

Governor's Salmon Workgroup Meeting
August 26-27, 2020
Video Meeting

Roll

- David Doeringsfeld
- Katherine Himes
- Mike Edmondson
- Paul Arrington
- Mark Menlove
- Scott Hauser
- Aaron Liberman
- Merrill Beyeler
- Joe Oatman
- Justin Hayes
- Roy Akins
- Kira Finkler
- Stacey Satterlee
- Will Hart
- Chad Colter
- Brian Brooks
- Richard Scully
- Jim Yost
- Jim Chandler (sitting in for Bret Dumas)
- (some members are in Special Session of the legislature)

Introductions and Opening

Dr. Katherine Himes, University of Idaho (UI), Meeting Facilitator

- Gave background and purpose of workgroup
- Rest of meetings are scheduled and will be posted on OSC's website
- Two day meeting with one technical presentation on Accords and rest of time is dedicated to Workgroup discussion on recommendations and the future and listening to public comment
- Workgroup Members introduced themselves
- These presentations are for presentation and discussion

Small Group Report-outs

Katherine Himes

- Workgroup moved into 4 small groups to address specific areas
 - After completing first round, they rotated topic areas

Small Group: Habitat + Water Broadly + Monitoring and Evaluation (Paul Kline presenting)

- *Put document up on screen*
- We inherited this document from previous groups
- On the screen is the document from the previous groups with our comments in purple
- Fredricks group largely went along with what they got from Hebdon group

- One comment was to consolidate some of the areas
- The “Recommendation” section largely came from Hebdon group and Fredricks group refined
- Habitat recommendation is largely consolidated now
- One edit we made was to change “advocate” to support and collaborate on
 - Just a suggestion for the overall group to consider
- Overall Habitat recommendation is broad and encompassing with more specific bullets
- *Went through inherited comments from Fredricks Group*
- Our group generally agreed with the Habitat consolidation
- Was one concern from one member that Statewide inventories are important but having one should not come at the expense of conducting on-the-ground- work
 - If funds are limited, should choose to do on-the-groundwork
 - Group did agree though that a State Inventory would be helpful
- One comment said that the habitat recommendation needs to apply to areas downstream of blocked areas only
 - Think that that is how it has been understood but included for discussion
- Also need to remind federal land managers to be protective and restore habitat under their management jurisdiction
 - We don’t always have opportunity for private grounds
- Need further discussion on how state with collaborate with projects on Tribal lands
- Next is Increased Funding Recommendation
 - Had some comments on this one but no general objection to this recommendation
 - Commended on some of the “immediately be funded” language because we didn’t want to set unrealistic expectations
- Open for comment
- Katherine Himes
 - Question came in from Chat: with presentation and your work, were there any areas of serious friction that warrant full Work group consideration
- Paul Arrington
 - Not really as it relates to the Habitat topic
 - Only points were mainly word choice but seemed to be general consensus around the topic
- Brian Brooks
 - There was consensus with the understanding that this is ongoing and not a new idea. Mainly just a continuation of existing practices
- Jim Fredricks
 - Wanted to add to when you implied our group supported Habitat Inventory. Our discussion was more consistent with what your group’s discussion was. Recognized that a lot of that work is being done but that habitat restoration should be prioritized
- Aaron Liberman
 - Think it would be helpful as we go along to discuss these sticking points at this juncture to get them identified so that we can work to a more finished form
 - Funding comes up here and I think all other recommendations. Is there merit to creating a stand alone Funding Recommendation? Could outline various priorities and could prevent it from being in every recommendation

- So, my question to the larger group is whether they have any issue with including that recommendation?
- Brian Brooks
 - Are you asking whether a separate recommendation needs to quantify cost of each of our recommendations?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think it's worth discussing and figure out whether it's worth having an independent funding recommendation
- Brian Brooks
 - As far as I remember is that funding has come up with every recommendation
 - I think we lack the expertise ourselves to quantify the cost to many of these things but could find help
 - Would be an additional activity to add that to the list of things to do
- Paul Arrington
 - Every single thing is going to cost money
 - We were talking about Hatcheries and if you look at backlog of maintenance cost is a huge amount
 - Each of these different policies do indicate we need funding for them
 - Reality is we won't get money to do everything, but we could maybe prioritize
 - There's no way we could quantify all these things ourselves and don't think we should but we could make a prioritization document of how money should be spent when it is available.
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Process-wise I'm certainly interested in this topic, but should we talk now or do it later
 - Katherine
 - I Think it makes sense to move on and we'll have time tomorrow to talk about it
- Jim Yost
 - We do specific inventories in detail in Clearwater and Upper Klamath, Lemhi, etc.
 - Local watershed
 - Soil Conservation Districts and DEQ has information
 - We probably need to think about gathering all the bits and pieces and putting them together
 - We should focus on consolidating what's out there
- Merrill Beyeler
 - One small thing
 - People I've been visiting with in the field have begun moving away from Restoration to Rehabilitation
 - Maybe as we go forward, we may want to substitute that
- Richard Scully
 - Want to follow up on Brian's comment that there is ongoing habitat work
 - I know the Governor would like to have some new recommendations
 - Is there a need for us to divide up the recommendation to show what is ongoing and what are our new ideas?
 - Seems like we're just reviewing what's been done for 40 years
- Katherine Himes

- I think that is a good question that could pertain to all policy areas and would be good to discuss in our time tomorrow about how to move forward
- Joe Oatman
 - As we walk through the Habitat document there is still a need to recognize that habitat work is ongoing and will likely continue
 - I think we would need to consider what new habitat work or new approaches may be beneficial. Think it would be worth our efforts
- Aaron Lieberman
 - It sounds like a lot of this will be addressed in our structure conversation but like for Merrill's suggestion, I would ask where possible if any changes have strong feelings that we should resolve them now
- Katherine Himes
 - I'm just concerned about time since we haven't made it through the first small group and need to get through the second one as well before the break
- Paul Kline
 - Addressing Water Broadly now
 - Previous comments also suggested consolidation
 - There were also some recommendations that came with this that were not necessarily Water Broadly that we'll also address
 - John Simpson was very helpful as a water attorney
 - Pointed out we have water quality standards in many areas of law currently
 - Our group's broader recommendations were in the handout was sent out
 - We thought that this recommendation that we received from the other group was very comprehensive and addressed many areas of concern
 - One comment was that they didn't want to get into specific examples and there are some high level examples instead
 - One of our comments is that while we don't want to get into the weeds but also thought that it was important not to lose track of the Lewiston Orchards project and also high flow claims
 - Not necessarily fund Lewiston Orchards but maybe support
 - High flows are also important because those waters can be used for multiple uses
 - Other group member input?
- Jim Fredricks
 - Did read out some example bullets that the Fredricks Group had related to this section
- Brian Brooks
 - I think we felt the same way as Fredricks group about the merit of those projects and maybe we could include them as an appendix
- Richard Scully
 - Question on the water rental program in the Lemhi. Is there a discussion of outright purchase instead of rental? Seems over time it would make more financial sense to outright purchase. Also, if BPA funding goes away then we're right back where we started. Is there any opportunity to get some permanence in these transactions?
- Paul Arrington
 - John Simpson is not on the phone, but Mike or Jim Yost could probably help
- Mike Edmondson
 - It's a misconception that it is just a rental of water

