

**Governor's Salmon Workgroup Meeting**  
**July 08, 2020 – 9:00 A.M.**  
**Workgroup Meeting via Zoom**

**Workgroup Roll**

- Jim Yost
- Scott Hauser
- Paul Arrington
- Aaron Lieberman
- Joe Oatman
- Richard Scully
- Chad Colter
- Mark Menlove
- Senator Dan Johnson
- Toby Wyatt
- Merrill Beyeler
- David Doeringsfeld
- Stacey Satterlee
- Brian Brooks
- Brett Dumas
- Kara Finkler
- John Simpson
- Representative Fred Wood
- Justin Hayes
- Will Hart
- Mike Edmondson
- Katherine Himes

**Intro** – Katherine Himes

- 10<sup>th</sup> workgroup meeting.
- *Gave purpose and history of workgroup.*
- This zoom is may be recorded so anything may be posted online or in the news.
- Moves to introductions of workgroup members.

**Update from Governor's Office: Sam Eaton**

- State staff is willing to put in as much effort as the workgroup.
- Notes that the process is on point.
- Excited to see the sheer amount of potential recommendations. Didn't think there was going to be that many so it's a pat on the back because of the successes you've already had.
- Doesn't think anyone coming into this thought there was one silver bullet.
- Moves to answering questions

**Q&A**

**Richard Scully:**

Q Are we still really focused on recovery to the point we want to make major changes to the status quo so that the populations stay stable? Are we looking for ways to make minor improvements?

A Sam Eaton: It's the eye of the beholder what you consider major or minor. Looking for actionable items that can move the needle towards recovery. Acutely aware of what we have control over and what we don't.

Aaron Lieberman: Regarding you speaking to the limitations of these types of groups with diverse interests.

- Q Against the backdrop of that and the low returns, outside of Covid, can you give me the prioritization of how this recovery sits with governors list?
- A Sam Eaton. Its high. You hit the nail on the head with that. I'm a policy wonk and a lawyer. Recently I've been a constitutional lawyer. But my interest is natural resource, came from the OSC, worked with Mike, so I have a personal interest and the Governor does too. Aside from education, our natural resources are his favorite things to talk about. To rank it with a number with the other issues, I can't tell you but I can tell you once the recommendations that come in, I plan on looking over. The intent is to act on any of these recommendations that we can.
- Q To follow up, beyond the recommendations we provide, can we expect independent motivation and action or is it the Governors workgroup doing it?
- A Sam Eaton: You guys are the brain trust then I guess were the executive and we execute on the recommendations we receive. Good recommendations are what's next, what other conversations should the State have in local and regional actions? These recommendations are broad based, consensus based, non-polarizing. Governor is willing to take on a challenge.
- Q You alluded to recommendations that may or may not be coming out of workgroup to engage in conversations with Oregon and Washington because the issue is largely downstream. Is this something the Governor would be receptive to?
- A Sam Eaton: Yes

Justin Hayes:

- Q Could you give us an out of Idaho report and give us an update on your office's conversations with other governors' offices? What might Idaho do after the workgroup ends with regard to those conversations?
- A Sam Eaton: It's been since February or March since we've had conversations with Governors' offices outside of Idaho. No reluctance from our part or theirs to engage in these conversations. Hasn't had any recently but there has been in past. Governors offices should have more coordinated conversations/efforts. Potentially valuable recommendation that comes out of the workgroup. That's something we think we should participate in, some sort of region discussion, whatever form that takes on.

**Review of small groups** – Katherine Himes

- Gives overview of what the group has been doing. Divided into small groups, given one of the 4 H's. Groups presented at the May meetings then additional topics were added. After July meeting we will continue to rotate.
- The intent is that each small group will have a chance to work on these topics.
- The small groups will have 90 minutes to present their topics and what they have found.

**Habitat Report-out** – Aaron Lieberman presented for the small group (*put edits up on screen*)

- Started with Overarching policy
  - Recommended removal because the overarching policy could be elsewhere
- Habitat Restoration: color coated slide to show what was kept, moved and taken out
  - Tried to consolidate to make it more concise but still comprehensive
  - Kept:

- Distribution to protect, restore and enhance habitat and watershed functions needed to support all life stages of salmon and steelhead
      - From first paragraph
    - Bullets consolidated and separated recommendations within “restoration”, “connectivity”, and “protection”
- Increased Funding and Capacity:
  - Grounded funding recommendation more concretely
  - No functional change
- Predation Management:
  - Considered this to be within predation policies
  - “Flagged it” so the group could discuss consolidating it within the other predation recommendation
    - Noted that predation section can be talked about through the different lenses of 4 H’s
- Water Management and Quality: consolidated
  - Within Water Quality: if there are already programs is it worth allocating more resources
    - Noted minimum flows
  - Made them both broader as they were concerned with specificity
    - Created definitions of water programs that would incorporate all projects as opposed to listing them
- Interagency and Inter Governmental Coordination
  - Added tribes
  - No other substantive changes
- Public Education:
  - Added Department of Commerce in consultation with Idaho Department of Fish and Game and other partners.
  - Made it broader as they thought it would be better to broaden to outside of the school system to educating the general public
    - How to educate is important but in that sense, time is of the essence, so group asked – Where do we get the most bang for our buck?
- Support Collaborative Efforts
  - Kept all of the meaningful content but consolidated

## Q&A

Kira Finkler:

- Q Supporting water exchange, was it a part of this groups discussion or if it was in another’s? If it was, I didn’t see it and I was wondering why?
- A Aaron Lieberman: That wasn’t in the original here I don’t believe. It was one of the identified recommendations that popped up a couple times in the original homework. Does any other workgroup member know if that is in a current or original small group recommendation document?
- A Paul Arrington: We did speak about it at one of our meetings. Water broadly, lower Clearwater exchange. Unintentionally forgot about in efforts to get things done in time for deadline. Hopefully in round 3, whoever gets this topic, can put that in.
- A Justin Hayes: We handed this to you and we didn’t include it. We didn’t include anything by name because then we thought it would turn into a long list of projects. Thought it better to be broader instead of specific projects.

