

Meeting of the Governor's Salmon Workgroup

December 2, 2020

Zoom Meeting

Workgroup Member Roll

- Mike Edmondson
- Katherine Himes
- David Doeringsfeld
- Roy Akins
- Paul Arrington
- Richard Scully
- Brian Brooks
- Will Hart
- John Simpson
- Mark Menlove
- Aaron Lieberman
- Brett Dumas
- Scott Hauser
- Stacey Satterlee
- Justin Hayes
- Eric Crawford in for Kira Finkler
- Joe Oatman
- Merrill Beyeler
- Jim Yost

Introduction

- Katherine Himes
 - *Shared slide of topics covered*
 - Welcome everyone
 - *Gave purpose and history of Workgroup*
 - This meeting in particular is an opportunity for the workgroup to hear public comment and work on shared policy recommendations and the report
 - Schedules were developed by the workgroup
 - Next meeting will be a wrap up meeting
 - The public comment today is the final public comment and written comment will be accepted through 12-14-2020
 - *Workgroup members introduced themselves*
 - Members of the public, if you would like to provide comment please indicate in the chat
- Mike Edmondson
 - *Gave instructions for submitting public comments*

- Public comment is now available on the OSC website in chronological order
- *Gave warning that video meetings may be recorded*
- If you don't have access to chat box please just interject when an opportunity arises

Public Comment

- Nic Nelson
 - Idaho Rivers United
 - Thank you, workgroup, for the past year and a half of productive discussion
 - Thank you to moderators for handling of contentious discussions
 - You've all done well
 - What does it mean to be Idahoan?
 - For many it's an understanding and way of life
 - Governor often uses term Idaho Way
 - Best I can tell it's a rugged individualism and ability to pull yourself up
 - We've often said that the salmon crisis can't be solved within the borders of Idaho
 - I've started to understand that maybe it can be solved within Idaho's borders by having Idaho regain independence from will of others in the Northwest and Federal government
 - We've constrained ourselves to think we need the dams
 - We've allowed us to be captured by the whims of Washington and federal government
 - We've not met our obligations to the tribes that have called Idaho home for far longer
 - This group should consider recommendations that lead Idaho back to self-reliance and not under the thumb of other states or federal government

- David Cannamela
 - Hope your holiday was good
 - I would like to recommend an article in the Seattle Times from Sunday that strikes at the heart of the issue
 - About all of the things you've said over the last year and a half has already been said
 - We need to follow the signs
 - Despite the recommendations of medical professional and polite suggestions we are seeing the results of not following the science
 - If we had, we would be in a much better place and it is the same with salmon
 - You will not solve the problem without removal of the lower snake dams
 - If you support salmon recovery you must support the removal of the dams, they are mutually exclusive
 - We should view removal and river restoration as an opportunity that we should not let slip pass
 - We should embrace it to restore salmon and all that they mean to us

- We should look forward to changing our infrastructure system so we can achieve a future that is bountiful and healthy and sustainable for future generations
- Thank you and thank you for your work
- Kurt Miller
 - Thank you for the opportunity to comment
 - I spent a good deal of time in Idaho. Dad bred quarter horses and Idaho was center for quarter horse racing
 - I appreciate all the work you have been putting in
 - I am executive director of Northwest River Partners
 - 100 members dedicated to clean energy in the northwest
 - We do best to champion merits of hydropower for its renewable value
 - Our organization has published many articles on the issue
 - I greatly respect what you're doing to work together to solve the crisis
 - One thing we do know is that with improvements in fish passage about 50% of smolts make it to the ocean and would be enough if we had SARs
 - Question we need to ask is why we are having high ocean mortality
 - People point to dam and climate change because of their similar timelines
 - Neither fact has been proved to have causation but only correlation
 - Fact is we need to do the science still before we can follow it
- Alex Spencer
 - Live in Washington and while I'm far away I'm a fisher by trade and recreationalist by heart
 - As a child one of my first experiences with fish was in Salmon River while fly fishing for trout
 - Any talk about salmon restoration that does not talk about dam removal is a farce
 - The lower 4 dam removal should be the first thing talked about
 - Reasons for keeping the dams have diminished and reasons for removing them has grown
 - Do we really need to produce excess power for pennies on the dollar when there is other options?
 - We need to provide food for the orca
 - For three years in a row the orca have come to the mouth of the Elwha
 - We encourage you to consider dam breaching as one of the most effective way for salmon recovery
- Dagny Deutchman
 - I am a 4th generation Idahoan from Salmon and a 12 year river guide
 - Associated with Idaho Outfitters and Guides for most of my career
 - This issue is incredibly important not just because of my career but because salmon and steelhead are imperative to the health of the area
 - If we lose these fish our town loses our namesake
 - I think it is really important
 - I'm currently in a PhD program and we need to follow all of the science not selective science

- Effects of dams are cumulative
- Just because we get good SARs in some areas
- A lot of fish biologists are employed by government and have to sign a non-disclosure saying they can't discuss lower 4 snake dams
- As a river guide it's extremely important because I lose my job if these fish go away and so do others that I love
- It affects people I love all over the state
- Effects down the line will be ranchers not getting the nutrients they need for the ranch to continue for generations
- Jeff Bitton
 - Thank you for your service on the Workgroup, not easy task
 - Here today for outfitters and guides and the communities they live in
 - Those people rely on abundant returns to remain in these communities
 - They've relied on you for a solution and that is a difficult task because it is a complex issue
 - As you continue to work forward, I hope that you consider all the alternatives
 - One alternative is not enough to make this problem going away
 - Outfitters and guides and communities are already being injured by this problem
 - For all these people I hope that you are able to be successful in making this Workgroup have an impact
- Own Begley-Collier
 - I'm a 15 year old sophomore in Seattle and have wanted to study orcas since first grade
 - We need people engaged on this issue and this Workgroup is part of that
 - But it is clear that not enough is being done especially in regard to dams
 - While orcas used to be regular, it is more rare now
 - Must take immediate action to remove dam to save salmon and orcas
 - A study I sent you show that these dams are not economical and likely never were
 - There is no question of when or how this needs to happen
 - The Corps knows how to breach and keep everyone whole but showed that they are unwilling unless more people speak up
 - Science shows this needs to happen within 5 years to save orcas
 - We are out of time. Time for band-aid measures have passed
 - I hope we can begin to recognize that urgency
- Nina Sarmiento
 - Workgroup members, it is not easy for me to speak harshly about the disservice you're doing by not talking about dam breaching
 - Much of this comes to some of your individual ties to the hydro system
 - This has allowed some to ignore the science
 - SAR of 4-6% is necessary to recovery and no degree of spill or hatchery will ever get to recovery
 - No measure of predation control will improve survival or fish ladders, or other capital investments will get us to recovery

- The reservoirs at dams are hot and stagnant and a living nightmare for fish
- Reservoirs are just as bad as dams and there are too many on the river
- I mourn for the tribes have been lied to and the salmon and steelhead who won't recover because people in power are not willing
- You have power to save power just by starting the conversation of dam breaching
- The time is now
- Maybe the best thing for you to do is to get out of the way
- It is clear to the public that this process is worthless without a discussion of dam breaching
- Can be reached at Damsense
- Jim Waddell
 - I'm a retired Civil Engineer from Army Corps
 - I've spent about 15,000 hours since retirement studying EIS
 - Spent 10-12 years in DC doing civil works and recognize what the Corps can and can't do
 - Science has always been clear that you can't recover stocks without removing the dams. Not going to belabor that point
 - Corps has duty and fiduciary authority to retire and remove the dams if they are not beneficial
 - CRSO EIS has always been a sideshow to this and whatever conclusion comes out is basically worthless
 - We've done studies that the peak power of the dams is essentially worth nothing
 - Other parts of the system were making money and we don't need to replace the power
 - Breaching is a simple procedure. Corps has studied it and you guys just need to make the decision
- Asa Menlove
 - I live in Boise and didn't plan on saying anything when I joined
 - All of you know the science and that dam breaching is necessary to recover fish
 - About a month ago I caught my first steelhead on the clearwater
 - It was a handshake with the wild
 - Want to pose a question to those not in favor of removal
 - Do you truly believe that the recommendations you've proposed will recover salmon and steelhead and that my children will have the opportunities I have had?
 - Anything short of breaching the dams is a failure
 - It will happen with or without you and I am asking you to be on the right side of history
- Mike Edmondson
 - Right now, we don't have anyone else on the list for public comment
 - We will give people some time to sign up for comment until 10:15
 - We may begin discussion of agenda but will check in to see if anyone has joined for public comment and allow them to go.
- From Chris Pinney (chat Box)