- There are several tools that are used
- Renting does happen but there are also subordinations, water banks, agreements not divert, etc.
- IDWR would be best to talk about them if the Workgroup wants, but not all of these transactions are temporary in nature
- There is a broad spectrum of effect and some of them are permanent
- Paul Arrington
 - We have 3 stray recommendations and monitoring left to cover
 - Inter-Agency and Intergovernmental Coordination
 - For sake of time I'll jump to Monitoring
 - Fredricks Group did not develop a full recommendation on monitoring, but our group did. They are attached to handout
 - Emphasizes importance of monitoring and evaluation and continued support
 - Want to make sure our recommendation doesn't get crossways with the Power Council
 - Second recommendation looks at wild stream v. stream with hatchery input and how it affects smolt out-migration
 - We need good RM&E
 - Funding for public facing salmon and steelhead dashboards to consolidate Salmon and Steelhead info would be helpful
 - Thought this would be good but not sure it rises to level of recommendation
 - State should identify clearly stated goals to track progress
- Katherine Himes
 - If no objection, we'll move on to next group and perhaps circle back to this topic if needed

Small Group: Harvest + Predation + Economic Impact Studies + Funding (Eric Crawford presenting)

- Katherine Himes: As you walk through, identify areas of friction that warrant full Workgroup discussion please
- Eric Crawford
 - *Put document up on screen*
 - Received this document from previous group
 - Blue/Purple is from Kline group
 - First one here addresses the overarching Policy Statement and the State adopting it
 - Moved on to Downriver Fisheries and continued to refine
 - Bullets in black are our recommendations
 - Increase buffer on forecast
 - More rigorous harvest monitoring in downstream fishing
 - Consider whether impacts downriver are being accurately measured
 - Did recognize the forums that Idaho's concerns should be raised
 - Idaho is not a member of these groups and we discussed seeking congressional support to get a seat at that table instead of just an advisory role
 - Encourage
 - Limit impacts of hatchery origin fish

- Secure more significant involvement/authority in regional forums and groups that regulate Columbia Basin Fish to ensure equitable access
 - Want to manage hatcheries in manner that protect wild fish
- Paul Kline
 - One the comment that management is primarily based on abundance based scales to manage ESA impacts
 - That's NOAA's process, not ours and we have little influence in it
 - I think this group having an idea of how complex that is is important
- Justin Hayes
 - I have tremendous respect for the work that has been done across the region, but I'll push back on the notion that how it has always been done is the way to save our fish
 - What has always been done is why our fish are where they are
 - I think we need to be more involved
 - Recognized it's different than the State's traditional role and I want that to happen
- Joe Oatman
 - Could provide more detail on the management agreement
 - Came out of US v Oregon
 - As fish in Columbia Basin have declined fish available for treaty have declined
 - Have developed different harvest frameworks to allocate
 - Fish listed in 90s and added another complicated layer of management to those fisheries
 - That has been developed and refined over time to what we have today in the abundance rate harvest schedule to lower impact rates when abundance is projected to be low and higher harvest in higher years of abundance
 - You also have triggers in there for natural Snake river fish
- Eric Crawford
 - I'll keep moving through these comments, many have been talked about already
 - Moving on to compensation
 - Talks about compensation program to those affected by harvestable runs
 - Didn't resolve who would fund or how to set a baseline
 - Kline group talked about moving this since it would not be sole responsibility of Governor, could be regional or federal and should may approach congressional representatives
- Aaron Liberman
 - I would pushback a little bit on the funding issue where we are not recommending a direct source of funding or who's responsibility it would be, and I don't think that would be a reason for excluding it. Open to having a discussion on it
- Eric Crawford
 - Moving on to Predation management
 - Paul's group recognized efforts are ongoing but more needs to be done to address management conflict
 - Shad was on here because their numbers returning are increasing and can clog fish ladders
 - There are some paper references in here if you want to learn more on the issue
 - Economic Studies

- There is a value in understanding the economic value but not sure where this would fall or how it could be conducted
 - Kline Group thought it may need more work to be formed into a policy recommendation
 - Other Important topics included
 - Impacts: does coloring impacts as green help potential to achieve
 - Included a list of ideas for specific actions that could be taken
 - Open for questions or input from others
- Katherine Himes
 - I don't see any hands or questions in chat
- Richard Scully
 - Going way back to Harvest and getting into Columbia River Compact. One of the things we discussed is impact to Idaho's ability to harvest at all when they're harvesting more downstream and we have to fill our brood stock needs. That argument should carry some weight.

Break

Mike Edmondson

- Couple of small things
- Some of our legislative members are still tied up in the special legislative session. They will hopefully be able to present tomorrow on funding opportunities
- We have updated the agenda for tomorrow to reflect the speakers

Small Group Report-outs

Small Group: Hatcheries + Systemic (Paul Arrington)

- Paul Arrington
 - Our group was round 4 on these topics
 - We spent a lot of time on Hatcheries and communicated a lot with former groups to understand the language we received better
 - I won't discuss the color system, we found that to be difficult at times and I think there is time tomorrow to discuss it
 - We didn't touch the overarching policy issue; I think we agreed last meeting we would refer back to our other policy
 - On Avoiding Negative Impacts on Wild Populations
 - We didn't change this a lot
 - Some of the language seemed like it was addressing the same goal, so we consolidated 3 policies into one and moved some language from the others into other areas of recommendations
 - Goal was not to change substance but to add some meat to the recommendation
 - Meeting Production Goals
 - Again, we consolidated to say that there are opportunities to enhance and optimize but basically say to develop the best Hatchery program that we can
 - Does need to be some recognition of priority of maintenance and protecting wild fish
 - We also talked about funding
 - Supplementation

- I don't think we changed this language at all
 - We weren't sure why supplementation was called out specifically at all
 - Ran out of time to do a deeper dive
 - Did discuss whether it would make more sense about having one recommendation that recognizes the various tools instead of calling out specifically
 - Same on lamprey
 - Blocked areas
 - Seems like this is a topic that also has a lot of overlap
 - Our recommendation is that Hydro is the place to keep this one and we merged what was here with what was there
 - Down below we have some notes from prior groups
 - Open for input and questions from others
 - I'll say that it was clear that a lot of work and a lot of discussion went into these prior to us receiving them so our goal was not to make large substantive changes
 - I'll now shift to Systemic
 - We spent a lot of time on the Hatchery and not as much time in this area
 - Didn't touch regional dialogue much
 - Climate change
 - Did change some of this language so I'll let you read that
 - Reconcile the Science
 - Talked about if we should focus on the difference in science available or should we look for areas where the science aligns
 - Didn't change language much but thought that it would be an interesting conversation for group to have
 - Education
 - Don't think that we touched this one at all
 - Tribal Guiding
 - Spent a good amount of time on this one
 - It was new to all of us and we weren't sure where it came from
- Aaron Lieberman
 - We did have some notes in the Reconcile the Science that I'm not seeing here
 - I'm wondering if the document with the markup is elsewhere
 - We did have an alternative for the Reconcile the Sentence to reframe that
 - On the Tribal Guiding- we tried to track down where that started and what it means, does anyone have idea on that?
- Paul Arrington
 - My mistake, that one had all of our chicken scratch notes but I'll be sure to send that out to the group
- Joe Oatman
 - On Tribal Guiding, this is one of the areas that the Nez Perce tribe provided as part of the assignment
 - Nez Perce tribe does provide guiding on Clearwater and thought maybe that could happen elsewhere
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Would that be something that the State would have to sign off or is that the independent authority of the tribe
- Joe Oatman