Katherine Himes: How does group want to handle projects? Comprehensive as possible list of projects or broader policy?

- A Mark Menlove: In my mind I was thinking about the list broadly. This shouldn't be a laundry list of projects so I was thinking what are the type of water projects that would allow these projects to be captured?
- A Paul Arrington: Agrees, doesn't want to have list of projects. But sees value in identifying some projects that have been in conversations for a while been but need some recognition to get them out of the conversation stage. Some value in identifying things that could use a little extra "umph" to get them moving.

Aaron Lieberman: Asks what groups thinks about an addendum so that the list is outside of the main document but still available for reference by the Governor and his staff

- A Merrill Beyeler: Somewhere in this we need to address economic impacts for these rural towns. If you're going to get collaborations thinks we need to address three things, that's how you're going to get buy in: ecological, social and economic wellbeing of those rural communities.
  - Q Aaron Lieberman: Do you have a recommendation on how to ground that in a particular recommendation?
    - A Merrill Beyeler: Hard to argue or go against the benefits or positive impacts. Example is working with local contractors.

Joe Oatman:

- Q Can I get clarification under collaboration efforts – does it correspond to conservation easements?
  - A Aaron Lieberman: Defers to Mark
  - A Mark Menlove: Yes, it does
- Q Regarding first page: if that is what is supported then there is a similar overarching policy in the harvest recommendation just wanted to flag that.
  - A Aaron Lieberman: Thinks there is a question for the whole group on whether they wanted to consolidate or synthesize those into an overarching policy or if there's merit in having an overarching in each of the sections
- Joe Oatman: Regarding increase funding: may be useful to include tribes in that as well
  - Q Aaron Lieberman: As a policy rec is there a functional tool the gov could use to increase tribal share?
    - A Joe Oatman: For example, presentation in 2019 if we do receive additional funding, we can do additional habitat restoration. Wants to recognize tribes do implement a fairly sizable habitat restoration effort and could do more if there's an increase in funding to Salmon or Clearwater
- Justin Hayes: Wanted to echo Joe's observation – we should be devoting funding that helps these fish in Idaho. Irrespective of the parties who do it, focusing on the outcome instead of who gets the money. General support is important.
- Richard Scully: Following up on same conversation, increase Idaho's funding. Maybe needs to be clear that its every group that does fish work in Idaho. Maybe being clear it's all groups, others may think its just for state agencies.
- Mark Menlove: This is the avenue for which money flows, not intended to separate out who gets what

*In chat*: Language recommendation for second bullet in funding – thought on how to increase that funding for Idaho specific entities

Paul Arrington: Should we have a discussion on whether we need a broad overarching policy or sub-topics policy since there's extra time?

- Justin Hayes: Interested in thinking more about how edits affect the core of what we were trying to pose.
  - Doesn't think that we have an overarching policy.
  - Other states seem to have larger umbrella policies that help other agencies to implement them successfully. If there is one, then awesome but we didn't see one.
- Aaron Lieberman: Thinks that the redundancy identified was that the overarching policy could be elsewhere other than couched in each sub-topic.
  - Personally, agree with first part should be in some broader place
- Paul Arrington: Bulleted list is restatement of what is below.
  - The first part is a restatement of Mission statement.
  - Doesn't understand how first part is functionally or substantive different from what we've already adopted
- Justin Hayes: We adopted those things, but the Governor didn't.
  - Thinks it should move forward to the Governor in a way he can adopt them as well
  - Thinks small group was just observing that State lacks a modern overarching policy of this.
    - It would be good for Governor's office/State of Idaho to have policy that articulates what it is trying to articulate at large and how these individual specific recommendations fit together as a whole
- Paul Arrington: Trying to understand what substantive difference between this and what we have already proposed?
  - Talking about the mission statement language and goals sheet speaking to phase one report goals, healthy harvestable.
  - Why do we need more language?
- Aaron Lieberman: Thinks it is largely the same language. What the other small group was getting at was we did sort of exhaustively hammer out language that we could agree on; but doesn't believe we've formalized putting that language into a form to get it adopted by the government.
- Katherine Himes: There hasn't been a conversation in terms of how Mission Statement connects to the policy recommendation.
  - There's the process piece, so is this apart of a part and parcel of policy recommendations or it was guiding the discussion?
- Aaron Lieberman: Doesn't see what it hurts putting it in.
  - We've already done the hard, controversial part of agreeing upon it
- Joe Oatman: Relative to overarching policy language and the remarks Sam provided to the group earlier this morning –
  - One thought might be if Governor's offices is going to be involved with other state conversations, then this language may help facilitate that dialog
- Mark Menlove: Going to add that this should be the preamble to our recommendation.
  - Not presented as Mission Statement but as an overarching policy recommendation that all of these other subcategories fit under.
  - Agrees that we make a recommendation that the state have a comprehensive overarching policy that encompasses all of the Hs and otherwise
- Katherine Himes: Thinks it's important for group to look at recommendations and think about how they want to synthesize and consolidate those and if they should be in the report
- Merrill Beyeler: May be redundant to have this in each one of the subtopics but somewhere it would guide things downward from that.
  - May be from mission statement

Katherine Himes: To Habitat small group

- Q Were you able to get through all of recs in water broadly or is that something the next group could take on?