- Enough said, Deja Vue all over again. It would take me three days, not 3 minutes to produce my comments, especially without a high degree of passionate cussing, so I shall provide more and last written comment. The Workgroup should be fully aware of my decadal long voice in the wildness that we must just breach the dams to drain the reservoirs.
- Richard Scully
 - It looks like our public comment is about over for our 15 meetings and I've heard over and over that we make a recommendation for breach in our public comment
 - I know that we are directed to have consensus on our recommendations but if we were to have a majority of the workgroup that favored it, would it have any effect going forward?
- Mike
 - That would be a question for the full workgroup,
 - The full comment is available on the OSC website
- Richard Scully
 - I think the public recognizes that the Governor doesn't have a magic wand to remove the dams but if we were to recommend that he support working with other states and congressionals to remove the dams would that be possible?
- Mike
 - I'll cut in here because we have more public comment now
- Liz Paul
 - I live in Garden City
 - I would like to thank all the members for your commitment and learning
 - I think one of the most beneficial things that has come from this workgroup has been the public comment that has come regularly at each meeting and written
 - So, I want to say thank you to the hundreds of people from all walks of life who came forward to talk about this issue
 - As the workgroup gets into talking what comes after this
 - I would encourage workgroup members to encourage the Governor to offer Idahoans the opportunity to provide their input
 - I think that would be a great legacy
- Azi Brannock
 - I live in Seattle and I'm 12 years old
 - I would like to talk how the snake river dams affect salmon
 - Every year at my elementary school we would raise salmon and set them free
 - Journalist has described the northwest as anywhere that salmon could swim
 - By that definition, our land has shrunk
 - Fish ladders are insufficient and doesn't even factor in delayed mortality
 - 40% of smolts are killed
 - Worse for hatchery fish because they are weaker and genetically inferior
 - Breeding fish in a hatchery is not a sustainable solution
 - The reservoirs affect salmon's natural ability to navigate the river and are their temperatures are too high

- Increases predation opportunities as well
- Over 16 billion dollars spent and has been ineffective
- Clear that removal of the dams is necessary
- Terri Wright
 - Thank you for the opportunity for comment
 - I am a neighbor from Washington on Olympic peninsula
 - I am here to advocate for southern residents
 - I believe all life was created by a power more wise than humans
 - I don't think that humans have the right to degrade habitat and cause extinction
 - I cannot figure out how we cannot look to the best available science to save the southern resident orca
 - We deny them access to their food by degrading their habitat and food. We have polluted their waters, captured them and put them in theme parks
 - I recognize solutions are not easy and I would ask each member to ask if we are doing everything we can to save southern residents? Answer right now is a resounding no
 - If chinook salmon were abundant, none of this would be necessary
 - Salmon need a free flowing river
 - Need to remove dams
 - Need over 270,000 chinooks to sustain orcas and need even more for recovery
 - There are options available that heal salmon, orcas, and others
- Mike Edmondson
 - Received a question of how the oral public comment is captured
 - It is captured in essence in the notes which are available on the OSC website. Won't be verbatim but we take the best notes we can.
- Gina Brooks
 - Thank you for having this meeting
 - I'm just learning about this process and this group
 - At the beginning of this I heard it was said that we should not be swayed by neighbors Washington or Federal Government and I disagree with that
 - Mother nature has no borders and I hope Idaho can reach out to others to help solve these issues
- From Terry Myers
 - Thanks to everyone
 - I've attended most of the meetings and have heard comment from all kinds of people and everyone is passionate on issue
 - Hope that they did not end up in just a pros and cons column but were seen as passionate pleas from people and were received sincerely
 - I hope these past 18 months are an effort you can build on to effect real change
 - I think that consensus is important and can be a jump off point for further efforts
- From Terri Wright (chat box)
 - Just wanted to add the rest of my comment here -- thank you: I understand that the members of this workgroup did not cause this problem, but rather inherited a

quagmire caused by years of human ignorance and a lack of understanding of the natural world. Unfortunately, we have operated on the premise for too long of humans being outside of nature. It is time to change this mindset to find bold solutions that safeguard the Southern Residents, the salmon they depend on, and all species. And I would caution all of us that we take scientific-based actions quickly so that we are not the generation that leaves behind a legacy of extinct Southern Residents and extinct Snake River chinook salmon.

- Joey (*No last name given*)
 - I have a manufacturing company for salmon and steelhead and based in Boise Idaho
 - Surprised that A run didn't return and they're bigger this year
 - I wish we would have more people express their voice on this
 - Was explained to me that we have a hotel with rooms but no guests coming
 - I wish that there were signs that this would follow through and not just fall on deaf ears
 - If we had more media coverage we could maybe reach out to legislators and others
 - I fully support you guys and hope we can get this turned around for our children and grandchildren

Break

Draft Report

- Katherine Himes
 - I'll give a brief intro to this section
 - The Workgroup wanted to tackle three main areas of the report
 - Recommendations
 - Body of report
 - Appendices
 - Schedule is open in blocks of time so we can get through all of them
 - Now till noon is time to focus on recommendations and perhaps start on the body
 - Any questions about our schedule?
 - So, the first big thing is the draft policy recommendations
 - Most of them, you have in your hand in either the draft report or the document that I sent yesterday, or they are going to come from some small groups today
 - I want to make sure we check the box on what's not in your hand before we move into the ones you do
 - First one I have notes in in is Harvest, that small group was developing more text. Is that text ready to share?
- Joe Oatman
 - So, the small team did not meet to work on this one as of yet. I think for some of these they may have fallen through the cracks on follow up so may be one that we can try to address here or lunch if we want to get this completed

- Katherine Himes
 - Ok, I see others nodding so we'll move on to the next one
 - What is in draft report on page 11-12-13 has been replaced by the document sent out yesterday on hatchery
 - Just want to make sure that that is clear to everyone
 - Any questions on that?
 - Ok, that is the end of things that are not in your hand right now. Small group will work to finish up the language
 - Now we'll move to policy recommendation language that has changed. First want to make sure that everyone is following.
- Justin Hayes
 - Question on new hatchery language? I want to make sure I understand the replacement
 - We're not removing the habitat and other recommendations on those pages, just updating the hatchery section, right?
- Katherine Himes
 - Yes, all of section C is being replaced so it will only be that section that gets replaced
 - Does that language sit well with everyone, any concerns? Now is the time for discussion
- Mark Menlove
 - Who was the small group who brought this forward and the need for it to be revised?
- Katherine Himes
 - We started this conversation at the September meeting about revising this. One goal was to be more forward thinking and to eliminate duplication.
 - SMEs also had some important points on technical viability
 - My notes say it was Chad, Lytle, David, Brett, and Kira and there could have been a few others. I know Jim Fredricks and Mike were able to attend the meeting as well
 - Mike is there more to add here?
- Mike Edmondson
 - I think the biggest thing is that the Workgroup review by the SME that the "Workgroup" wanted
 - Was fairly easy but got a little tangled up in Hatchery because there are so many terms that have specific meaning and there was some mixing of terms that we wanted to untangle
 - The SME's felt it was cleaner and more easily understood to pull the background out and make it a preamble to the recommendations
 - The Hatchery group plus some other members met to go through the SME's comments and the result was sent out yesterday
- Katherine Himes
 - Before we go to preamble let's stick to policy recommendations

- Any questions for this small group or concerns on new language?
- Scott Hauser
 - Something Mike just said, he mentioned that there is very specific language for the policy statement for hatcheries.
 - Under enhance and expand in the second sentence, would that sentence encapsulate increased hatchery production for ceremonial purposes for put and take fisheries?
- Mike Edmondson
 - I think that is best posed to members of the subgroup
- Justin Hayes
 - Seeing no one speaking up, I think that is an important thing to make sure it is included
 - Put and take for areas that don't have passage seems important
 - Seems that in that first sentence a statement could be additive to include what Scott is talking about
- Scott Hauser
 - I wonder Mike, since you are familiar, is there some language that could be taken directly out of Idaho's blocked area policy
- Brett Dumas
 - I think in the discussion of this it was discussed on how all hatchery fish are allocated
 - I think we tried to examine this in the blocked areas policy and said that the fish would have to come from the State's allocation
 - Wasn't sure we could do otherwise under the law, but others please feel free to fill in
- Mike Edmondson
 - I see Lance Hebdon and Jim Fredricks are with us so please feel free to give input if you have any
- Jim Fredricks
 - I recall going along the lines of what Brett said and the blocked area policy discusses expanding hatchery production
 - Was trying to separate hatchery production increased for that and for other purposes
 - Could take that language but may confound the blocked area policies
- Joe Oatman
 - I think the point I was going to make was covered but will add some perspective
 - I reviewed these hatchery policies as distinct from blocked areas policy
 - My recollection is to maintain infrastructure, enhance and expand production, supplementation, and that they all try to deal the same thing which is trying to meet certain goals with these programs
 - These were meant to go in hand where you want to maintain what you've got and enhance and optimize to meet obligations
- Katherine Himes

