

To: <Karl.Halupka@noaa.gov>, <SCANTREL@hq.dfg.ca.gov>, <Gary.Stern@noaa.gov>
Cc: <73420.1232@compuserve.com>, <jsingle@compuserve.com>,
<pherrges@delta.dfg.ca.gov>, <JWHITE@hq.dfg.ca.gov>,
<RREMPEL@hq.dfg.ca.gov>, <mkie@water.ca.gov>
Subject: Re: MSCS species goal prescription for spring-run salmon

:
:
:
:
:

Yesterday, I suggested that we reference the criteria from (1) the delta native fishes recovery plan, (2) production targets from AFRP, and (3) DFG's latest recovery prescription. Then we also state that a NMFS/DFG-led spring-run recovery plan is forthcoming, which would be the definitive criteria.

This approach would basically document the three most recent estimates of spring-run restoration targets and show the approximate range of numbers where we think the recovery plan will be. (Rempel's correct, however, in that this approach would help politicize the recovery planning efforts. On the other hand, a range of numbers may help us avoid reinitiation based on modification of a prescription).

This approach would be roughly parallel to what was done with the steelhead prescription.

My only concern with using DFG spring-run numbers is if we reference ONLY those numbers. In light of the fact that there are other criteria already published, and more expected, is it prudent to go with a single set of numbers that is likely to be changed when a recovery plan is completed?

DFG, NMFS, as far as I'm concerned it's your call. I'm awaiting something resembling a consensus decision from you both on this issue.

Another option would be to make spring-run an "m" species, so that recovery criteria don't apply. (just kidding)

-Mike F