- A Aaron: Yes, make them actionable
- Paul Arrington: One other issue we didn't talk about and I didn't bring up but may be a good one is the concept of flow augmentation.
  - Ensure we optimize flow augmentation program

**Reconvene at 11:10** – Mike Edmondson welcomes back group and moves to second report-out

**Harvest Report-out:** Justin Hayes presents materials for group (*Put edits on screen*)

- Loosely ranked the recommendations by the impact the small group thought they would have, and color coated them by “Impact”, “Consensus”, and “Feasibility”.
  - Used green, yellow and red
- Overarching Policy:
  - All green – no major changes
- Downstream Non-Tribal Recreational and Commercial Fishing
  - First paragraph provides context for the bullets
    - First bullet would give an accurate glimpse on how large the Idaho run is
    - Second bullet would give Snake River fish moments of unimpeded progress
    - Third, reduced non-tribal harvest for the mainstem of Columbia River
    - Fourth would allow anglers to still harvest but not Idaho's fish
    - Fifth would shift fishery locations to above Bonneville Dam
    - Sixth would limit fishing to tributaries
    - Seventh would limit the gear types
    - Eighth would allow for harvest timing to be managed adaptively
  - Final recommendation would secure a decision making role in regional forums that discuss and regulate downstream harvest
  - Impact = green. Consensus = green. Feasibility = yellow.
- Predation Management:
  - Goal was to be all inclusive as these affect fish at all life stages
  - Noted that we've created space for predators
    - Notes that identifying factors that favor predation and working to modify them in and outside of Idaho
  - Suggests Idaho advocate for increased federal funding for removal of regulatory/legislative constraints on predator control
  - Impact, consensus and feasibility was green
- In-state Non-tribal Recreational Fishing
  - Suggests that Idaho manage fishery timing, scheduling, locations, take limits and gear types to maximize protection for endangered populations
    - Did not get too far into this as they recognized a lack of tribal input in their group and look forward to getting Tribes opinions
  - Impact, consensus and feasibility was all green
- Compensation
  - Suggests identifying or creating compensation/protection programs for guides, outfitters, Tribes and other business or entities that depend on harvestable runs of Snake River Salmon and Steelhead, to be used if fisheries are closed or limited
  - Impact, consensus, and feasibility all green
- Increased funding and flexibility for participation in regional collaboration
  - Suggests Idaho ensure funding and staffing for advocacy work with Federal agencies, states, and Tribes through regional forums
  - Suggests funding must be sufficient to task, reliable year-to-year, and long term in nature
  - Impact, consensus and feasibility was all green

- Mitigation:
  - Suggests Idaho review and update the current Lower Snake River Compensation Plan program to evaluate its impact on wild salmon and steelhead stocks
  - Impact, consensus and feasibility was all green
- Downstream tribal fishing
  - Suggests Idaho advance discussion around modifying tribal harvest regimens and methods to minimize the impact on wild Snake River salmon and steelhead outside of Idaho
    - Recognizes there is no tribal members on the small group so they're looking forward to other input
  - Impact = green. Consensus = yellow. Feasibility = yellow
- Ocean Commercial Fishing:
  - Suggests Idaho engage with regional forums to identify and implement measures which reduce the impact of ocean fishing on Snake River salmon and steelhead
  - Impact = yellow. Consensus = green. Feasibility = yellow
- Asks if there's any other small group members that have input:

*Toby Wyatt:* We're trying to get more fish into Idaho so if lower fisheries can wait then we would have a better idea on how many are coming. Oregon and Washington harvest more Idaho fish than Idaho does

*Merrill Beyeler:* Moving fishing off of main stem is not an uncommon idea. Sometime in the 90s when we had poor returns, they shifted fisheries off the main stem. Then in 2001 when we had good returns, fishing on the main stem came back

*Representative Fred Wood:* Tried to be very careful while putting thoughts down to "not get in trouble". Understand some of these are controversial but also thought all of these things needed to be talked about no matter how hard that may be

*Justin Hayes:* moves to questions

## Q&A

Brett Dumas:

Q Can you educate us more on benefits of moving fisheries off mainstem and into tributaries?

A Justin Hayes: When fishing on Middle Snake/Columbia River you're fishing all of the fish who pass through there. Some of them may be from healthy runs some may be from runs that cant sustain harvest like Idaho fish. So, by asking for those seasons to be moving up into the tributaries were taking the pressure off of Idaho fish who pass through there.

Scott Hauser: Comment – maybe more verbiage describing treaty/nontreaty tribes

Joe Oatman: Four comments

- Under overarching policy (harvest portion 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet):
  - This would be one that the tribe could not support it would essentially mean the tribe would support litigation.
- Second deals with bullet number four
  - change would result in direct conflict between treaty and non-treaty fisheries and people who participate those, conflict in social and tribes.
- Third deals with in-state nontribal recreational fishing
  - tribes did create a recommendation that they hope would be involved.

- Fourth is regarding downstream tribal fishing
  - Tribes have treaty right to maintain and continue their fishing-based economies. Much has changed since these treaties were made

Representative Wood: In response to Joe Oatman

- We put these things out there understanding there would be further comments made so thank you for all of your points. As we go forward and work on this. We will all become better educated.

Richard Scully: seems to me that we are all sharing crumbs, the runs and SARs have been low so we don't have a lot of fish coming back

- Wanted to point out that everyone (other states) over the last few years, in spring chinook fisheries get their count then reduce it by about 30% so that they don't over harvest. But it seems in recent years that even with the 30% reduction, they're still overharvesting.
- Recently someone pointed out that the early chinook that show up below Bonneville first are Idaho fish because they are the long-distance runners so they get disproportionately affected

Aaron Lieberman:

Q What is the mechanism for putting pressure to get these things done?

Q Did you have any more conversation or ideas on what levers or leverage there is to increase Idaho stocks returning to Idaho?

A Justin Hayes: Getting formal participation for State to have an official position.

- Legislative then litigation.
- Also delaying fishing season.

Q What about the regulatory way? How we actually get the authority in those bodies.

A Justin Hayes: Ask. Maybe get changes to how we get into those bodies

- Representative Wood: Congress would need to change the statute so there's statutory authority for Idaho to be involved. Also need to consider that the members of those bodies may not be looking for another member, especially one that may have conflicting views

Aaron Lieberman: States Fish and Game does good job managing what little resource we have.

Q Curious if anyone in group knows and any specific matters that are new?