- My recollection is that there was some discussion and that back then there was some push back from the state
- From us we have been doing guiding since before Lewis and Clark and it may be another area where the tribe would like to diversify its economy
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Ok, I understand and have had some of these conversations before
 - No opposition from our part
 - I think for the recommendations, it would be helpful to flesh out the existing authority on what the tribe could do on its own or not
 - If tribe has authority to expand on their own, would it be worth including as a recommendation
- Joe Oatman
 - I could agree that it could benefit from more details and we could work on that
-
- **Small Group: Hydro + Letter (Justin Hayes Presenting)**
- Justin Hayes
 - I think it's our group that keeps advocating for an overarching state policy and we included again here. And our goal is to recognize that the State does not seem to have an overarching policy and that it would be helpful to nest individual recommendations under
 - As in prior versions, this is just a draft policy statement and just pulled out bullet points
 - Hydro: System passage infrastructure and operations
 - Put this at top because we think it is important to refine the system to limit powerhouse encounters
 - Spill: we have two competing spill operations – Flex Spill and Maximum Spill
 - Max Spill is the most aggressive that would maximize spill for the greatest benefit of salmon and steelhead
 - We don't necessarily endorse the federal agencies desire to use Flex Spill as adequate
 - Want to make sure overall group has a robust discussion on spill and we're leaning towards adopting the most aggressive spill regime
 - Flow Augmentation
 - Think the States' current program should continue
 - May be some opportunity to modify Dworshak operation to optimize thermal benefits
 - Fish Transpiration
 - Collecting fish and barging is nobody's idea of a good time
 - There are certain areas of river that are lethal enough that barging is preferable but should be done with best available science and should not be normal practice but saved for unusual circumstances
 - Reservoir Drawdown
 - New insert from our group
 - Many studies have been done on Spill crest drawdown
 - One thing we discussed thoroughly was that Spill crest drawdown could be an effective predator control
 - We would like to re-explore that

- We would like to coordinate these efforts with planned closures to navigational system
 - Blocked areas
 - State should pursue funding and programs to reintroduce fish into blocked areas
 - Would like to expand put take fisheries
 - Discussed whether recommendation should be limited to Idaho blocked area
 - Thought it would be appropriate to issue support for actions in other areas
 - Breaching
 - Did not reach consensus but agreed that it would be impactful
 - There is strong understanding that it is the single most impactful thing that could be done but it's also highly controversial
 - Letter/Regional Dialogue
 - Broad support in Idaho engaging in these forums and advocating for Idaho's fish
 - Notes
 - All notes from prior group are in the Appendices so people can refer back to them
 - One issue we deleted from our consideration was a section whether the upcoming ROD should be implemented for the next 10 years without challenge
 - Deleted it because it is not consistent with the goals of this Workgroup and letting it play out for 10 years does not help this groups goals
 - Still in this document in the Appendices
 - Questions or input?
- Paul Arrington
 - I think our group drafted the regional dialogue group and our thoughts were the same as yours that it addresses the letter
- Aaron Lieberman
 - In terms of blocked areas/regional dialogue
 - We also had in our notes that regional dialogue be consolidated
 - Think that there is one in Hatcheries as well
 - We suggested it could be consolidated in any one place
 - Some of the blocked areas language is similar among different groups and would recommend consolidating that language too
- David Doeringsfeld
 - On reservoir drawdown, I wouldn't be able to support drawdown
 - It does turn the Lewiston area into a big stinky mudhole
 - It also dewateres the banks and there was a large economic cost to roadways and railways giving away
 - That's why that went away after the 90s
 - On Breaching: I would not support inclusion of this language either that Idaho should advocate for this
- Justin Hayes

- I understand on breach
- On the drawdown, I think its something we should study and understand to see if it could be helpful
- David Doeringsfeld
 - There's a reason why that went away, and it was the economic cost
 - There are some drawdowns that occur for maintenance that occur with a 3 week period. A spill crest drawdown would take much longer
- Paul Arrington
 - We had a long discussion on what to leave in and what not to as these documents move forward
 - This color coding makes a need to put everything in, right?
 - We weren't sure how the colors would be reflected in final report?
 - How do we pick and choose which non-consensus items are left in or moved out?
 - There is some disagreement on the EIS and its benefits but not agreement on how to address non-consensus issues moving forward
- David Doeringsfeld
 - The goal was to provide consensus based recommendation so if there is no consensus then they shouldn't be in final report
- Aaron Lieberman
 - One of the ways we talked about it in our group
 - What the Governor will accept, by his own accounting, are the ones that have consensus
 - On the one regarding in the EIS, we discussed it and recognized there wouldn't be consensus but kept it in because we knew that it was important to group members
 - I think that that is a responsible way to move forward; to include things that could be impactful but are not consensus-based
- Brian Brooks
 - I think we should maybe add another meeting to discuss how we address this
 - I can see how it could result in
 - Could possibly be a poll outside the group
- Will Hart
 - When we were having those discussions about moving on non-consensus issues that we wouldn't have it in the final, but we would continue to discuss it
 - I think our purpose is to provide consensus based and we all have the opportunity to bring additional issues up to the governor after our process has concluded
 - I'm not that interested in adding a bunch of red recommendations after the green
- Aaron Lieberman
 - What to risk by including areas that could be impactful but didn't have consensus
 - Provides a clear picture and governor's office could parse it out
- David Doeringsfeld
 - If you have a plan that you can't implement, then you don't have a plan
 - If we have a bunch of items that we're not recommending for implementation, then it's not helpful
 - I think it was the call of this group to provide consensus based recommendations

- Richard Scully
 - Our mission statement says to restore abundant and sustainable populations
 - To do that, we are going to have to do things significantly different than we have been the last 50 years
 - Some of the things we have consensus on will not move the needle
 - Not going to get there by doing what we have been doing
- Joe Oatman
 - My mind goes back to earlier conversations and assignments
 - I think we're getting to the second part of the assignment of addressing what our priority of recommendations and how they affect results
 - I think the impact of the recommendations is a good consideration
 - In my mind, we haven't got to the point of the assignment of addressing impacts of the different activities
 - I thought in our previous conversations that we contemplated that we would include some non-consensus recommendations in the final report
 - I think addressing the assignment completely would put us in a better position to discuss this
- Will Hart
 - Then do some members of our group need to go back and pick up some of the things we dropped because there was too much red on them so we have a larger discussion?
 - That's a concern for me?
 - There are some things that didn't make it through the first round, and I think we need to be aware of those things.
- Mark Menlove
 - I think that there may be an alternative
 - One of the documents we'll see is a schedule and one of the topics is an Appendix
 - I think it would be irresponsible of the group to not include some of these issues to show they were addressed
 - Could be appropriate to include them in the appendix
- Stacey Satterlee
 - Similarly, to what Mark said, it has been important to the group that we are transparent in what we've considered
 - It does seem odd that we would include non-consensus topics in a consensus based document
 - I think it's important to identify the line of where things get cut off that would get included in the report and some that don't make it may get kicked out or into the appendix
 - It does seem on some things that have a lot of red may fall off because it's not the most productive use of our time to consider but others may be impactful but won't have consensus and impactful that perhaps we should include
- Mike Edmondson
 - We do have some time tomorrow to discuss how this process may play out
 - I wanted to circle back to make sure that there are not questions on Justin's presentation
- Richard Scully