- Are we there or is Scott's concern still there? Has it been resolved?
- Scott Hauser
 - I feel comfortable after hearing from folks so we can move on
- Eric Crawford
 - On that last policy on balancing hatchery and wild fish. We would like to add "and stakeholders" to the last sentence. Most of our other comments were addressed in the preamble revisions
- Katherine Himes
 - I will share my screen so we can edit together
 - *Put draft report on screen*
 - Any concerns with this phrase being added?
- Joe Oatman
 - I'm not sure that I could support this at this time, I would like to bring this back through the tribe. We've spent a lot of time dialing this language in so that the tribe is comfortable with
 - Inserting stakeholders could mean all hatcheries and have to involve stakeholders in those discussions and get agreement and would ask that we have the opportunity to bring this back to the tribe to see if they would be comfortable with it
- Mike Edmondson
 - I believe we did discuss this point and I believe Lance or Jim discussed where public and stakeholder opportunity for involvement in hatchery management
 - I think that this language could suggest a new process
- Jim Fredricks
 - I'll start but let Lance follow up
 - There is a public involvement process
 - The fisheries management plan is a plan that receives public comment and it is reviewed and approved by the commission
 - The 8 GMPs provide the federal authorization for our hatcheries and there is a public comment opportunity there
 - So, there is a public involvement opportunity but not necessarily coordination. Depends on how you define coordination on the level of involvement it would require
 - It sounds straightforward but gets complicated when you start digging into what it really means
- Mike Edmondson
 - Given that, Eric do you want to Joe to take that language back or would you like to hear from Lance?
- Eric Crawford
 - To answer Joe's concern, we are very pointed towards those wild areas
 - We're aware of the GNP and Fisheries Management Plans
 - If there was ever to be any change to the wild management areas, there should be some stakeholder involvement

- Mike Edmondson
 - I think that there was some discussion of the states' responsibility there and maybe Jim could review that
 - I believe Eric's concern was that there should be a stakeholder process
- Jim Fredricks
 - That is what I was just looking at
 - I think the troubling work is coordination
 - I think it is totally reasonable to have some public or stakeholder involvement before altering wild management areas
 - I'm trying to word smith it to see if I can make it work because it becomes a complicated issue
 - To me public involvement means something different than coordination
- Eric Crawford
 - So, the suggestion is to remove stakeholders and coordination and replace it with public involvement?
 - I tend to agree with the way that Jim represented that, that there is no reason for the "in coordination" but believe that there is an obligation on the state's side to allow for some public and stakeholder involvement if management decisions that would affect those wild stocks.
 - Would that ease the tribe's position?
- Joe Oatman
 - I think we would be comfortable with the language that we agreed on last week that didn't include stakeholders and respect that the state has some obligation to involve stakeholders, that it doesn't need to be reflected here in the policy
- Mike Edmondson
 - Should that ever occur there is some backstops there in the ESA and NEPA
 - I think that there are some further examples of public agreement
- Eric Crawford
 - I think we can be fine with the language that we worked on and agreed to
- Richard Scully
 - I'm following Eric's line of thought
 - I think that the main thing is that any plan or need to move into areas of previously wild fish management to involve hatcheries is a big concern and to me would be moving in a negative direction
 - Public involvement should be part of the process however it is stated
 - Don't know if it is different for the tribe on the processes there
 - We're talking again about fighting over crumbs
 - I would like to have some public involvement in hatchery decisions that would affect wild areas
- Justin Hayes
 - I want to speak to the title being used in the "Balancing hatchery and wild fish"
 - I fear that the title of balancing does not accurately capture our intent to prioritize wild fish

- Should the title read protect or prioritize wild fish?
 - Balancing indicates you're accepting some sort of erosion
- Joe Oatman
 - I think at the start there were other edits in the preamble and would like to maybe see those
- Katherine Himes
 - Let's save that for when we move to the body but only edit was one sentence from Trout Unlimited
- Mike Edmondson
 - Katherine, from your perspective what are we looking for from workgroup members?
 - Silence is consent? Word smithing?
- Katherine Himes
 - We're turning to new language on the Hatchery topic and ask if there are any question or concerns, and if not, can we move on to other policy recommendations
 - Is there anything in there that you can't live with?
 - So far nothing has changed in the language of the Hatchery language
- Eric Crawford
 - I believe that Justin brings up a solid point
 - These wild management areas have been managed that way for a long time and that a more appropriate title may fit here
- Katherine Himes
 - So, change to protecting wild fish?
- Justin Hayes
 - Just something that is along those lines that indicates support for wild fish
- Brett Dumas
 - I think the intent of the title was to recognize in the broader management we are seeking to see a balance between wild fish management and hatchery management, and other management
 - I think what Justin proposed is fine and think that it is what we're trying to get to
 - Think purpose was to indicate that we wanted to manage those populations separately
 - The text of the section took a lot of work and I would like to leave that as is
- Katherine Himes
 - So, you would be ok changing to Justin's, but body should not change?
- Brett Dumas
 - Correct
- Katherine Himes
 - So, does anyone oppose changing it to "supporting wild fish"
 - Seeing none, I'll make that note

- Now we'll turn to the next new language recommendation at the bottom of page 13. Blocked area fisheries
- Brett, Paul, and Scott met and worked out some new language and we wanted to make sure that that new language is really clear
- You can see the strikethroughs and new language
- Any questions or concerns?
- Paul Arrington
 - You may remember that as we've been going through this process a number of folks around the table have also been involved in CBP process
 - As part of that process the state developed a policy about restoring fisheries about Hells Canyon Complex
 - Some conversation has been whether this is an opportunity to remove the specific Hells Canyon Complex and make it apply to the whole state
 - There's a sentence up there to provide some context
 - Since this is an existing policy that we're changing I would ask that the strikethroughs carry through
 - We took out the Task Force language and Hells Canyon Complex because some of the language came straight out of the CBP report and didn't fit and then it applies to whole state
 - Just wanted to provide that context
- Katherine
 - Questions, comments, concerns?
- Joe Oatman
 - A question to Paul?
 - You mentioned that this policy was developed during the CBP
 - The tribe wasn't involved in those discussions
 - What's being proposed is consistent with what was discussed in the CBP process
- Paul Arrington
 - When that Phase II report was done there were some appendices that included numbers, and some included a policy or position statement to explain those numbers
 - The state of Idaho included this
 - Many people included a number of statements
 - What this is the statement that Idaho developed and included in that report and modified as I described
- Joe Oatman
 - With that, is there any need to reflect the policies of the others involved?
- Paul Arrington
 - I don't think there is because this document is meant to affect state policy
 - So, for example, this document won't affect the Nez Perce Tribe's policy or any others
 - So, I don't think the other statements would be necessary or appropriate in this document based on what this document is intended to do

- Katherine Himes
 - I'll highlight the pieces that I think get to the point that Paul is making
- Joe Oatman
 - Just for some clarification, the amended policy would be applicable statewide and not just above Hells Canyon
- Paul Arrington
 - Correct.
- Joe Oatman
 - One more follow up. I think I understand the purpose and intent of this policy and don't have any well thought out language, but we may want to add some language to explicitly say it won't affect the policy of sovereigns or other organizations on this
- Paul Arrington
 - At the end of the intro paragraph put a period and include a statement like Joe said
- Katherine Himes
 - *Made proposed edit regarding affecting policies of others*
- Merrill Beyeler
 - Where it starts to talk about the change in the language about not applying to areas outside of blocked areas above Hells Canyon
 - Are we expanding to all blocked areas across the state?
- Mike Edmondson
 - This does not refer to anything that is naturally blocked
- Merrill Beyeler
 - Correct
 - Looking in my part of the world, you have culverts that block areas. Would it apply to areas like that and how would you approach that?
- Mike Edmondson
 - Good point. I think that it could be that way
 - I think everyone that is working on this issue is working to open up as much habitat as possible
- Merrill Beyeler
 - So, you don't see any issue with that last part about applying that policy to those types of areas
 - I just wonder looking at that.
 - I recognize the importance of Blocked areas above Hells Canyon
 - If an organization looked at this and it was policy could it create unintended consequences down the road
 - Paul, do you have that
- Paul Arrington
 - Honestly, I haven't thought about that context
 - I need to think about it and how it may affect those areas
 - Is the easy solution to have a sentence that defines blocked areas?

- Merrill Beyeler
 - Yeah, maybe a clear definition of a blocked area
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Could we just cite a reference to a document that deals with blocked areas or commonly understood?
 - Could put a cite to say we reference to another document to say what we mean by blocked areas in this certain context?
 - While I'm unmuted, is it necessary to list out other statutes, agreements, etc. that are in place that any action or policy would be bound.
 - Or in a footnote or appendices? It's a lot of information to go down
- Paul Arrington
 - My perspective since that this is existing state policy Mike or someone else may be able to answer better
 - Those are all important steps in restoring those fish
 - This was developed with a lot of consideration and it was developed specifically for the Hells Canyon project
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Ok, I'm not opposed to it but was just curious
 - In other places we've talked about keeping the minutia out and maybe keeping it clean but will talk about that later
- Paul Arrington
 - Since this was a policy that had been approved and developed through another process, my goal was to change it as little as possible
- Merrill Beyeler
 - Paul, I do like the proposed definition of "Blocked Areas" and think it creates clarity
- Katherine Himes
 - Any concerns about the new language or edits?
- Paul Arrington
 - As you think about it, I would specifically look to Scott Hauser and John Simpson on if the proposed definition is accurate to describe what we mean here?
- Scott Hauser
 - I usually look closely at all Paul's email but this one I wasn't as detailed and mostly just looked at the Task Force language removed
 - With this conversation coming up, it makes sense to me having the policy be consistent across the state and don't have issues with the additions
- Justin Hayes
 - I appreciate the definition of blocked areas but in the points, it uses the term historic habitat and I think we need to be consistent in our use of blocked areas
- Paul Arrington
 - I think that would be an easy change
- Katherine Himes