A Justin Hayes: Two things came up

- catch and release
- new limits on fishing in holding areas

Toby Wyatt: Notes that guides don't get any assurance

Justin Hayes: Notion of safety net is not just limited to guides, many people are impacted in unique and significant way. Not targeted at one party

Brian Brooks: Just wanted to add that there are a lot of people impacted by fish numbers

Katherine Himes: Notes that were running up against the lunch break

- Gives options on how to proceed since we're on lunch break now.
  - We could plow through and push lunch, or move to end of day or move it to tomorrow.

Brett Dumas in chat: move to tomorrow

Representative Wood: agrees with Brett

**12:44 lunch break to come back at 1:05**

**1:06** – Mike Edmondson welcomes everyone back and moves into next small group report-out



### **Hatchery Report-out:** Presented by John Simpson

- Blue highlighted sections are the notes and revisions
- General consensus that the recommendations below (from first small group) were of value and appropriate
  - Not general consensus around some of the wording
- Included stream nitrification or other nutrient sources like carcass analogs
- Recommendation 1: maintain and optimize existing production infrastructure
  - General consensus to support this recommendation
  - Asked if recommendation could focus on Idaho hatcheries, after discussion group felt like this could apply more broadly
    - noted more clarification may be needed
- Recommendation 2: enhance and expand the capacity of the fish production system
  - General consensus to support this recommendation
  - Discussion surrounding the scope of the recommendation
  - Notes that Tribe is interested in making progress here to better address mitigation objectives and to develop solutions for meeting harvest objective year after year
- Recommendation 3: monitoring and evaluation program
  - General consensus to support this recommendation
- Recommendation 4: supplementation programs
  - General consensus to support this recommendation but to also include a discussion of the benefits and risks of the other accepted used of hatcheries
  - Group noted this is an ongoing discussion
- Recommendation 5: blocked areas
  - Group did not finalize the wording or come to a consensus
  - Recommends that small groups work together to develop one set of recommendations for blocked areas that follow the same format
- Recommendation 6: balancing hatcheries with wild production
  - Recommends Idaho adaptively manage hatchery production
  - Workgroup did not finalize working or come to a consensus on the statement
    - There was general consensus that a policy recommendation address the balance between wild/natural and hatchery fish
    - One member raised the issue that a discussion of how to balance wild fish and hatchery production will need to occur when wild fish objectives start to be met

### *Moves to Systemic Solutions portion*

- Recommendation 1: reconciling science between two models
  - Comparative survival study and Life Cycle Model
  - To have a clear understanding of distribution data
- Recommendation 2: support tribal guiding and outfitting and other economic opportunities involving fish
  - Tribes interest to expand economic opportunities is consistent with the groups mission to restore healthy and harvestable fish
  - Possibly combine this recommendation with education and outreach
- Recommendation 3: climate change
  - Refers to recommendation 4
- Recommendation 4: request an unambiguous position on climate at the state level
  - Some work group members could not support language as written
- Recommendation 5:

- Notes that the group addressed this draft policy recommendation in their review of the hydro topics
- Recommendation 6-8 are incorporated into recommendation 9
- Recommendation 9: state should support public education, outreach and regional dialog
  - Felt that recommendations 6-9 could be consolidated

*Brian Brooks:* Has addition

- Never really brought up how the fish accords tied into all of this.
- Thinks it worth discussing how the accords may affect what they are talking about now.
- *Paul Arrington:* Agrees because it could influence outcome

**Q&A** Paul Arrington steps in

Brett Dumas: Clarifies in chat that they will be going over that (accords) in Hydro 2 presentation

Aaron Lieberman: Question regarding the systemic solutions recommendation numbers 6 & 7.

Q Confused about why the recommendation to combine regional dialog with education?

A Paul Arrington: one combined education, outreach would be effective but open to full group discussion

- Thinks they are different things. Follow up:

Q Hydro 1 did not cover the political level or regional coordination by governor and outreach?

A Joe Oatman: Clarifies that it is in the recommendation 1

*Justin Hayes moves back to above mitigation*

*Joe Oatman:* provides comment on Lower Snake River comp. plan fisheries that if conversations haven't occurred regarding this topic, maybe there should be

Aaron Lieberman: doesn't feel comfortable making the downstream tribal fishing recommendation

**Break – Group reconvenes at 2:40**

**Hydro Report-out:** Presented by Brett Dumas (*Put edits on screen*)

- Used the first hydro groups document they just added on their comments
- Spill Management Recommendation
  - General consensus to support this draft recommendation
  - Asks whether there are periods where we can spill more than agreements set out
    - Group discussed whether the need to review the current strategy of providing 16 hours of high spill and 8 hours of performance standard spill
  - Notes that they were not familiar with Idaho accords
    - Recommends whole group needs to understand this topic and where the Governor should go on the next round of accords
- Flow Management Recommendation
  - General consensus to support this recommendation
  - Recommends additional rigorous studies on augmentation benefits and opportunities for optimization
  - Discussed temperature benefits
  - Discussed imputing total maximum daily loads within this recommendation
- Systems Operation Recommendation
  - General consensus to support this recommendation