- Was there ever a response to the letter that was sent out to the Governors?
- Mike Edmondson
 - Not that I know of. I don't think any of the Governor's responded
- Aaron Lieberman
 - The only feedback I had for Justin's group was to include the CRSO EIS as a recommendation moving forward and note that there wasn't consensus because it is relevant and significant to many members of the workgroup
 - I think that those things should be included, and it shows we are diverse with diverse people and can recognize each other's interests
- Stacey Satterlee
 - The question was not whether we supported the CRSO EIS or not but whether it belonged as a policy recommendation
 - Because it's contentious and doesn't get it where we're going that maybe it didn't belong here
- Merrill Beyeler
 - I think that sounds right
 - I think one thing we're trying to do as a group is to show the public that we really considered these things and that it wasn't an arbitrary exercise of what we selected
 - I think that putting non-consensus issues in an appendix could be appropriate because people are going to look at this and if we don't have a record to show what we considered, then we could lose confidence in the overall document
- Aaron Lieberman
 - In our last 10 minutes maybe a couple other relevant things to discuss would be whether it makes sense to consolidate certain sections. Some of them are very similar and could be consolidated into one area
 - Does everyone think that's makes sense?
- Justin Hayes
 - I think there are areas that could be consolidated
 - Some things like education and funding run through a lot of topics
 - I assume we'll address that later when we're hashing out the final language
- Katherine Himes
 - There is some time set aside tomorrow to have these kinds of discussions because we knew this group would be getting to this point
- Roy Akins
 - I do agree that an appendix could be a good idea just to make sure everything is accounted for
 - Breach was brought up often in public comment and it's important to show we addressed it
 - I'm on board with the direction we're headed
- Justin Hayes
 - When we return from lunch the workgroup members are presenting, do we have an order?
- Katherine Himes
 - No specific order, some members have asked to go first or last due to other commitments

- *Long discussion about the order of presentation*

Lunch Break

Katherine Himes

- Setting the stage for this conversation
- Mike will be taking notes and I will facilitate this section
- *Shared the instructions given to the Workgroup on this topic*
- Want to bring up a question that the members answered from the first meeting which was “what does success look like to you”
- There were many definitions but some common language use around cooperation, collaboration, and keeping stakeholders whole

Envisioning the Future

Paul Arrington

- From a water users’ perspective, John Simpson and I have similar perspectives on this issue, so we’ll combine our time
- Water users don’t support a society without dams
- We rely on a dam system for agriculture, irrigation and other benefits to
- The difficulty is not knowing what will be demanded from water users should those dams be fished
- Our history includes demands to mitigate for fish
- Has required us to send more and more Idaho water downriver
- In a recent BiOp that provides for Flow augmentation last 30 years
 - No guarantee that would remain if dams are removed
- If some dams are removed, what stops that happening to other dams as well
- Will we have to relocate our farmers and agriculture?
- There have never been assurances that stakeholders will be made whole
- I won’t speak to navigation or hydropower
- Hydro users have a history of being proactive to find paths forward that work for everyone and any path forward must have those assurances

John Simpson

- I will add that the folks I’m representing are Idaho Water User Members
- They benefit from the dams
- One of the things that have made Idaho great and made people viable is that we try to find solutions as they come up
- One of the cornerstones of these discussions is that stakeholders are kept or made whole
- In looking at this issue is that there has been no certainty provided to stakeholders thus far to show that stakeholders on this issue would be kept whole
- It’s the uncertainty that is the issue
- No degree of certainty has been made to those that would be impacted
 - Could be argued that the same risk could be on the other side of the tracks also
- Every year the water users have a set of resolutions that they pass and live by
 - Those resolutions directly oppose dam removal
 - It’s based upon the concerns that we’ve raised here
- It’s really about the uncertainty and it not being addressed yet
- Even the science does not have consensus. People pick and choose

- We respect people's positions and ask that ours be respected as well
- Questions
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Paul and John, thank you
 - I appreciate you meaningfully engaging the questions
 - You both spoke of assurances and I think that is a very fair and highly relevant questions
 - It may be a broader and longer conversation
 - I think that that is a question even for the people I represent
 - I'd be interested to get a sense from each of you what type or what assurances you may need for it to be a possibility
 - Don't know if there is a quick answer or a longer conversation
- John Simpson
 - Just for example, the SRBA adjudicated water rights but also provided the water users with a 30 year Biological Opinion
 - One issue is if the situation changes, would consultation have to be reinitiated and what would that look like?
 - It's very difficult to get a real assurance on something like that
 - One could argue that the aspects of certainty apply to the other side too.
 - I don't think it's possible to have this discussion without touching on sensitive issues
 - At the same time, I don't want to talk about an Idaho without Idaho Stocks
- Richard Scully
 - How much of the concern of the Upper Snake community that if the lower snake river dams were to be breached that the environmental groups will come after other dams? To me, it's a little bit of a scare tactic. The focus on the Lower Snake River dams is informed in science. I don't really think it is a valid concern to say if those dams go, they'll come after other dams
- Paul Arrington
 - It is a real and valid concern
 - We operate on water and with water so anytime that this dialogue come up and to set precedent to be applied to other areas is a real concern for water users
 - Those are issues that we face on an ongoing basis on more local levels
- Chad Colter
 - How safe do you feel with the BiOp? We have additional listed species in the Upper Snake like the Yellow Billed Cuckoo that includes things like cottonwood corridors that rely on water. How confident are you that reopeners will not occur given that new species are being listed in these areas? We have concerns in our own area that the flows are not sufficient to sustain the cottonwood areas and may have to have another consultation on those pieces
- John Simpson
 - I have some familiarity with the Yellow Billed Cuckoo
 - There is definitely some risk that new listings and designations could reopen consultations and that's a risk that is out there
 - In regard to YBC, I think those conversations largely involve flood control by BOR, I think there's no discretionary action on the agencies part
 - I think the question would be whether those actions are affecting and not the diversion for irrigation purposes

- Chad Colter
 - BOR will tell you an opposite story and say that they don't have control and that the private dams and the pushups for irrigation does leave irrigation open for consideration. So, I'm just curious to how safe you think the BiOp is from reopening is from re-initiation of consultation
- John Simpson
 - That is uncertainty and no one knows the answer to how that would turn out but what we do have no is a 30 year biological opinion that offers a level of certainty to users

Roy Akins

- I appreciate this opportunity and hope its not too sappy
- I personally see this as an opportunity to share my vision
- I was raised in Jerome Idaho and looking off Prine Bridge wondering if salmon ever swam under it
- I knew that they made it down to Nevada
- Knew Swan Falls was unpassable but maybe they spawned just 500ft below
- After hearing about lonesome Larry, I felt compelled to help on the issue in Idaho
- Some claimed it was habitat, some overharvest, some blamed more dams
- For me, this last claim made some sense. I knew where I grew up, dams were the reason they didn't make it there
- I had opportunity to be a person in a publicity stunt recreating lonesome Larry's swim
- After the swim, I moved to Riggins and carved out a living as a guide
- Fishing was good and small towns had glimpse of what abundant runs could do for us
- This led me to take the big risk of buying an existing guide business and we became totally dependent on sustainable runs
- My vision is that one day we would have a restored river system that would return abundant runs and support my business so I could pass it down to my children
- I know this dream has winners and losers but right now my neighbors and I are the biggest losers
- I don't want to pass my problems onto others but at this point it is more than economics, our fish are at risk of extinction
- We could find new ways to fill the gaps that the dams would leave
- I am expendable but an Idaho without wild salmon and steelhead is not
- Just in case anyone has confusion
 - I truly believe there is no closer relationship in nature than the relationship between a predator and prey
- Questions
- Brian Brooks
 - We work a lot with other river communities. Where were some of the other towns; big guiding towns?
 - Roy Akins
 - I'd say up to Orofino was probably up to the hotspot but maybe some action up to Kooskia