- *Made proposed change of “historical habitat” to “blocked areas”*
 - Any concerns with the changes?
- Paul Arrington
 - What I would say is that as we go through these and reach this point of silence, it has to be taken as consent so we can move on.
- Katherine Himes
 - So here is the final new text from a small group for the Workgroup to address
 - Think this was sent to Paul and Justin
- Paul Arrington
 - You can all see the language there so if you have thoughts or questions, we can address them
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I got some flack from Paul and Justin on this
 - One thing that is not in here is a timeline
 - What are folks’ thoughts about adding in establishing a strict timeline was not practical but that there was a sense of urgency
- Merrill Beyeler
 - Maybe “time is of essence” to be shorter
- Katherine Himes
 - *Made proposed change*
- Justin Hayes
 - Can we insert the work “wild” to describe populations?
 - I think that’s consistent with what we’ve said throughout the document
- Brian Brooks
 - Agree
 - We say we want healthy, abundant, etc. which is true and then we get into healthy and harvestable levels
 - And then in the third sentence it says we must restore but doesn’t say whether that includes hatchery or just wild or whether we need to make that distinction in there
- Paul Arrington
 - I think if we just take out healthy and harvestable in the second sentence
 - I think what it is trying to say is that we’re trying to get to levels of wild fish that we could harvest
 - I don’t think that removal takes away anything
- Brian Brooks
 - Maybe change to “in order to reach healthy and harvestable”
- Richard Scully
 - Brian covered most of my points
 - If we get our populations up to where they were in 50s and 60s, we’ll be able to harvest them like we used to
- Katherine Himes
 - Any concerns with these proposed modifications?

- Hearing none I will stop the share
- One more thing before we move to report body, we have one draft recommendation the workgroup hasn't seen which is downstream Tribal and recreational harvest
- Other thing to look at is the SME review of the recommendations
- We can start this and then we'll run into lunch
- I will share a different document that has that feedback
- *Put document on screen*
- SME's had feedback on some but not all recommendations
- Tried to arrange this to make their feedback very clear
- Just want to present what the SME's saw in terms of technical viability, consistency, etc.
- Jim Fredricks
 - I want to point out that the viability is not what we were really assessing. We were just seeing if they were technically sound
 - We made a point to steer clear of determining viability of each one and focused only technical correctness
- Katherine Himes
 - Looking at the first one, it is a language addition
 - Is the Workgroup comfortable with this addition?
 - This is Habitat Restoration Connectivity and Protection recommendation
- Justin Hayes
 - Not really getting into the substance but one thing noticed by the copy editor is that the Workgroup should decide some uniformity in how we want to present information
 - Proposed edits here aren't consistent with other so could we talk about what the purpose of the change is rather than getting held up on the specific language?
- Katherine Himes
 - That is a good point
 - *Discussed purpose of language*
- Merrill Beyeler
 - Could you scroll down a little bit, want to check one more part
- Katherine Himes
 - Rest down here is just commas. Copy editor may have already caught
- Richard Scully
 - It seems like what this is is to continue what we're doing but do more of it
 - Is that practical? Do we need more money or what?
- Katherine Himes
 - I think the point is that there are only five words different than what the workgroup already agreed on and everything else is the same
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Correct me if we're wrong but I think it's just to recognize that the state is already doing some of these things

- Katherine Himes
 - It may be important for us to be clear on what is new and what is expansion, etc.
- Jim Fredricks
 - With this policy and some of the others that is a lot of what we're trying to capture
 - It's not so much for the Workgroup, you all already know that this is already going on
 - I was thinking more of the casual reader who may think that Idaho is doing none of some of these things
 - Just wanted to give a nod to some of those things that are ongoing and that we need to push harder on these
- Merrill Beyeler
 - As we work in developing these policies and in my perspective.
 - Our focus has changed over time and I think that this provides an umbrella for us to move in different directions in the past
 - I think it does show the things we've already been doing but also provides some opportunity for expansion into other areas.
- Katherine Himes
 - I will send this document to you and we will pick back up a 1pm
 - Some will work through lunch to finalize some language
 - Mike, anything to add?
- Mike Edmondson
 - Not really, we'll have some conversation later but nothing to add right now.

Lunch

Draft Report Continued

- Katherine Himes
 - Welcome back from lunch
 - Just a reminder that these meetings can be recorded
 - We're going to keep moving through the report policies and appendices until 4 and then we'll shift into next steps
 - I'll share my screen and we will keep going over SME technical review
 - Small group also has new language to show us after we finish that
 - *Shared document on screen*
 - We are on the second policy recommendation that the SME had feedback on
 - Safe harbor note
- Mike Edmondson
 - Yes, this is simply a note to find the exact reference in Section 6 of the ESA and anywhere else that we can cite to
- Katherine Himes
 - So, this would just add specificity to the part of section 6 it's referring to.
 - Any concerns about that change?

- Hearing none, we'll move to the next one, Predation Management
- This language has changed a little bit since going through the copy editor. Those edits were minor
- SME's have suggested this alternative language
- Comments, questions, concerns?
- Jim Fredricks
 - Want to also mention that we did proposed the portion above the italics be changed to match the italic language
- Katherine Himes
 - Thank you
 - Goal here was to clarify and be specific and it is workgroups role to say yes or not ok with new language
- Justin Hayes
 - I think that there is a subtle difference
 - What about native fish that have thrived in the reservoir system, specifically Pike Minnow?
- Jim Fredricks
 - There is a bounty program for fish like Northern Pike Minnow and no limit
 - Not trying to change the meaning just keep clear
- Justin Hayes
 - Got it. Just pointing out that including non-native in there then excludes those native species like Pike Minnow
- Jim Fredricks
 - That did come up in our conversation and we decided that we would leave it out because it could affect other native species
- Joe Oatman
 - On the promote more aggressive language and deletion of distribution language
 - I thought the intent was to do more of the predation control and in more areas than in what is being done
 - I think that the change may limit that concept and I wonder if there is some additional clarification or detail, we could provide to avoid that limitation
- Jim Fredricks
 - We didn't think it to that degree Joe, we just wanted to capture that there are existing programs and that they need to be larger in scope and scale.
 - The deletion was an effort to be concise and removed because they may not add anything but after what you've said, maybe they do
 - Will leave it to the group on whether to include or not
- Joe Oatman
 - Would propose keeping the deleted language or some version of it
- Merrill Beyeler
 - Thinking about what Joe just said, maybe we could rearrange that language to the end, and it may read better

- Richard Scully
 - I think it was better where it was
 - The other thing I would like to say is where the alternative language is proposed
 - I would take out the endangered language, so it encompasses all the salmon and steelhead
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok, I'm just going to work through the changes
 - Any concerns with the first one?
- Justin Hayes
 - Fix double use of sufficient scope
- Richard Scully
 - Add piscivorous fish
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok any concerns with the next proposed changes?
- Justin Hayes
 - What does aggressive engagement mean?
- Katherine Himes
 - While we finish that one will shift to 3rd sentence
 - Does workgroup want to entertain alternative language or original language?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think the alternative language
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok I see nodding for alternate language
 - *Made change*
 - Any thoughts on last edit?
 - Seeing none, we'll move to the next recommendation
 - It has a lot of recommended edits in order to be more specific than original edits
- Jim Fredricks
 - I can speak to this if anyone wants after you've finished reading it
 - Again, it's recognizing that much of what the recommendation is asking for are actions that are currently being implemented and need to be further refined
 - By law we have to conduct our fisheries so as to not to endanger wild populations
 - We wouldn't have fisheries if we didn't already have fishery plans approved by NOAA that acknowledges that we're doing those things
 - Just trying to capture that
- Justin Hayes
 - I think a sentiment I've expressed, and I think others, is that we appreciate ongoing activities and we want to do more and bigger. I'm not sure that the new text conveys that
 - Language seems to pitch more of the status quo and I'm wondering if there's a way to acknowledge what is happening but emphasize the need to do more and do it bigger

- Aaron Lieberman
 - If I understand, is we're talking about our current fisheries?
 - Current fishery management is based on how biology can support it
 - So, we would be advocating additional limitations on harvest opportunities, is that right
- Justin Hayes
 - I'm not saying to further limit the correct fishery allocation but focus on the protection of the wild fish
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I get where you're coming from and agree with you for most the rest of the report but not sure that it is helpful or appropriate in this specific recommendation
 - Jim can you think of how that would be helpful in this context?
- Justin Hayes
 - There was language that this small group developed before that I think has been eliminated. Maybe it should have been eliminated but I feel like now we're endorsing a paragraph that embraces the status quo
 - Looking at the fishery gear, I think that that was an idea from Toby or Roy early on to address wild fish and that would be gone with this new proposal
- Jim Fredricks
 - Our intent was to capture that we would do more as we learned more
 - As our understanding grows, it's an ongoing process and we adapt as we learn more
 - Don't want it to sound like it's more of the same but we do feel strongly that we are managing our fisheries to protect wild fish
 - Wild and hatchery overlap has been identified and have led to the studies that are ongoing
 - Should read how the Workgroup wants but wanted to try to make it clear of the efforts that are being undertaken
- Katherine Himes
 - Would it work if we restored the deleted language?
- Justin Hayes
 - I'd like to hear from Roy or Toby a bit on this topic
 - I remember this conversation and I don't know that it got resolved
- Roy Akins
 - We are interested in the topic, but I think it's important to trust Jim on this
- Brian Brooks
 - After hearing Jim, I'm kind of split
- Katherine Himes
 - I've un-deleted the removed language. Does this make sense, or does it not make sense?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - As we go through, there is certainly some things that IDFG does