- Notes that there is moderate to strong likelihood Governor Little would support this recommendation
- Further clarification needed to ensure language is accurate
- Outreach and Education Recommendation
  - General consensus to support this draft policy recommendation
  - Thinks this should be in a “general recommendations” section of the report
    - Includes advisory role
- Barging
  - Continue to implement fish transportation programs
  - General consensus to support this recommendation
  - Moderate to strong likelihood Governor would support this draft
- Systemic
  - Implement actions identified in the CRSO EIS and BiOp for sufficient time to assess their effectiveness
  - There was not general consensus within the small group for this recommendation
  - Group suggested this be deleted as the state already submitted comments
- Reservoir Drawdown
  - Implement spillway-crest drawdown at one or more Lower Snake River dams
  - General consensus within group to not support this recommendation
  - Marginal likelihood Governor Little would support this recommendation
- Blocked Areas
  - Plan, develop and implement programs to reintroduce salmon and steelhead to blocked areas within the Columbia Basin outside of the State of Idaho
    - There was not general consensus to support this recommendation
    - Additional discussion is warranted
    - Marginal to no likelihood Governor would support this recommendation
  - Plan, develop and implement programs to reintroduce salmon and steelhead to blocked areas within the State of Idaho
    - There was not general consensus
    - Marginal to no likelihood Governor would support this recommendation
  - Continue to plan and conduct adult salmon and steelhead put-and-take Tribal and nontribal fisheries in agreed-upon blocked area locations in the State of Idaho in cooperation with Tribal and other implementation partners
    - General consensus to support this recommendation
    - Does not address the objective of restoring natural populations in Idaho
    - Include a discussion of requirements for additional resources and innovative solutions to provide more certainty of sufficient returns
- Lower Snake River Dam Breaching
  - There was not general consensus to support this recommendation
    - Acknowledged that certain interests may not be in a position to have recommendations forwarded to Governor without a statement on breach and the potential impact of such action
  - Recognized that Federal Congress is the only entity that can initiate and carry out the removal of federally authorized dams
  - Not a near-term strategy
  - Marginal to no likelihood Governor would support this recommendation

**Q&A**

Justin Hayes:

Q Clarity on what group may be putting forward for recommendations and if they add up to anything that will add up to getting us towards recovery. What is it that you are recommending?

A Brett Dumas: Think what hydro 1 intended to do was capture all of the potential policy ideas that came out of our discussions and what level of consensus was there.

- The red yellow green would be helpful to add to the document.

Justin Hayes: when we see info coming from DEIS that saying these things aren't getting us to recovery, were not really putting forward hydro system recovery options were just endorsing the status quo

Richard Scully: Regarding accords – prior to 2008 there was fish mitigation funds with more specificity. Would like to see Governor not sign any more accords because they seem to make it so Idaho cannot stand up for itself as a state

- Brett Dumas: I agree, we have a lot of questions regarding the accords notes that it has been presented to us.
  - Might like to see the pros and cons of them.

Aaron Lieberman:

Q Any specifics on how to improve surface passage?

A Brett Dumas: Doesn't think so. This is a step getting towards what your suggesting

- Scott Hauser: Offers assistance to reach out to third party
- Jim Yost: We need to get ahold of Richie graves from NOAA. These guys put the thing together

Toby Wyatt: More pit tags detection on dams and pit tagging more fish. Better way to track fish

Aaron Lieberman: Question I had for Sam, regarding workgroup post December report submission.

- Dave Doeringsfeld: Maybe we just offer our willingness then the governor could say yes or no.
- Mark Menlove: Agrees
- Representative Wood: Cautions against creating a bureaucracy

David Doeringsfeld:

Q What if you took smolts to Lewiston put them in a barge then go downriver?

A Aaron: On the barging front – in certain cases it works in others it doesn't.

- There are scientists around the state that we can look to

Justin Hayes: Notes that federal plan no alternative doesn't even get to ESA numbers. Concerned that we don't have hydro recommendations that amount to survival of fish

- Brett Dumas: If hydro system is going to be in place, we need to look at spill and other transportation measures
- Richard Scully: preferred alternative has minimal. Life cycle said minor and CSS said significant
- David Doeringsfeld: We're not going to get there on a debate on models. Doesn't see how that conversation would be helpful.

Aaron Lieberman: It's shown that hydro has the single most affect area in the system. We have to have the conversation

- Brett Dumas: If you want to optimize salmon efficiency and resiliency, removal of the lower four snake river dams would benefit but that comes at a large cost
- Aaron Lieberman: Having a conversation talking about having a conversation is not the same as having the conversation. We're all adults, we can do this, we need to have this conversation if not to just get it over with. If nothing comes of it then okay, at least we had the conversation.

- Representation Wood: Remembers when predation wasn't a factor, now it is.
  - o Thinks the recommendation should fall within what we've got to work with.
  - o We can have the conversation but doesn't think were going to get consensus from this group.
  - o Preferred alternative is centered around the fact that the hydro system has many things it's supposed to benefit, not just one.
- Richard Scully: If our fish didn't have to go through 8 dams, we would have higher yield.

Toby Wyatt: Offers insight into reservoir drawdown, in 1992 they did it so quick that they killed a lot of resident fish. Could killing those predators be a reason for better returns?

Justin Hayes: If people aren't going to move forward with more aggressive things such as breach or flow augmentation then we have to do other things, we can't just endorse the statute quo.

Aaron Lieberman: Inquires about the letter.

- Brett Dumas: Meant to bring that up. They never had time to get into the letter
- Aaron Lieberman: Are we open to sending out a poll for Governor to respond in a meaningful way to the letter sent by Dave?
- Katherine Himes: Since this Fredricks groups didn't get to the new topic, that the third small group in the rotation would take on.
- Brett Dumas: Whoever assumes the letter, Aaron why don't you get a proxy of a policy to them and they'll incorporate that in there

Brian Brooks: Even the people who have been open to having difficult discussions knows that were going to supplement other areas to keep communities whole.

- We are in an economic downturn right now because of the situation were in. We're losing money and its killing fish.
- So, he rejects the notion that any idea of a new future is going to be hurtful because there are people out there living that economic nightmare.
- When we talk about breaching were not talking about letting our grain growers figure out how to get their grain to market.
- The current EIS is going to keep them on an extinction path. DEIS has confirmed the countless studies that breaching a dam would give us more returns. It feels really instructional we're not going to talk about what we have proof of what is the best option to bring back the fish.

Scott Hauser: would like to re-address comment of how blocked areas are important to Upper Snake River Tribes.

**4:15** – Katherine Himes moves to small group process

Mark Menlove: May be helpful to have more direction as to what each small group is producing

Merrill Beyeler: Would like small groups to look at other two topics that they haven't seen yet

Joe Oatman: Regarding keeping communities whole, thinks if we could spend some time what "keeping whole" looks like to all folks represented here on the workgroup, I think that would assist us as we move forward through this discussion.

Justin Hayes: Completely agrees with what Joe is saying. What are we going to do with that?