Merrill Beyeler

- Thank you for this opportunity

- The message I would hope to share is one of hope, wisdom, and urgency and maybe a question
- In 1834 a quote “I lay down to rest, I had plenty of provisions but could not eat. Water was the objective of my wishes”
 - Think this is just as applicable today
- In 1857 some of my relatives came to Lemhi to settle it. In a journal entry they said from the travels from Salt Lake (350 miles) they said they only wildlife they saw was 4 antelope
- About 100 years after grandfather wolves were introduced. I asked my father about the wildlife and he said that the first time he saw a deer was when he was 14 years old
- That was the first time my family had seen a deer.
- Our entertainment was found in the rivers and mountains
- I remember an abundance of wildlife and fish
- Our summers were spent on the rivers, streams, and high up in the mountains
- It was not until the 1970s that elk became a common sight. By the 90s elk was everywhere
- My son’s class took a field trip to see their first bald eagle
- Was swathing hay in 1980s and found a cow moose and drove the swather 8 miles to get the family and show them
- I doubt if you were to ask my grandchildren when they saw their first wildlife, they would be hard pressed to remember because the wildlife is so abundant in our valley these days
- They and my kids have many memories of interacting with wildlife
- Remember seeing the road hunters out in force and couldn’t believe that just off the road there was a stretch of elk that stretched out just out of sight
- Have talked to neighbor who had a herd of over 150 elk outside his house
- With all this abundance in 1993 I found myself walking along the river with biologists asking how we could make things better for the fish
- One of them said that our efforts would be good for resident fish but that it could be too late for our salmon
- There were some good years, I remember taking kids in early 2000s to see fish spawning in Lemhi
- Letter I received from a friend “in middle of July in 1964 I was asked to assist an IDFG employee to count fish. We walked and counted approximately 2 miles of river and it was about 300 chinook salmon. I remember asking how many fish were in the river and he guessed between Leadore and up there was probably about 1200 fish.”
- We’ve done a lot of work in the Lemhi to benefit our fish
- All diversions are screened, minimum flows, tributary reconnection, cold water refuges, improving irrigation efficiency, pasture designs, and yet we wait for the salmon.

Brian Brooks

- Thinks that there are two ways to look from a sportsman view
- Where we’ve been and benefits of taking them out
- If the dams come out there isn’t much the sportsman need to be made whole
- Conclusions drawn by CRSO operators themselves that breaching would cause the single greatest benefit to Idaho’s fish
- In a future without dams, we will enjoy more fish
- Still will be a need to do habitat and monitoring work until wild fish recover to numbers to sustain themselves

- For the sport fishing to be made whole we need our friends in agriculture and others to be made whole as well
- For a long time we've been hurting, and we wouldn't want to pass that along to anyone else
- We often talk about what would need to happen to make people whole, but we fail often to recognize that there are current people and communities being left behind
- We work often with these river communities that are not benefiting from the current system, they are decaying.
- Many are concerned of how they will sustain their business
- The prosperity promised to us by this system has been evaporating for years
- Many of these small towns sent a unified message to leaders how the current system did not help them
- From 1996 to 2018 Idaho had 40% job increase but the region 2 area only saw 6% increase
 - Jobs declined from 2013 to 2018 in the clearwater region
- The math and mainstream tell a much different story then the one that's been told
- Port of Lewiston has seen a decline in shipping over the years
- While the number of shippers has decreased and the cost of maintaining this system is on the rise
- To divide the cost but the number of boats going through the system makes the subsidy rate fairly high
- I know I'm not alone in seeing a disconnect between the rhetoric and the reality
- We've spent 16 billion dollars so far
- The dam breach scenario in the EIS is the most significant benefit to fish at about one tenth the cost of what we've spent to try to recover fish now
- There is definitely value to some Idahoans from the current system, but the cost is shouldered by many
- Those that rely on it have valid concerns on how it could affect their day to day operations but need to recognize the other large number of Idahoans whose day to day is affected by low runs
- People on the losing side of the system are advocating for a solution that works for everyone
- The status quo is the far more expensive route
- I think that there is a scenario in breaching the dams in which we all win
- It will be hard, and it is a huge lift but that is kind of what we're doing right now and I believe that in the end it will be better for everybody

Chad Colter

- I have a statement here on behalf of ShoBan tribe
- Water is at the center of the tribes' culture because without it none of us would be here
- Right now, the fish need it
- It would be unacceptable to the tribe to lose a fish that has provided so much to us
- The lack of abundance that brought this group together shows how it affects all of our cultures
- The immediate need is for abundance to avoid extinction, but long term is abundance for sustainability
- We believe in the 7 generation concept where we plan out for 150 years

- It is our obligation to ensure and provide for the next 150 years
- The tribes are committed to pursue and initiate efforts to restore the Snake River System to a state that most closely represents the natural ecosystem
- Our vision is of a restored snake river through a program that provides for infrastructure
- Our short term vision is to continue the good work of improving habitat
- Our long term vision is removal the lower snake river dams through a new Power Act 2.0
- We see numerous opportunities for improved economic activities
- The restoration of 100 miles of river corridor, irrigation improvements, and power development may be needed
- This vision would remove mitigation obligations from BPA and give it to a regional workgroup wither the tribes have a seat at the table
- See a vision that could work for all Idahoans

David Doeringsfeld

- Salmon and steelhead extinction is not an option but do not believe that abundance and dams are mutually exclusive
- It is certain that farmers would go bankrupt and power prices would double
- Dam removal is not certain to reach abundance, it is just an experiment
- We've talked about how people need to be kept whole but have yet to hear how stakeholders depending on the dam could be kept whole
- The EIS is silent on private railroad investment to improve infrastructure, we are talking hundreds of millions of dollars and there is no guarantee that the railroads will make it
- Before we move to dam breaching, we need to address some questions
- For several years were recovering and then the blob happened
- Climate change, not dams is affecting salmon recovery
- Does it make sense to breach these carbon neutral dams?
- Power supply is also another consideration
- With the retiring of coal plants, the dams are more important to Load Probability
- Regarding predation
 - Some over 30% of smolts are subject to avian predation
 - Up-migrating fish are subject to seal predations
- Compared to Frasier River in Canada
- Considering farmer in Northwest grow a niche crop, approximately 90% are exported overseas. If the dams are breached it would be tough for them to efficiently get their crops to export
- There are issues to relying on railroad as well
 - Cost, infrastructure, permitting, monopoly on prices, low competition
- Barges maintain reliable schedule
- If the dams were breached, over 60% of the transportation goes away
- These are just a few of the many questions that need answers. Until we have the answers, I think that it would be irresponsible to breach dams
- Another point, we are basing this off of two computer models that do not even agree with each other
 - We need to reconcile this disparity before we consider breaching
- A growing cruise boat industry would disappear, and our recreation scene would drastically change

- I want abundant salmon and the benefits of dams and I think that we have the capability to have both
- Shippers did not abandon the port
- In regard to subsidies, barges don't get a check from the government and they are not the only ones that use the locks.
- 1,100 farmers employ a lot of people

Bret Dumas

- *Shared screen*
- Idaho Power (IP) has been committed to fisheries in Hells Canyon
- We've gone beyond what we are required to do in our FERC license
- 6.8 million hatchery releases
- We have a dedicated fisheries staff
- At the same time, we are an electric utility and would like to show how the dams factor into the electric picture of the region
- Looking to future trends, we are looking at a large retirement of coal and gas and an increase in electrification and variable resources like wind and solar power
- As an electric utility we have to figure out how to provide reliable power in that framework
- Let's talk about how the region looks
 - Northwest peak power is in winter
 - Mountain desert west peaks in summer
 - CA peaks in September
- To meet the different needs, we share power among the region
- Looking at high load resource capacity under low water conditions
 - Even with the dams in place it is unsure if we could have enough power under constrained conditions to meet peak needs in 2025
 - Removing the dams exacerbates this data
 - In other parts of the year in non-peak time it isn't a problem, but we need to be able to handle the peak times
- We have to plan to be able to provide power 365 days a year
- Without that power, the price of power skyrockets until you have to shut things off.
- Limits on infrastructure in 2018-2019 winter made it so we couldn't get power from just anywhere, but the prices were extreme
 - We got by by importing from some different coal plants. As those retire, it is no longer an option in those situations, so the dams become more important
- Showed hourly generation vs demand and shows how 800MW of coal supplied energy will be gone and need to be replaced
- Some purchases were made
- Showed how the load can vary in a single day
 - Showed wind production and solar in relation to daily load
 - Wind was no help and solar is unreliable
 - We pick up the difference by purchasing and getting it from other sources
- If we take out the dams, we need some kind of readily dispatchable power to keep reliable power
 - Other sources are unreliable or not in development currently