- It seems like we're speaking in relatively broad terms on data informed circumstances.
- Jim Fredricks
 - It may be too technical unfortunately. In my mind some of the ideas are captured in the language beforehand
 - Again, I don't want to advocate but that's just the way it makes sense to me
 - I don't know that the group wants to make a recommendation that areas restrictions should be implemented if they're not necessary
- Eric Crawford
 - The reporting requirements for FMEE are broad and based on reports of the past. There's no way to tell what specific population the take came from
 - Will that benefit wild stocks throughout the state or language to add to go above the minimum bar
- Jim Fredricks
 - When we talk about salmon, we have varying understanding of where anglers are handling wild fish
 - Our knowledge is adapting on that and we are adapting our management as we gain that
 - To me the statement captures that but if it doesn't to the group, I think that it should be modified to make sure your point is getting across
- David Doeringsfeld
 - Right now, I like taking out from the implementing catch and release to the end and then leave everything else
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think that is definitely something IDFG does as far as nature allows
- Katherine Himes
 - I added some "seek new" language to get past Justin's status quo comment as well.
 - Any questions or concerns on these proposed changes?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Overall, I think the SME edits are capturing what was said above except for the very specific measures we discussed
 - I would defer to folks who know more about the issue if they feel strongly about it
 - Otherwise, I think the SME language summarizes it well
 - To Justin's concern, I hear you and am fine with the "seek new" language.
 - I would ask what that means specifically before I endorse it or maybe propose other language
- Roy Akins
 - I think that a lot of the stuff deleted are tools fish and game has used in the past and will continue to be available to us.
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok we will move to the next one

- Regional Dialogue – add the phrase to recognize new name is Columbia Basin Collaborative
- Ok, we'll move to the next one which is mitigation
- The three sentences offered by the SME are meant to capture the recommendation in alternative language
- Joe Oatman
 - When you were working through the Hatchery policy statement, it did address the mitigation obligations, so is this one needed?
- Justin Hayes
 - I think that is a good point, but I don't have that language in front of me
 - I think the notion of funding in this one got eliminated with the new language
 - I don't know if the new language in other areas discussed funding or not
- Katherine Himes
 - I just posted mitigation language from small group working on Hatchery policy
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Could whoever worked on that talk as to why the funding language was not appropriate there?
- Jim Fredricks
 - I'm not sure why, but could be because it was captured elsewhere? Others remember why?
- Joe Oatman
 - I can jump in
 - We had the hatchery language that Katherine posted and the policy recommendations that follow we say advocate for essential funding in multiple places
 - From my perspective I think we have addressed the funding aspects in the hatchery recommendations
- Eric Crawford
 - From a TU perspective, we would appreciate that last sentence containing the LSRCP program be retained
- Aaron Lieberman
 - So, the only functional difference is that in the original language it says that the state would work to change funding structures
 - I think that this is close to original language we had in our small group
- Lance Hebdon
 - I think you're correct Aaron
 - I think the modification was to make it higher level rather than getting down in the weeds rather than conducting review of the adequacy and that it's more about moving that program and meeting the mitigation goal
- Paul Arrington
 - All of these policies require funding
 - We could put something about funding in every single one but that would dilute it

- I thought that there was a separate policy recommendation for funding that would address all that
- Katherine Himes
 - I think you're right Paul. It's towards the end and it is pretty short
 - *Read language*
- Jim Fredricks
 - I think that that's a good point. Funding will be central theme throughout
 - There has been an assessment of funding and it is inadequate under the current model
 - Our thinking that calling out lower snake funding specifically would be helpful in addressing that specific issue
 - I think it was deleted because it was captured in the hatchery part, but it should be captured somewhere
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Yeah and I think we went through this exact iteration in our group, maybe a little stronger
 - This is us telling the governor that we think Idaho should push the feds to more appropriately allocate funds through Lower Snake Comp. I'm in favor of that
- Richard Scully
 - In this lower snake comp plan funding, it seems like they have failed to meet their mitigation obligation in terms of fish coming up over lower granite dam
 - What do you see as the solution? Increase size of hatcheries? What would you do with increased funding to satisfy mitigation?
- Jim Fredricks
 - Quick answer is that there is a backlog of maintenance efforts that need to be done. It's not funded adequately to operate at the levels they are now
- Katherine Himes
 - So, does the Workgroup want some language on funding or are you good with the language? No clear direction yet.
- Aaron Lieberman
 - *Proposed some language on funding*
 - I would beg input from people who are more familiar with this than me
- Justin Hayes
 - I think that moves us in the right direction
 - I think it was Joe who originally said that maybe this is not needed in this place.
 - Maybe that whole thing should be lifted out and moved to the Hatchery Mitigation section that came out recently
- Katherine Himes
 - This language originally came from harvest and predation and the other language came from hatcheries
 - If we're converging on something, I want to make sure we do it in the right area
- Joe Oatman
 - I think moving this down into the new section would probably be a better fit so

- Or we could have this one as a standalone about Lower Snake Comp
 - I think it goes in hatcheries
- Katherine Himes
 - *Pulled up hatchery revisions*
 - I've put the language in this section to see if the group likes it.
 - Or would the Workgroup like it as a separate policy?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think it's fine under hatchery. To Joe's point, it fits with the theme
- Katherine Himes
 - Any concerns?
- Brett Dumas
 - Seems a little repetitive
 - Already said we're committed to lower comp land and meeting the goals
 - I would strike the language, period. I think it's already captured
 - I think the research monitoring evaluation program blurs the purpose of this policy statement and we're combining different intents
 - I just don't see that we really need it
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Where it's novel is in the language that we just introduced
 - I don't think elsewhere in the report talks about Idaho trying to advocate for equitable funding
- Brett Dumas
 - I think it's a more detailed way of saying the same thing
 - To meet the goals all of those things have to happen
- Joe Oatman
 - My point is that if you read the policy recommendations below, those capture the details
 - I think I would be fine deleting the proposed language and keep the recommendation as is. I think it covers all the details
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I see your point, do any of the SME's see any benefit to having that additional language or do you see it as already captured
- Jim Fredricks
 - I think that it's captured
 - I think that my point earlier about funding levels for hatcheries needs to be called out and it is
- Katherine Himes
 - Don't worry, maybe it will make it into an appendix
 - We already did blocked areas
 - Now moving to Hydro-Flow Augmentation
 - Proposed edit to remove some of the original language
 - Any Concerns?
 - Seeing none, we'll move to Hydro-Surface Passage

- Has a note that it is redundant with spill recommendation
 - Any questions or thoughts?
 - Seeing none we'll move on
 - With that, we'll move to the final policy recommendations that the small group got to us during lunch
 - *Shared new language on screen*
 - Downstream non-tribal recreational and commercial fishing
 - Does anyone from the small group want to say anything on the new text?
- Joe Oatman
 - What we attempted was to refine the policy recommendation into a couple of sentences
 - The basis was to try to get it consistent with other recommendations we have gone through
 - The draft we were working with had the “seek standing” language and additional supporting information and some bullets
 - We tried to capture all of the old one in a revised more concise recommendation
 - What we came up with is the language on the screen
 - So, the perspective on these changes is to maintain consistency with the intent of the recommendation and that the state would coordinate with the relevant managers on downstream non-tribal fisheries
 - Also recognizes that it may implicate broader discussions in other venues
 - Here we thought it may be a cleaner way of conveying the policy
- Katherine Himes
 - Questions, comments, or concerns?
 - Seeing none, that is the end of policy recommendations
- Richard Scully
 - I have a question
 - It says coordinate with other relevant managers
 - It seems that it could say coordinate with managers and not other relevant managers
 - Is Idaho considered a manager or is it just Oregon and Washington
- Joe Oatman
 - My perspective is that that first sentence is that this policy deals with downstream non-tribal fishing
 - Idaho has concerns with how those fisheries may affect fish destined for Idaho
 - Here the recommendation is to have IDFG coordinate WFW WEFD for mainstem Columbia Fisheries and that would be a way for the state to engage directly
 - I think the second sentence gets at the fact that these are not all the types of fishing that occur in the main stem and may require broader conversation
 - This too may be one that could benefit from SME review
- Eric Crawford
 - Is there more to this?
 - The original had some additional language, is that now gone