Katherine Himes: Brain is filled with what could be constructive at the August meeting.

- Thinks that there are a number of ways to approach the next steps.
- Maybe not equal time for the 4 H's depending on how the third rotation goes?
- Brings meeting to a close. Thanks everyone for having tough conversations. Looks forward to tomorrow and sharing the next steps

**Meeting adjourns at 4:30.**

**Governor's Salmon Workgroup Meeting  
9 July 2020 – 9:00 A.M.  
Workgroup Meeting via Zoom**

**Workgroup Roll**

- Richard Scully
- Brett Dumas
- Paul Arrington
- Justin Hayes
- Joe Oatman
- Jim Yost
- Aaron Lieberman
- Senator Dan Johnson
- Toby Wyatt
- John Simpson
- Kara Finkler
- Chad Colter
- Brian Brooks
- Mark Menlove
- Will Hart
- Scott Hauser
- Stacey Satterlee
- David Doeringsfeld
- Representative Fred Wood
- Merrill Beyeler
- Katherine Himes
- Mike Edmondson

**9:06** - Katherine Himes introduces

- Zoom may be recorded so anything may be posted in the news
- Public comments is at noon, gave option for written comment as well
- Group introduces themselves

Mike Edmondson: Wants to strive to have a balanced discussion so that everyone shares equally

Katherine Himes: Thanks Mike, notes that it's important that voices are heard.

- Gives overview of what is going on for the first section – small group break outs.

- Time to think about feedback from yesterday
- What were the points to hone draft policy recommendations
- What were the big questions the Workgroup had.
- Also, opportunity to talk about areas they haven't covered.
- What new information do they want to share with the group?
- Another report out but a briefer version.
- Notes that the small groups are for workgroup members, SME and support people, we can reconvene at 10:10 together.

### **Small group break out at 8:22**

### **10:15 back to big group and a break**

### **10:23 Habitat Small Group Report Out – Presented by Aaron Lieberman**

- Overarching Policy:
  - Notes that mission statement and goals has already been vetted but language could be changed to make it into policy for an overarching policy statement
- Habitat Restoration:
  - More emphasis on scope and scale of the actions were added/suggested
- Increased Funding:
  - Talked about identifying sources
  - Spoke about the need to gain more of a proportional share
  - Increase Federal or regulatory share of funding
- Water management
  - Took out flow augmentation as these recommendations are more state based and flow augmentation is more regional
  - Spoke about whether to include a list or not
    - Noted that they tried to frame types of project structure and include the projects that way as opposed to listing each
    - Added Lewiston Orchard Exchange Project
- Public Education:
  - Spoke about whether this should be individual per subtopic or more broad
- Support Collaborative Efforts:
  - Addressed Ecological, Social, Ecological within the second round
  - Transferred “Collaborative efforts . . . ensure benefits to the community.” to the revised recommendations

### **Q&A**

Representative Wood: Merrill was concerned about the private land portion, that's the only thing I can see that he might be concerned about

Aaron Lieberman: We can address that in the second bullet – offers language change

Representative Wood: Concur

*Aaron Lieberman adds in the verbiage*

Mike Edmondson: These are the guiding principles that the community came up with in the Upper Snake River Basin when contemplating and seeking funding

Paul Arrington: We have that section on predation in here, but I understood listening to harvest that they pulled it over and incorporated it. Doesn't think this group really has to deal with predation, thinks that predation is in harvest.

- Katherine Himes: Makes note to separate those two in the next homework assignment

Scott Hauser: Going back to cloud seeding – there are mixed studies that putting silver iodine up into the atmosphere can have long term environmental impacts. There’s a lot of unknowns so a little hesitation in adding that

- Brett Dumas: There is a lot of information out there on cloud seeding. It would take a bit to answer Scotts question and you’re going to get a lot of different inputs. Generally, science has shown that there’s not a large impact.
  - o Can share research.
  - o Certainly, has provided a lot of water availability in the snake river.
- John Simpson: Echoing what Brett said.
  - o There’s ongoing cloud seeding efforts and a number of the water users are in participation with the water resource board.
- Justin Hayes: Thinks this ties into why we didn’t get into naming projects.
  - o Thinks it should be some sort of support materials.
  - o Concern about dating our recommendations because in a few years new information could come out.
- Katherine Himes: Possible way to address that is through an appendix in the report
- Representative Wood: Echoing Justin’s point – policy statement is first sentence.
- Aaron Lieberman: seems that there weren’t any issues regarding well supported strategies but that there is controversy surrounding cloud seeding.
  - o Would anyone be against just removing that portion?
- Richard Scully: Likes idea of keeping those ideas outside of the main policy portion

**10:53 Harvest Report Out** – Presented by Mike Edmondson

- Spent time talking about overarching ideas. Group looks forward for this to topic getting to other groups

*Representative Wood*: Thought it was thoroughly discussed so in the breakout session we didn’t talk about any of the topics, except for recognizing that all tribal issues (didn’t have a tribal member in workgroup) we tried to be as sensitive as possible knowing it would go onto tribal members and we welcome their input.

*Stacey Satterlee*: Tried to think broadly in their recommendations, putting a lot of stuff in the presentation knowing it wouldn’t all make the final cut. Technical expertise would be helpful

Katherine Himes: Do you have non harvest/predation discussion items that you want to share with the workgroup? Anything you want to tee up for a full group discussion?

Toby Wyatt: Asks if anyone has any questions regarding harvest on the lower portions of the Snake River

*Stacey Satterlee*: One thing we discussed – everyone felt strongly that we have these technical experts and that we would benefit from having their knowledge/expertise in our recommendations. We want to have smart and relevant recommendations based in reality. We should have a way to have that presented to us as we move forward.

*Justin Hayes*: Wants to make sure that we are supported. Sometimes frustrated by what he considers to be the inertia of beurocracy. Doesn’t want “we tried that and it didn’t work”. Doesn’t want our efforts to be hamstrung by action from the past that failed. While he wants the past experience and expertise doesn’t want us to be constricted by that.