- We would like to see LSRD to meet energy needs and see what we can do to lower impacts to fish from the dams

Kira Finkler

- Trout Unlimited has decades long history of working collaboratively to make sure all partners needs are met
- We're committed to working collaboratively because we've learned this is the most durable way to take care of the fish and communities
- Salmon and Steelhead are the lifeblood of some of our communities
- Idaho has seen some of the worst return numbers
- The overwhelming science shows that we need a natural river to restore our fish to abundance
- Unless we take bold action to change the current trajectory, these fish will go extinct
- Even the CRSO EIS shows that breaching gives these fish the best chance to recover
- Our recent report lays out the overwhelming evidence of why we need to remove the LSRD to save the fish
- There are alternatives that we can invest in to mitigate for those who rely on the dams
- The fish do not have any other opportunities
- The efforts thus far have failed to recover Snake River Salmon
- When we talk about keeping everyone whole, we need to recognize that there are people who are not whole now.
- Many outside the state which to return to angle in Idaho
- Abundant runs bring millions of dollars to Idaho's rural communities
- The impending crash of these populations is our collective problem to solve
- I cannot abide a story that ends in time squandered and fish extinct because we couldn't agree and see eye to eye
- Now is the time for us to come together to put together a plan to recover salmon and steelhead
- The Lewiston Orchard water exchange is an excellent example of the process that TU has found that gives the most effective results
- The groups involved talk of times when they could not even be in the same room together until a local leader made the effort to bring people together to try and approach the issue from a different way. They had 3 core objectives
- This was there moment and they found solutions
- Out of the study there were 33 possible solutions
- Everyone had to give a little but, in the end, everybody is better off
- This is our moment
- *Quoted Governor Little*
- *Quoted Representative Simpson*
- We have all these people around the table who care about Salmon and Steelhead
- If there is any question then look to our Mission Statement and Goals, and the fact that we've committed to multiple day Zoom meetings
- It will not be easy but if it was easy, everybody would do it. It's the hard that makes it great
- Questions
 - Aaron Lieberman

- If the dams were removed and the funding how would that affect the TU operations and how do you plan to navigate that?

Will Hart

- In approaching this task, I thought I would talk a little about who we are and where we are now and what our future would look like without dams
- I think we could also have the conversation conversely in how we make people whole while keeping the dams, but I'll stick with the assignment
- Over 140,000 of our consumers across the state provide power to rural communities
- There is value in the flexible and reliable hydro power
- Just to restate, the system and the 4 LSRD provide a lot of reliability and flexibility to the system to meet the load capacity
- A huge part of the system is these 4 dams
- Touching on climate change; we think the dams are extremely necessary to address climate change and allows us to integrate other not as reliable renewable resources
- One of the things we haven't talked directly about is the concern of rate increases
- That is a real concern for our constituents in rural Idaho
- Could lead to a 10 to 50% increase in rates
- At a time where 1000s of customers are having difficulty paying their current bills, any rate increase would be extremely difficult to bear
- Another issue is the transmission. The BPA transmission system is critical to the region
 - Removal would take significant investment in transmission infrastructure and would need to be done prior to removal
- These projects are slow to be accomplished
- I want to say that I am one who probably came kicking and screaming to having this overall discussion about breaching, but I do appreciate it and appreciate hearing from all of you
- It has been said in both positive and negative ways that BPA customers have committed significant funds to salmon recovery
- We have had years of both great success and years like now of no success
- I do have concerns of continuing to go down the road of this discussions
- I continue to believe that the consensus based ideas that we can provide are the most valuable
- I don't want to exclude others just because we don't think they are significant enough because they don't have a big enough effect
- A lot of things, especially politics go into any of these decisions and they do not happen fast
- There is a crisis now
- We have a sincere desire to stay around the table and come to solutions that can be implemented now to start chipping away at the current crisis
- Questions
- Brian Brooks
 - Said there would be an increase in rates, have you given thought to what could be used to replace that power
- Will Hart
 - Right, I said 10-50% on modeling and likely replacement resources would need to be 100% renewable

- I think that Bret had a good slide showing the challenges that could present
- We believe all tools need to be in the toolbox
- Our members do examine a lot of alternatives like nuclear but there are always trade offs with any of them
- There are hurdles we need to overcome but right now we have a system that is working for public power consumers in the northwest
- We're hoping to find a balance as well and we are always looking at other opportunities to add to our portfolio

Scott Hauser

- *Put up some slides*
- Want to speak to USRT Salmon First Scenario
- First thing to touch on is to avoid normalizing the status quo or perpetuating false equivalences among sovereigns and stakeholders on remaining whole after dam breaching
- USRT members have not been whole for 150 years
- Historically USRT tribe members ate 2 pounds of fish per day
- Now, at best, each member eats .6 pounds per year
- Never going to revert back to pre-European colonization and the tribes will never be whole
- Historic benefits should be weighed in comparison to future impacts
 - Some economic
- The concept of making everyone whole is culturally inappropriate at best and a false construct that moves the baseline from pre European colonization to now
- This concept of Salmon First is set around tribal rights and the restoration of their cultural, spiritual, and traditional resources
- The baseline for tribes predates European settlement
- It demands an immediate call to action by the region to reverse the decline of salmon and steelhead
- Need to change narrative to how can we meet the needs of salmon instead of how can we get salmon to meet our needs
- Seven Biological strategy areas
 - Hydro
 - Tributary Habitat
 - Estuary Habitat
 - Blocked Areas
 - Predation
 - Hatchery
 - Harvest
- For the salmon and steelhead to thrive at healthy and harvestable levels, the region needs to return the river to a more functional state
- Questions
- Aaron Lieberman – Do the USRT receive mitigation funding? And if so, how would those dollars be replaced if the dams were removed?
- Scott Hauser– we have had internal discussions but have not fleshed out any specifics. We saw what was coming down the pipe but haven't had a robust conversation yet. I would expect that the ShoBans have had a more robust conversation around that.