- Joe Oatman
 - As I mentioned as I was prefacing, we tried to put this recommendation in a consistent format so we tried to take the previous recommendation and bullets and capture as much of it as we could and replace all that was there before
 - What we've seen for other recommendations, these additional details may be included in the appendix so that might be another consideration
- Eric Crawford
 - Thanks Joe
 - As long as some of the more pointed bullets that encourage the state to do the following show up in the appendix, it makes sense
 - It's not in there I'm afraid that we may remain in status quo and state will just get to provide input in regular public comments
- Brian Brooks
 - If the bullets are incorporated in the appendices I think it will help
 - I think that I proposed that to what purpose and why we are addressing the downstream harvest?
 - Not sure if we need to say that here because it might be a little vague
 - Others might not feel that way and I wanted to pose that as a discussion
 - May be included in the bullet points
- Katherine Himes
 - To be clear, your group tried to fold all of the bullets into the paragraph?
- Brian Brooks
 - Yes, but with that bullet specifically I think it's important to make it in
 - Other thoughts?
- Eric Crawford
 - Yeah, I definitely like that, and it promotes a positive way forward. Without that standing they're just commenting as a member of the public
- Lance Hebdon
 - I'd like to weigh in quickly
 - The Columbia River Compact only has authority over commercial fishing and no authority over recreational fishing
 - I think that was one of the reasons it went back to a small group
- Eric Crawford
 - I would add that with Washington efforts to expand gill netting in the lower river
- Brian Brooks
 - I would say that even though we don't have commercial fishing, it affects Idaho stocks and would warrant us to get involved
- Lance Hebdon
 - Yeah, I get that. I just want to make sure people are aware that that would not give us authority over recreational fishing
- Justin Hayes

- I agree with the direction this is going and would just emphasize that the purpose is to push to do things that we haven't been doing before
- Brian Brooks
 - Is the idea that the removed language would go to the appendix or just drop off?
- Katherine Himes
 - The idea I've heard is that the removed language would go to appendix
 - Are these edits correct?
- Joe Oatman
 - I would ask that the second sentence be removed and then included in the appendix
- Katherine Himes
 - What is left is this opening sentence and the content of the discussed bullet
 - I see some nodding and reading
 - We are coming up on a break and then we will discuss the report body and report appendices
 - We are scheduled to have another break at 3:45, we can shorten if we need more time

Break

Draft Report Continued

- Katherine Himes
 - Welcome back
 - I think there are two level of feedback related to the report body. Line item edits and then more substantive points
 - Connected to the more substantive points, there needs to be a discussion on consistent use of language and tone. Should vs will etc.
 - What is the best use of the groups time here today?
 - There's no one that has volunteered to give an overview, but I definitely wanted to mention that before we jump into the body
 - Any other opening comments?
- Paul Arrington
 - We do have that small drafting group and most of our work was done before the last meeting of the Workgroup
 - We sent the draft over to the copy editors and it seems like they did a good job of not interfering with the substance and tightening up the document
 - Thanks to Joe and Kira and others, the conclusion is near completed
 - Most of what's happened since last meeting is the result of the copy editing process
- Aaron Lieberman
 - In terms of time going through the report body
 - It looks like the copy editors did a good job maintaining content

- Barring any Workgroup members having gone through and finding any red flags, id don't know if there is much time to spend on the first point you mentioned earlier
 - Would rather spend more time on actual content
- Katherine Himes
 - Think that is a good use of time but think that the group should decide what tone to take
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think that is what I was trying to get at, and I would advocate for the verb leading structure that ICL put in place and open it up for conversation
- Katherine Himes
 - So, you are advocating the Idaho Would or Idaho Shall language and clean it up
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Yes, and I think that has largely been done. Do others agree?
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok seeing a lot of thumbs up, which I think means Workgroup agrees and would like to move on to substantive points
 - I'll turn to Justin and Paul and ask where we are in the process? Where are we in the process? What would be most efficient
- Paul Arrington
 - We really are close to the end and my thoughts; I think that the time for major substantive changes have passed and we're working on readability and little things to clean it up into a final product
 - Reality is that every time we read this someone will feel that something should be different
 - We have the draft and the finalized policy recommendations; I think there is some value in having one last read through to make sure their comfortable with it and then be done and have it cleaned up
 - If there is a way to get everything we finished today in report and sent out tomorrow and get comments in week, our small group can incorporate them and then be done
- Katherine Himes
 - I certainly can put everything in the draft report by tomorrow
 - I know that there are some workgroup members that have started commenting on the Nov 21 version
 - I think we have potentially 4 or 5 different files right now from different members
- Paul Arrington
 - I think that at some point we have to stop making substantive changes
 - I think small changes can go to our small group and we'll incorporate it and I think we're passed substantive changes
- Katherine Himes
 - We do have the new hatchery preamble and I will forward some edits to that too.
- Paul Arrington

- Only thing I'll add is that we were aiming for concise language and this one seems especially long compared to others
- I don't know it well enough to change it but would just comment that it is much longer than the other equally important topics
- Scott Hauser
 - Joe, Chad, and I have been working on Tribal perspectives and I've got to run that through 4 tribes and unfortunately Chad is not on the call, but I know that he has been working on language
 - Have some language on Kootenai and Coeur D Alene tribe
 - What is the hard deadline for getting language?
- Paul Arrington
 - If you're adopting my proposed schedule that would be next Wednesday so we have time to incorporate it, so everyone then has time to review
- Katherine Himes
 - I'll say one thing, the Governor doesn't necessarily expect to have everything done and in his hand on the 15th
 - If you can, then that's great but isn't an absolute necessity
 - Will be good for workgroup to think about what they want to highlight and who needs to present etc.
- Paul Arrington
 - I may push back a little bit in that it's not a hard deadline, but it is our last meeting
 - We may be cleaning it up but for all intents and purposes it needs to be done by the 15th
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Barring an extension, I agree
- Scott Hauser
 - That answers my question, but I have another one
 - There's nothing inflammatory in the language I've put together but I am curious to know how that language would be received? Is that open to comment or is tribal perspective the tribal perspective?
 - I've been very cognizant of the language I've put together
- Paul Arrington
 - The short answer for me is that I'm not intending to comb through it really finely, but I think that it's more about everyone knowing everything that is in the report and being ok with it in its entirety
 - The only changes may be copy editing to make it flow with the rest of the documents
- Scott Hauser
 - Hopefully I can get a hold of Chad and hopefully him, me, and Joe can talk and move forward
- Joe Oatman

- I think it's in our interest in being fairly concise in the perspective that we bring forth, so I'll be looking for that
- Justin Hayes
 - I wasn't aware that there was going to be an additional heading for Tribal Perspective.
 - Could we go over what it's meant to cover? Does it suggest we haven't incorporated tribal perspective in our report?
- Joe Oatman
 - We discussed that the perspective in the earlier reports was too long and should work to shorten
 - We talked about how tribes occupy a unique position as sovereigns and implement a lot of restoration actions in the state and elsewhere and that what comes out of this will likely involve coordination with tribes
 - I felt that some additional background would be helpful in that regard
 - So, the idea was to get the tribal members together
 - Then we could have a discussion on where it fits best
- Justin Hayes
 - Will it be one tribal perspective or one from each of the tribes?
- Joe Oatman
 - The most recent development is that we start with a broad statement that leads into more specific tribal information
- Richard Scully
 - Is this an addendum, or chapter, or stand alone? What do you think?
- Joe Oatman
 - I don't think we've got to the point of where it may best fit. Could be some of it is in the report and other parts in the appendices
 - I recognize we're in December and don't have the info and that makes it difficult
- Scott Hauser
 - Originally in the earlier report there was a section right after the introduction about tribal interests. That's where I originally thought it would go. This draft is not quite the same, so I understand where the confusion comes from
- David Doeringsfeld
 - This is one of those picky questions, in the appendices where we cite our work some of the cites aren't there
 - Where you do have the citations, I take it you'll go through that and change it out
 - Some of the citing right now seem old and don't belong
- Paul Arrington
 - Alli sent a draft yesterday that covers most of the cites
- David Doeringsfeld
 - Citation # 8, they're citing an article that cites to Jim's presentation
 - Should cite to original source and not to Jim citing to something
- Paul Arrington

- I appreciate that and I think that's an area where we can help
- I think that Alli was getting more of here info from the materials presented to the workgroup and if there was no original cite then she cited to the presentation
- David Doeringsfeld
 - I'm happy to help with that little stuff and then it will have somewhere to go when the document comes out
- Brett Dumas
 - Our intent on the hatchery preamble and not replace the intro but be the preamble to the hatchery recommendations
 - We thought it would be important for the reader to have some context since we revised the recommendations
 - That preamble would go right under section C leading into other policies
- Paul Arrington
 - Makes sense. Thank you for that presentation
- Justin Hayes
 - On the tribal piece, being reminded that some language was removed.
 - Is that something we should go back and revisit rather than add a whole other section to this report
 - I wonder if we could think more on whether we should move towards a separate appendix or go back and integrate something into the report instead of opening the door to allowing a lot of different perspectives
 - Maybe we can recapture something if it was cut out and should not have been rather than including a whole new section
- Stacey Satterlee
 - I think we should have the conversation in our small group about the introduction and that there was too much and that it distracted from the focus of the report
 - It became apparent that not having the language would make our lives easier and make the report more effective
 - One place that we did agree was having the tribal perspective because it is unique and important. I did have the same thought, Justin, that everyone has a perspective, but we don't need a section for each of us
 - I envision a few paragraphs that highlight the unique perspective of the tribes and the river and then the reset of the report
- Justin Hayes
 - That sounds fine to me, but I think that my thought is that we could capture that in the report and not have it in an appendix or elsewhere
- Richard Scully
 - You know that from day one I've been concerned about SARs and that if we don't increase them then we're not going to move the needle
 - Some words earlier is that we'll do more and do it more aggressively but just don't touch the dams and we'll be happy
 - The consensus idea with a broad diverse set of people whose livelihoods depend on fish and on the dams