Chad Colter: When it comes to harvest and tribal harvest, there are the two tribes with treaties in Idaho. There are 5 Idaho tribes. All relied on the tribes for sustenance. When it comes to the tribal harvest, Shoshone-Bannock was hit the hardest from those treaty. Need to make sure we're addressing our lack of ability to harvest because it has been suppressed.

Toby Wyatt: Probably the biggest take away from harvest is having a voice, having Governor approach congress. If Idaho could get a vote that would make a big difference.

Justin Hayes: Thinks they were assigned economic studies – didn't address it, didn't think they fully understood the breadth of that question

*Katherine Himes shares pdf from May 4<sup>th</sup> exercise two slides*

### **11:13 Hatchery report out – Presented by Paul Kline**

- Went over documents presented yesterday and will make additional comments
  - Made comment regarding Tribal interest in recommendation 2
  - Recommendation 4: suggested each be addressed (harvest mitigation, supplementation, conservation) in an appendix or one well-crafted recommendation
  - Recommendation 6: discussed whether hatchery production is still needed at present day levels if region makes progress on meeting wild fish escapement goals
    - Columbia Basin Partnership set goals for summer and spring Chinook

### **Q&A**

Merrill Beyeler: Three goals mitigation, supplementation, conservation.

Q Can you speak to hatchery and conservation?

A Paul Kline: didn't have sites set in production, no return goals in mind. The only thing they had in mind was preventing the population from blinking out.

Q Regarding the 127,000 natural origin and 90,000 hatchery origin – how close are we to meeting those goals?

A Paul Kline: 127,000 is natal ground representative of 1950s that lower snake river developers used to identify what mitigation efforts should be. Goals were developed at partnership table. How we are doing now is a good question. We've had natural origin runs in the double digit thousand – now were around 10,000. It hasn't been in the 100,000s for some time. Its jumped around a lot now it is a little below 10,000. There may be some value for this group to have that number on paper as a recommendation. Regarding the hatchery number, doesn't think its been met for chinook but think it has for steelhead.

*Paul Kline moves to systemic solutions*

- Small group thinks there should be further discussion on recommendation 2
- Regarding recommendation 3 and 4 – small group thinks it would be amiss to not make some sort of recommendation
- Notes there were workgroup members that suggested recommendations 6-9 should not be consolidated
  - There's unique elements and discussion on these points that could be discussed in the final recommendation

### **Q & A**

Justin Hayes: If we assume the CSO objectives have been implemented then we wouldn't be talking about trying to have a seat at the table (example harvest).

- Paul Kline: If it is implemented thinks there would be an ongoing discussion.
- Justin Hayes: So, you're assuming we should accept it and develop alternate language in the case that it doesn't work out?
- Paul Kline: Think we were having the conversation in the hopes that there would be a possible consensus recommendation from the workgroup in both sides
- Brian Brooks: References a note that mirrors what Justin just said – bottom of the last page could be modified to identify or recognize that other alternatives might be more effective at addressing the end goal to return healthy and harvestable populations of salmon and steelhead to Idaho.

Katherine Himes: Notes a couple other hands that are raised but that we need to move to the next small group so that we can get to public comment on time.

**11:56 Report out: Hydro** – Presented by Brett Dumas

- Higher level constructive discussion about some of the issues
- After yesterday's small group discussion – we all had different methods for computing the changes.
  - Our suggestion is converging on a standardized template that we can use as we move from each topic.
  - Look of the document and the template and how we capture the changes from group to group.
- Topic number two: policy proposal that covers the intent in having the governor participate in a regional discussion.
  - Didn't have to use the letter directly, in their viewpoint its captured within the letter.

Richard Scully: Even though letter requests region conversation, we would like that recommendation to go to the governor from the workgroup itself. Governor to initiate it if hasn't been already.

Brett Dumas: Regarding dam breaching – some members feel like we haven't had the conversation and there's some who feel like we've covered it every time.

- We were thinking we could have a discussion that those on the “defense” can give their perspective.
- There seems to be consensus to have a half day discussion to let members of the workgroup to lay out their position on breaching.
  - Richard Scully: That would be followed by a discussion. We have about four meetings left, if we had that discussion in August or September then we could come back in a meeting or two and discuss it further if need be
  - Scott Hauser: We've had a lot of science say that breaching would get us to our SAR. Would like to hear the nonbreaching party side to understand what the dams bring to them, how they benefit from the dams and how they support their lives and livelihoods

*Katherine Himes moves to break and gives information on public and written comment*

**Public Comment**

- Katherine gives information on how to participate in public comment and moves to comment period

Nick Nelson: Asks that a policy recommendation be that the new accords involve public input and transparency. In order to have constructive convos we must first acknowledge the lower 4 dams provided. Group has danced around what that means instead of talking about what it means. Set sights for salmon,

clean energy and good economy. Idahoans from all walks of life are hurting from Salmon shortage. People of Idaho deserve to have their voices heard. Suggests a discussion on what Idaho may look like if we do have a consensus.

David Cannamela: Governor Little has made right decisions relative to pandemic, science-based data driven cares about Idaho and makes painful decisions because of their benefits despite. If gov applies this to dams then it will be beneficial. What's best for Idaho? Idahoans from all walks of life are hurting from lack of returns. Federal agencies don't care about restoring our fish. We have to do that. It will be much better if Governor Little is on our side. This group needs to have courage to recommend this at the heart of our recommendations. To do this – get a vision of the future. Do we see people in the future shaking their heads that we sacrificed the salmon for concrete blocks?

