.

