- If you could solve all the problems with the consensus it would have done a long time ago
- I'm not happy with just having a few paragraphs on breach and think that we could include more of the benefits
- If we can't increase SARs, the rest of this is not going to move the needle
- Not going to get there doing the things that people have already been recommending
- Isn't this group's original purpose recovery?
- I would like to see some more discussion around breaching as a necessary step for recovery
- Paul Arrington
 - I'll push back a little bit on that
 - I feel like that breaching has been a significant piece of the discussion we've had over the course of this process
 - There were some issues that we knew coming in that we would not reach consensus on
 - There is a section in the report that talks about the complexity of the issue
 - Ultimately, I don't think anybody thought we would find consensus on a breaching recommendation. Especially in 18 months in a group we just started
 - In CBP we were together for 5 years and could not find consensus on breaching and I think the section in the report recognizes the value of comment and the discussion that we've had around it
- Aaron Lieberman
 - We were talking about doing a final read through of the report? Is that correct?
- Paul Arrington
 - I think I didn't hear any angst on getting final comments by next Wednesday?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Right. I'm wondering if it makes sense to do some now realizing that we may still have some comments come in
 - Does it make sense to go through it now to see if there are any areas of major contention?
- Paul Arrington
 - If you consider that it took us about 3 hours to get through about 5 recommendations, I don't think that would be a good use of time
 - I think if we get comments, we can get a good sense of the issues and work them in
- Brett Dumas
 - I thought we were supposed to be done commenting by now
 - I think that we are going to have to grant some trust to that group on what changes are made
 - I don't think it is a wise use of time to go through the comments now because we haven't even gotten to appendices yet

- I think we figure out a strategy for the appendices and then let the document team do their work
- Scott Hauser
 - I'd like to go back to the question on the tribal perspective. Justin, lived though CBP and unfortunately near the end it got into an appendix pissing match where everyone would add language and that is not our intent here
 - I put in the chat what the Kootenai tribe provided but the language will be keeping with our mission statement
 - It's not my intent to go back into a Phase II CBP battle of who can write the most
 - It's unfortunate that Chad is not on because we talked about this a lot
 - The ShoBans have a longstanding Snake River Policy that may be included
- Justin Hayes
 - The hatchery preamble part that we got to be part of the recommendations
 - There is some good text in here, but this is so unlike the rest of the recommendations and I would suggest that it would be placed thoughtfully in an appendix
 - I don't want to lose this text, but I don't know that it belongs there
- Mike Edmondson
 - The thought behind that was that it was needed to give context to allow the reader to understand what was being said
 - If that goes in the appendix, we may lose that purpose but that may be ok
- Brett Dumas
 - I understand where you're coming from Justin and I think you are right, but I think that people will have trouble understanding hatchery without that context
 - Surely the other ones could have it, but we thought it was particularly important here and did not want to work it into all of the policy recommendations
- David Doeringsfeld
 - I was the least informed on the Hatchery group and that preamble language helped me a lot
 - I think the reader could have trouble understanding the intricacies
- Joe Oatman
 - This relates to appendix as well
 - When I think about section A of healthy and harvestable stocks
 - It might be useful to have a summary table of those goals in the report or in the appendix so that the reader can understand the goals
 - I think rather than having people try to look it up it may serve us well to have a summary table
- Aaron Lieberman
 - That was a good segue Joe, can we move on appendix
 - I think that Joe's idea of having a summary table could be useful
 - From my part I think it would be worth having it as a graphic in the actual document

- In light of the direction we've taken so far where there has been additional context or important info should go into the appendix
- Maybe we could put that hatchery preamble in the appendix and trust the reader to fully read the whole document
- How do we want to decide on what else is going to go into the appendix?
- Paul Arrington
 - We had a discussion briefly on the workgroup and if you look at the bottom, we identified 3 appendices
 - A is Record
 - B is recommendations that didn't reach consensus
 - C – Projects list
 - Those are what we talked about last time so maybe that would be a place to start
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Would that include infographics etc. or would those be included into another appendix?
- Paul Arrington
 - I think that it was left over from a previous version
- Joe Oatman
 - The small team one of the things we were asked to do were identify graphics to consider for inclusion
 - Like I mentioned earlier, one could be summary of goals
 - Could also go back to the graphics that Jim Fredricks showed us on day one showing abundance and their relationship to goals
 - I think that having some version of those would be helpful
 - One thing that Jim or others may want to do is perhaps update those graphics for 2019-2020
- Justin Hayes
 - I would like to voice support for including some numbers showing the level of abundance we're shooting for.
 - In the version of the text seeing here, it is mostly just text and not much graphics
 - There is the opportunity to do more of a graphic design treatment to this report to capture graphics
 - Could add other photos as well and we have some capacity to do that.
- Mike Edmondson
 - I think that we are getting into the next topic
 - I would suggest we take a short break and come back and finish the discussion

Break

Next Steps

- Katherine Himes
 - I want to make sure we finish the discussion about appendix content
- Mike Edmondson

- Right, I think that there were some decisions to be made and fit well in the next steps discussion
- Katherine
 - I have been working with John Richards and Alli to work on appendix B and C
- Aaron Lieberman
 - One area I don't think we've addressed in the appendix conversation is that if there is material we want to put something that doesn't fit well in other appendices, do we want to make one more? I think that could be easy fix because I don't know if there is another large category needed.
 - Would provide additional information that is not particularly a project
 - So, like earlier when we were cutting bullet points we talked about cutting some bullets, not because we didn't think it was good info but because it didn't seem to fit
 - I think we can decide it and then it's a matter of copy and paste
 - Do we want to put that into an existing appendix, or do they fit into one of the existing ones?
- Will Hart
 - Could you explain what would go there again?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Yeah, there has been some instances where we cut out bullets or some info that we thought was good information, but we just thought it didn't belong in that spot
- Will Hart
 - In that case I think we can have another appendix
 - If we need an Appendix D to fit some things in there, then let's do it
- Paul Arrington
 - The real question is who has the bandwidth to do that. I'm guessing the document groups won't
- Stacey Satterlee
 - We've said all along that we'll put in the appendix and it's time to pay the piper on the appendix
 - We have a lot of information and the beauty of the digital age is that we can include as many appendices as we want and link to it in the document
 - I guess I don't see the downside of including it
 - We've had some great support staff and I don't know who's job it will be to put it together, but we've said it all along and now we need to do it
- Mike Edmondson
 - CBP was a heavy lift at the end and this will be as well
 - We really do have to assess our bandwidth and prioritize
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Stacey said it when she said we need to pay the piper because we've said this all along
 - The rest of my staff is fictitious but I'm willing to take this on
 - Let's do the thing we said we'll do

- How do we make that happen since we said we'll do it?
 - I will volunteer to help if others will help as well
- Mike Edmondson
 - How about something to consider, Workgroup members that have items they want in the report and send them to you?
 - That way you don't have to try and go find everything
- Aaron Lieberman
 - The point is that these are things that we've agreed on
- Justin Hayes
 - We've got some staff resources that we can dedicate to this
- Paul Arrington
 - I like Mike's idea of sending things
 - Makes sense
 - They have to be things we've talked about and not just things that we each want in there
- Katherine Himes
 - Appendices that Alli is working on are the policy recommendations that did not receive consensus and the ideas for specific projects
 - She's going back and compiling that information
 - Beyond that, she hasn't been working outside that scope because that is how we understood them.
- Aaron Lieberman
 - If the bullets are going somewhere then where are they going?
 - Because they don't belong in non-consensus correct?
- Katherine Himes
 - A lot of the bullet language included specific projects and it will include those but not all of the bullet material
 - It's in note form but its there
- Aaron Lieberman
 - So, if that's stuff that is captured then that's great
 - I think that there was more then just projects in the bullet points but if it's being captured then thank God
- Katherine Himes
 - If there is another D that is meant to include important information that was important to the workgroup, that is not being compiled if it doesn't fit in the other two categories
- Aaron Lieberman
 - So, did we decide on an appendix D
- Richard Scully
 - It sounds like Alli and you may have gotten all of that information and maybe it's already there
 - Could you send out a rough draft of what she's got

- Katherine Himes
 - Right now, we don't have something to send but will soon
- Aaron Lieberman
 - 3 things that we had from last time
 - Columbia basin collaborative
 - Legislative presentation
 - Accountability on the side of the state in some form
 - We also left the discussion of the impacts for this point too
- Katherine Himes
 - I think another immediate next step, I think that the Workgroup should talk a little bit now of what they want to tell the Governor, who will present and keep in mind that it should take about 15 minutes
 - I'll add that to the discussion list as well
- Mark Menlove
 - One other item was the discussion of the future of this group as well
- Paul Arrington
 - I Guess I'm not sure what that means
 - Is that something we have a say in?
- Mark Menlove
 - I think it's something we have a say in requesting or providing input
- Richard Scully
 - Is that something that the Governor should be aware of so he can think about that
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Mike maybe you could talk a little to this?
- Mike Edmondson
 - If I recall correctly it goes back to the philosophy that you're the architects of your own destiny
 - If you see that there is a future for you it makes the most sense to make a recommendation if you can receive consensus that speaks to that
 - I think that far more than originally asked for has been produced
 - I'll end there for more discussion
- Mark Menlove
 - And I was not attempting to hijack the conversation for that topic
 - Just wanted to add it
- Mike Edmondson
 - We can finish this and then go back to the other items
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Going to legislative presenting
 - We've talked about it in a couple of different meetings and have kept it open
 - I think it makes sense to address the legislature and tell them what we've did
 - I would be interested in other people's thoughts on this because I know there are some with way more experience