Kaitlin Straubinger: Works for Idaho Rivers United, gave comment in January as well. Acknowledges that group is tackling a tough issue. But restoring the runs is not a difficult subject. Encouraged to hear these difficult discussions. Suggests putting it all on the table and have these discussions. What would it take to transport? For energy? Your legacy could be incredible. Have these important conversations and ask yourselves what it would take. Salmon and steelhead are an economy on their own. You have the amazing opportunity to make a difference in restoring these salmon for the region and the world

Kristin Troy: Husband and her have owned rafting and fishing business in Salmon and a lodge in Frank Church Wilderness. What has become clear is that salmon and steelhead need a river. Timing is everything and this is our time to end our paralysis and end a system that we built. Idahoans and especially rural Idahoans know how to do hard things with an eye and a heart to keeping things whole. This group must find the courage and backbone to go to Governor Little that yes, it is a big systemic fix but it can be done in a way to benefit the state and region. Governor little would be in good company if he takes on this task. Simpson is willing to do the work, he just needs the rest of us to show up for him.

Lori Ode: Speaking on behalf of unaffiliated group whose interested in restoring anadromous fish to Idaho. We must compel Idaho leaders to work collaboratively with other regional leaders to decommission the lower 4 snake river dams. Salmon are essential. Idaho salmon and steelhead have been in decline since these dam's construction. The four dams have been isolated to the primary cause and major limiting factor. Dams and reservoirs cause direct and indirect mortality.

Jonas Seiler: River guide on middle fork. Mentions the fish jumping up Dagger Falls and invites workgroup members to go see this. Encourages the group to come together and do what it takes to remove the dams and keep the community's hole. Make sure Governor Little gets this right so that we are on the right side of history with Inslee, Brown and Simpson.

Mat Rigby: Owns fishing and rafting business on Salmon River. Quickly became aware of the dwindling harvest permits that was once the backbone of their community. Please let the salmon return to the Salmon River.

Danielle Jones: Owns sport fishing on Clearwater River. Reading a letter Kyle (her husband) wrote to Senator Crapo in 2018. Idaho's steelhead season used to reliably supply yearly income now it has become their biggest liability. The river and our reliable customer's has allowed to make a living in rural Idaho. The current state of Idaho salmon and steelhead have forced us to look to live elsewhere. We ask everything be done our kids and many others have the same opportunities to enjoy Idaho as we have.

Steven Pfeiffer: Conservation associate at Idaho Rivers United. BPA accords have subverted Idaho's rights to recover Idaho salmon. Obvious current hydro system is broken as far as salmon and steelhead are concerned. The current hydro system is scientifically proven detrimental to the salmon. Recommend to

Governor he not resign the fish accords, give Idaho the power to speak up on these issues. Use this opportunity to talk about the what ifs in taking these dams down.

Dave Hansen: Wanted to second what Steven said. His opinion is that the removal of the 4 dams in questions is what he would like to cast his voice for. We need to make sure we can take care of all the parties involved. There's a way to do it where everyone is taken care of and the fish aren't just hung out to dry. We know the dams are a huge problem, especially for sockeye in both migration directions.

Zena Hartung: From Moscow, has children and grandchildren here. From being in the Puget Sound area. Aware of the stress that has been put on our natural systems and the salmon and steelhead populations. Turning this around is going to mean major changes for the Pacific Northwest and how we have treated our natural resources including main stem and tributaries and elsewhere that the salmon need to go for their spawning. Wants to see changes, particularly removing dams. My life will likely not see these changes, but they are badly needed.

**2:01** – Katherine Himes reconvenes meeting

- Dates that work well seem to be August 26, 27

**Agenda subgroup** – Mark Menlove facilitates

- Moving forward past December?
- Consensus thought around prioritizing potential topics?
  - Comprehensive look at basin wide returns
  - NOAA 5-year review
  - Optimizing supplementation
  - Idaho accords
  - Monitoring
  - More detail on Clearwater and Dworshak
  - Abundance and harvest
  - Keeping people whole
  - Breach conversation

*Katherine Himes briefly describes drafting of report sections which will be shared with Workgroup members soon for review and editing.*

Richard Scully: Sooner we have discussion on breach would be better

David Doeringsfeld: Thinks dam breach and how to keep community's whole is one conversation not two separate

Joe Oatman: Mentions accord idea.

- Relative to breach/keeping people whole, we should have it in August it will help inform not just the hydro recommendations but all of the recommendations

Representative Wood: I would suggest that our next order of business would be getting a format together in how we want to present this.

- Paul: Maybe we should divide the list on what we have to do and what we would like to do. Thinks accord and dam breach and scheduling in August.

Justin Hayes: Thinks we should have the breach discussion but doesn't think that there is going to be a consensus one way or another.

- Maybe in advance of that discussion if there is not some hands-on facilitation or mediation.
- Should we bundle getting together to talk about breach and how were going to handle that discussion so that we don't devote a day to it then have nothing come from it.
- What are our options going forward after we have that discussion?

David Doeringsfeld: Believes our charge is create consensus recommendations

Will Hart: We were tasked on forming consensus around recommendations.

- We made the decision to go a little further than that in restoring runs, there was give and take there.
- Understands there is strong feelings on having time to publicly air having a discussion about breaching dams.

Jim Yost: Accord, history of them.

- Breach discussion allowing those who want to talk to talk

Mike Edmondson: Gives information about accords

Aaron Lieberman: Framing of breach discussion hopes that we don't frame it like offense and defense.

- For him, the discussion is worthwhile because it is a significant factor in what we are discussing. This is how we have faith and show compassion with one another.
- Framing it like what would this mean 20-30 years down the road would be beneficial.
- Hope we cannot go into the "us versus them" mentality.

Toby Wyatt: Considering how 95% of the public comments favor breach, I think we owe it to those people to have those discussions.

- Prefers in August and prefers framing it as "keeping communities whole".

Brett Dumas: I think we are obligated to try to find consensus over addressing the lower 4 snake river dams

Brian Brooks: Agrees that we won't reach consensus but would like to be convinced why its not a good idea.

- Looking at all of the recommendations we've put forward and we kind of pick them apart.
- When it comes to dam breaching the one component that were missing is why it's a no-go.
- Lets just nit-pick it apart like we have all of the other recommendations

Mike Edmondson: notes that there is interest in repolling for future meeting dates

**3:00 Meeting Adjourns**