Justin Hayes

- *Put up slides*
- In thinking how we want the future to look like and how we can work together to achieve it
- We want a Just, Sustainable, and Prosperous future for everyone
- I think this is something that everyone can agree on
- A part of that for us as a conservation group is abundant wild salmon and steelhead
 - Want it for everyone, not just our people
- Want them to be so abundant that they are economically and ecologically significant
- We also want thriving agricultural economies
- We want Affordable, Reliable, and Clean Energy
- We want to fulfill our moral and legal obligations to each other
 - Some are laws, or treaties, or compacts to each other as citizens
- We want healthy and prosperous communities
 - Applies to rural, and city communities
- Right now, I don't think we have these things in the Northwest
- Some have bits and pieces of this but don't have all of these things
- Major System Changes are needed in order for us to get there
 - The status quo is not working and that's not just the status quo for fish
 - Chad pointed out that Power Act 2.0 could be a big part of that
 - We need to completely redefine our relationship with the hydro system
- We agree that dam removal is the single most important thing we can do for Idaho Salmon and Steelhead right now
- We're not going to have consensus on dam removal so how do we proceed without consensus
- I put together a document earlier called Salmon Surge + Community Investment while preparing for dam removal
- Salmon Surge – means we need to do absolutely everything we can right now to help salmon
 - Habitat
 - Harvest
 - Hatcheries
 - Hydro
 - Predators
- We've identified a lot of things in this group that could help but need to be doing it on an unprecedented scale
- Community Investment
 - Transportation
 - Energy
 - Transmission
 - Irrigation
 - Community Infrastructure
 - Job Creation
- Frustrating to hear we can't remove dams because there aren't alternatives
- We need to talk about the investments that we can make now so it can be an option down the road

- Be ready for dam removal in 10 years if it's still needed
 - If it's not needed, then together we have restored salmon and made our communities better
 - If it is needed, then together we have restored salmon and made communities better
- These are the things we need to do to get to a Just, Sustainable, and Prosperous future
- We need a lot of work together to get there
- Questions
- Scott Hauser
 - More of a comment, I thought this was an incredibly well thought out plan and I appreciate it.

Aaron Lieberman

- Some premises before I start.
 - I really do appreciate that this is happening and that we as a group thought that there is merit to this discussion
 - Second, *quoted novel*
- As a representative of outfitters and guides I struggled how to frame this
- Didn't want to frame it in our burden although that should be recognized
- I think unfortunately many of us have been convinced, erroneously, that the dam removal question is a zero sum game
- I think that the fear of negative impacts is a valid concern, but I do think that it is something that we can control for
- I personally don't buy it and hope that we could, as a group, set aside those cognitive traps
- I think that issue represents more than just salmon
 - Represents economic vitality, equality, and our responsibilities to each other
- I represent an industry that has long suffered and shouldered the impacts of diminished returns
 - Seen things like loss of tradition, economic vitality, ability to pass along company to children
- Governor has often stated his goal of keeping Idahoans in Idaho and bringing back those who left
- Fishing is not the whole trend in our industry, but it is certainly a significant part of why we see less people staying or coming back
- I would say that for the outfitting component that outfitters and guides contributed over 1.2 billion dollars with about 187 million coming from anadromous fish
- Many outfitters and guides live in areas with small populations and these runs are critically important to rural Idaho
- We are also unwhole as an industry as are rural communities across Idaho
- We consider the removal of the LSRD as the most significant action that could be taken to impact salmon
- I think the way to dam removal is a federal one
- I don't think we stand to lose anything by planning for a future in which the LSRD have been removed
- As part of that I need to better examine what is necessary to prepare for that
- We lose nothing from that exercise but have much to gain

- I can speak to a couple points for our industry
- If there were decision to remove dams, our industry would have to discuss how to replace hatchery production until wild stocks recovered
- We would also have to account for the idea that sport fishing could shut down for a period of time would the dams be removed
 - There would need to be some relief or mitigation funding
 - This is not a black and white issue for people from our industry either but we're willing to go in and examine it
 - I hope that all of us could do that
- I'm not saying that we could solve for all the variables, but I hope that we can come to see the value of giving it a shot and I think this conversation is a good indicator of that.

Mark Menlove

- Thank you to this group to having this conversation
- In envisioning the future, I need to talk about our stake in the issue
- Our stake begins with TNCs mission to protect all land and water that nature depends
- We are participating in the workgroup with the single goal of salmon and steelhead recovery
- As to our vision to where Nature and People thrive
- For TNC this work started more than 2 decades ago having conversations in the Lemhi with landowners
 - That went from simple conservation projects to much more complex and ambitious efforts that were landowner led
 - Definitely wasn't always smooth
 - There were elements of mistrust in things like conservation easements but since then we have had many successful conservation easement projects and have alleviated the mistrust and helped make landowners lands and life sustainable
- If we're having the what if question, then the community trust building needs to happen at a very broad scale
- In the end it's the same dynamic of trust, and open mine, and being open to possibility
- This issue will necessitate that Idaho negotiate beyond our borders
- Many people that we work with have economic loss, cultural loss, and so much more from lack of abundant returns
- The future we see includes a robust regional dialogue with other governors, congressional delegations, and tribes
- That dialogue needs to engage in the Northwest Power Act
- We hope the region comes together with a unified vision for Salmon recovery
- We recognize indigenous communities have been more impacted than the rest of us and that their use predates the rest of ours.
- Questions
- Aaron Lieberman
 - In the absence of that funding, what will your organization do to replace that funding
- Mark Menlove
 - I'm not sure we do replace that funding, but if we've accomplished what that funding was intended to do then it was money well spent

Joe Oatman

- Appreciate the opportunity
- I think back to the treaty council
- The treaties reserved the rights to the Tribe for fish
- Pre-treaty consumption was much higher
- Need to recognize that the status quo is problematic and unsustainable for fish
- We support the Goals for Healthy and Harvestable Stocks
- For the Tribe the bottom line is that the fish needs to complete all sections of their lifecycles to survive
- We have developed an impact/effort grid that could help us weigh the recommendations
- The tribe is a leader and essential to the conversation on how to recover the fish
- Tribe does extensive efforts to aid in Salmon recovery
- More can and should be done to help salmon and steelhead
- We must be willing to try things we haven't been willing to yet
- One of these things could be removing the LSRD
- Tribe supports returning to a free flowing river
- We have been told that we can have dams and healthy and harvestable salmon
 - We haven't seen that since the dams went in
- We would like to see the Governor work with other Governor's and congressional delegations
- Harvest in the last few years has been a fraction of what it once was
- We envision a day that our people can travel to all our harvest sites and harvest
- To bring back Salmon is to bring back the Nez Perce people. Both must be made whole
- Told story of family trip to catch salmon but no fish to catch
- While the tribe has done so much for salmon, we have also sacrificed the most
- Our treaty said that our fisheries would be preserved in perpetuity and it is time for that to be made a reality
- We need to see SARs in the 2-6% range with average of 4% which will require immediate and ongoing efforts
- If Idaho rises to the challenge, then this type of collaboration would be worth the time and effort
- We need to do this with unwavering resolve and commitment
- I appreciate the opportunity to share our perspective

Stacey Satterlee

- A lot of my comments mirror others
- In north Idaho the grain industry is inextricably tied to the river system
- Wheat after it is harvested is loaded to trucks and shipped to the loading facility to be stored and loaded on barges
- Wheat is Idaho's second largest crops and Idaho is ideal for growing wheat
- If you are a farmer, then the river system is part of your operation
- About half of Idaho's crop is used domestically and the other half is exported
- 4 of our top 5 customers are in the Pacific Rim
- It's a premium soft white wheat that we grow, and customers pay a premium for that
- Because of the Lewiston port, we are able to access a global market
- Barging is certainly the most environmentally friendly transportation method