- Paul Arrington
 - I think it's a good idea and the legislators would appreciate it
 - A joint meeting of the natural resources committees would be a good opportunity
 - In CBP the facilitators and NOAA picked members to present as certain meetings
 - Other members presented as well
 - There were people across interest groups asked to be the mouthpiece
 - We can't all go but maybe pick a cross section that is representative of this group
- Will Hart
 - To add on to Paul's thoughts
 - That would be a good opportunity
 - Of course, it is up to the chairman of the committee and we need to be uniform in our asking
 - Some of us have done this before
 - When I worked with OEMR the department has presented the intro and introduced the body
 - Unfortunately, less is probably more and it would likely need to be condensed
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Katherine, Mike – I do like Will's idea that agencies or facilitators sometimes introduce topics and how do you feel about choosing
- Mike Edmondson
 - I would rather not put somebody on the spot
 - There are members who are often in front of legislature and I would like to leave it to the group to decide
- Mark Menlove
 - Also need to think what Representative Wood and Senator Johnsons role is in this
- Paul Arrington
 - They are both on resource committees so will be in the room either way
- Brett Dumas
 - nominated Paul Justin and Joe
- Aaron Lieberman
 - That's totally ok with me but I don't know if we want to establish a process
- Katherine Himes
 - This could tie into who presents at the next meeting. Is it the same or different?
- Paul Arrington
 - I think that you have enough people interested that you could do two simple groups
 - I think it would be good to have someone represent the small fishing communities to add another person because that came up in a lot of comment
 - Would be a good cross section of the group
- Justin Hayes
 - Since my name is out there. I would be happy and enjoy doing it and would work with others

- Would do that if I was asked
- Mike Edmondson
 - For the agenda on the 15th we could allocate time to discuss who presents to the legislator or continue to discuss
 - Want to make sure we have time to get to other items
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Next item is reporting/accountability on the side of the State
 - Governor tasked us to come up with meaningful recommendations in response to our declining fish
 - To my thinking there should be some need for some degree of reflection by the State or Governor or someone to see if this is working
 - We never decided exactly what that meant, some good suggestions but that was as far as we got
 - Any thoughts?
 - Well in the absences of direct comment I would encourage that whoever addresses the Governor make the point that the urgency not diminish and that this is not mission accomplished and that there needs to be some format for follow up
- Mike Edmondson
 - So, your saying at the meeting on the 15th present that as a question and get an answer there
 - Another way to do that but that could work as a policy recommendation with a suggested format rather than just asking him on the fly
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I'm open to that, but I'm just spit balling on how that may be accomplished
 - I know that there has been concern about timing, but I did see some nods so if that's the case that's fine by me
- Stacey Satterlee
 - For the sake of discussion, I feel some sensitivity around this conversation seeming that we were asked to do something in a certain amount of time and we've done that and I don't see a role for us past that
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I don't think the recommendation is that the Governor report back to us as a Workgroup but because it is important
 - He can do what he wants but should we encourage him to report back to reflect on the progress that comes from this
- Stacey Satterlee
 - And maybe that is something like a final statement that we can make in our presentation, but I don't know what our ask is to the Governor beyond that
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think that's what I'm asking
 - Obviously, I think that we as a State, not as a Workgroup, need to keep focusing on this

- I think we need to encourage the focus to continue and wanted to make sure we picked this topic back up from last meeting
- Brian Brooks
 - I agree with Stacey, don't know exactly what role we could continue going forward
 - I think that things will get better or they will get worse fast and the Governor will hear about it one way or another
 - Maybe it's better if we can talk to each other about some specific language but I feel that if things get worse that it will get bigger than the Governor
 - I'm happy to have this recommendation offline and see if we can come up with a small recommendation
- Joe Oatman
 - I think I'm coming back to the same place
 - Mike mentioned earlier, we were given a task and we have our report with the policy recommendations and the mission and goals statement so from the Tribe's perspective we would be interested in knowing what the Governor will be moving forward with
 - We heard from Sam Eaton that they should know fairly quickly which ones will rise to the top and have momentum behind them
 - I think knowing which ones those are will be helpful
 - Having some feedback on that would be reasonable to ask
 - We're dealing with time, how long is it going to take to get these fish back?
 - Some of these policies will take time
 - Having some check in on a periodic basis to the people in the state to show where we are and what we're doing to get fish back to abundance would be helpful
 - Again, I think we can put forward a request to get some service that we did here
- Mike Edmondson
 - I've got a short list, but Aaron did you have another item?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Want to emphasize this was workgroup's list to the agenda group
 - Last one is impact exercise
 - We talked about engaging in an additional impact exercise for input and was meant to be flagged for this discussion
- Mike Edmondson
 - Any comments?
 - I guess that would entail sending the document around and allowing people to do the exercise
 - May result in a paragraph or chart
- Richard Scully
 - On the impact exercise, it seems like it would be a value to the Governor to see what we think is the most impactful and what may be the easiest to accomplish
 - Could show things that are impactful and doable and give him some ideas of what we think

- He can't do all these things at once so how can we help with prioritization?
- Jim Fredricks
 - If the idea was for the SME would do that, time is very short and it's a subjective process
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Wouldn't be the SME who would do it
 - We did it once before and we discussed whether we would find value in doing it again with the final recommendations
 - Were some ideas of when we would do it and it was flagged for additional discussion
- Joe Oatman
 - I think we recognize how difficult it was to apply the grid last time with 57 policies and now we're back down to a more manageable number
 - Believe that there is some utility in doing that and the tribe would support doing that
 - Recognizing that we have very little time left and if we do that exercise, I would be happy to compile those results
- Will Hart
 - I respect everyone's opinion, but I think it's an unnecessary exercise
 - We're in the final stretch and I think that the Governor's experts will easily be able to determine the impact and priority of each of the recommendations
 - Some are way more experts in certain issues and I think that any of this rating has so much subjectivity I don't think we need it
- Mike Edmondson
 - Other thoughts or comments?
- Paul Arrington
 - I don't think we have time to do that and it's 4:59
- Stacey Satterlee
 - I'll agree with Paul and add to Will's point that we're all experts in different areas and it's a suite of recommendations that go together and we don't have the time
 - Don't think it's required and think that it is great without it
- Mike Edmondson
 - There are updates from Columbia Basin Collaborative I can share those in an email or next meeting
 - There will be a workshop on it soon and you will be invited to participate
- Scott Hauser
 - Pre-Christmas or post-holiday?
- Mike Edmondson
 - I'll have to get back to you after I open my email. That group met today. Originally was going to be 17th but I'll have to see where they ended up
 - As a question to the group, do we want to do an agenda subgroup meeting to set the agenda for the next meeting? Thumbs up will do
 - Ok, that's a yes.

- Legislative presentation sounds like a go and we have some time to do that. It will have some ongoing work
- I think some clarity around Appendix D may be needed, it sounds like we'll get out a draft of B and C and then anything not in there you can send to us and we'll put it in an appendix D
- There's been talk about a glossary, need to decide if that is what you want to take on
- I think we're to a shorter list, but there is still work to do
- Anything else?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - This is probably our last full meeting do we want to finish our discussion or call 5 as 5
- David Doeringsfeld
 - What's left?
- Brian Brooks
 - If we're doing a presentation to legislature may be good to push to February to give us and them time
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Don't think we settled on group for Governor, that may be a good one to figure out
- Mike Edmondson
 - It's kind of outstanding, there was a lot of names in the chat box
 - I think the agenda group would talk about it and reach out and reach out and make sure everyone's good with it
 - I think it was Joe, Paul, Kira, Aaron
- Aaron Lieberman
 - May be good to finalize that now. Think it would be easier than sending that to the agenda group
- Mike Edmondson
 - We have half an hour of the Governors time and we have 3.5 hours of additional time and that's what I think the subgroup meets to lay out an agenda for
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Not sure we finished up on the impact exercise and discussed the accountability
 - And Marks point to future iterations of the Workgroup
- Mark
 - I think we covered that as well
- Aaron Lieberman
 - With that Mike, I think that's all the things
- Mike
 - I think we're ready to wrap up, Katherine is there anything you liked to add
- Katherine

- Workgroup somehow maintained focus through yet another full day Zoom meeting
- Thank you all for all your hard work
- Wish we could be in a room together
- Thank you also to the public who made themselves available early on a Wednesday and for participating with us
- Mike
 - Thank you all for your time and attention
 - If you want to follow up on anything give me a call
 - We will be scheduling the agenda committee and if you're not on that, I look forward to seeing you on the 15th

Adjourn