- There is data about how eliminating the barge system could affect transportation in terms of additional needed trucks and rail cars
- This issue is also bigger than Idaho, it comes from other states
- 10% of nations wheat passes through barges through the dams
- Also, if we remove barging then we are captive to rail and there is nothing to keep them competitive
- The question of envisioning a river without the locks and dams is extremely difficult for the wheat industry in being able to cost effectively ship grain
- Farms are operating mostly on equity and it is not economically feasible for them to take on additional shipping costs
- One thing I'd like to mention is the dichotomy that is built is that we're all invested in these communities together
 - In these small towns we all use the same facilities and there's no one side and the other. We're all one community
 - It is a complex issue and there are a lot of things that feed into it
- All of this is to say that we support salmon recovery and appreciate the opportunity to be around the table
- I have been heartened to see that there is a lot of things that we can do and make meaningful recommendations, but it is hard to see how we could survive without the locks and dams on the river
- Questions
- Aaron Liberman
 - I think there is a strong similarity between farmers and outfitters and guides
 - Both depend on land and natural resources
 - Both operate on thin profits and depend on healthy crop
 - On transporting grain, do you see any other areas that would need to be addressed for your group
- Stacey Satterlee
 - I may have to follow up, but it is important to note that every time you touch a commodity, it adds a cost
 - Right now, the infrastructure is not present and there really isn't the give in the system right now that allows for additional cost

Richard Scully

- I grew up in Lewiston and for the first 35 years of my life there were no reservoirs there
- Beautiful beaches, and my dad owned a boat, so I have a history of seeing Lewiston as a beautiful riverine area
- Once things stabilize it could be a great recreational area
- I like to look at comparative economies since the last 45 years since the dams went in and the time that salmon have been around
- I like Scott's statement of what can we do to meet the needs of salmon
- That's what we need to focus on
- I want to speak about some IDFG Commission Statements from the 90s
 - Said that the dams were the primary factor in limiting salmon return and that a natural river system would provide the most benefit
 - There was no evidence that harvest rates were a limiting factor

- Science points to the construction of additional dams is the primary factor in the decline of salmon
- Others science since is that the only way to recover is to get SARs up to 4% and a natural river is the only way you're going to get there
- Another group of federal judges have said for more than 20 years that more aggressive methods were needed
- Uncertainty should not be used to justify delayed action or taking no action at all
- In talking about the 4 H's, we've taken a lot of time talking about all of them
 - We've looked around the state at different areas and it seems that Idaho has an abundance of good habitat and the lack is due to hydro
 - Habitat projects alone cannot recover salmon alone
 - Doing more with hatcheries will not do more to recover fish
- Currently there are barely enough adults to cover brood needs
- Sport angler have not been able to harvest wild fish for decades
 - When there are extremely low runs even catch and release is closed
- Reducing Harvest will not recover fish
- I would say that the problem is not in Idaho but is the LSRD
- Currently Snake river are less than 1%
- Only SARs greater than 2% and averaging 4% will recovery salmon
- If the dams were removed the river would have closer to 4% SARs and closer to recover
- I think short of removing the Snake River dams, everything else will be inadequate to recover salmon

Jim Yost

- I find it interesting seeing the comments today seem identical to the very first meeting
- No one's position has changed, and I'm not surprised
- No one has changed but hopefully everyone has learned a lot
- A lot of people have mentioned the CRSO EIS and that's a reality we have to live with
- People who read it come to different conclusions just like they do with the science and that's just the nature of people
- The decision was correct and supported by all the Federal Agencies and other folks as well
- It's not perfect, and some of the data was a little stale and needs to be updated
- In the next few years, I hope that the council will be able to assist in looking to replacement power
- One disappointment to me in a year and a half is that we didn't engage in a conversation on power needs and distribution
- Most of the focus is on breaching and that's ok. I understand the strong feelings around it
- When you look at this you have to look at the primary reasons for the dams. We have to look at all of those before we make a decision on breaching.
- It's not timely, we'll need to do some additional studies on the impacts to better know our options.
- We have time to do that. It's going to take a long time to get breaching on the table
- Would take a primary and a secondary study
- I do think we need to do more for fish. I wonder where the fish would be if we hadn't work as hard as we did the last 20 years. I think about that and thank God that we're doing what we're doing

- You can't just look at the LSRD, you have to look at the whole system. With Idaho fish you are look at 3 stocks out of 4. Some do ok and others do poorly
- If you're looking at the ESA and what the Judge say, they don't talk about any of the other talks
- When you look at the dams, the region is going to want to look at the greenhouse gas and those dams going down will cause a hardship on greenhouse gas emissions
- No one is looking at transmission like they should but if the dams go then there will need to be changes to transmission
- It'd be interesting to see what Congress and the Administration think about the dams in terms of national security
- Even with the current system, we are nearing black out conditions and with the retirement of coal plants in the near future it's going to be tough to find reliable replacement energy
- Until the technology provides with some sort of viable alternative energy source, we've got to deal with what we've got
- I fear that people are looking to remove dams in a short time frame. Planning should be done over long lengths of years.
- I think we need to focus on the timeline that the governor has available (4 or 5 years) and focus on continuing to gather data to be able to make better decisions

Aaron Lieberman

- Question for Jim
- You've been engaged in this issue in a long time and understand that there are limitations
- Is there anything that you would offer that approximates hope on doing something we haven't done?
- What can we do that hasn't been done that would be helpful?

Jim Yost

- There are several things we can do that we haven't been able to do yet
- We need to take care of predator control both avian and marine mammal
 - Sea lions take 40% of Summer Chinook so that would be a huge difference maker
- We can't control ocean conditions
- Habitat work is doing pretty well and we're hoping to get the brood stock back to fill those areas
- More we learn the better we can do
- We do have projects we want to get on the ground that we haven't been able to do as of yet

Mike Edmondson

- Thank you.
- We have had between 40-60 people listening in and hearing our opportunities
- I'd like to say thank you to those who have helped and are not necessarily on the Salmon Workgroup

Adjourn

Governor's Salmon Workgroup Meeting
August 27
Video meeting

Workgroup Member Roll Call

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

Introductions and Opening, Dr. Katherine Himes, UI

- *Gave history and purpose of group*
- Future meeting dates are set and will be posted on OSC website
- We will hear from Public today for the comment period
- *Shared slide of technical topics that the Workgroup has covered*

Idaho Accords Presentation and Q&A Invited: Shoshone Bannock Tribe (TBD), OSC, BPA Break (Presentations Available on OSC Website on Governor's Salmon Workgroup Page)

Mike Edmondson

- I'm a member of the Agenda subcommittee and work to get speakers lined up
- I think title is a little misleading because we do have other Accords so probably should call fish accord
- We have a hard stop with some of our speakers at 10.

Dori Welch and Tim Dykstra, Crystal Ball

- Here to provide high level overview of Fish Accords
- BPA Fish program funds hundreds of projects every year
- Came about as part of Northwest Power Act
- Projects are implemented through annual contracts

- Improves habitat in mainstem and tributaries, funds hatcheries, and monitors and assesses success of these efforts
- Accords is one of many tools to implement Fish and Wildlife program
- BPA responsible for mitigating for negative effects on fish and wildlife by the system
- Accords arose from CRSO litigation
- Contract with Tribes and States and CRPFC
- Focal point was to help anadromous fish under ESA but also help other fish in the Basin
- Agreements have resulted in more effective implementation due to cost sharing and increased funding
- Creates ability to implement large scale projects that take collaboration and multiple years
- When you boil the Accords down its based on relationships and using those to accomplish important projects on the ground for fish
- Also have invested in important work for Lampreys as well
- Would really like to underscore the importance of the collaboration and partnerships
- Things like the Flexible Spill agreement was something that came out of partnerships and good faith engagement. Was debated and talked out and resulted in a good idea
- The partnerships were solidified in 2008 Fish Accords and have remained a vital part of that success
- **Moving to 2018** agreements, as they were set to expire, parties expressed interest in extending the agreements
- Many partners chose to become cooperating Agencies in CRSO EIS
- That final decision should come out by the end of September
- Due to Presidential Memo, the Federal Action agencies moved up the timeline on the CRSO EIS
- Because of the term in the Accord extensions, they are set to expire when the CRSO ROD comes out in September
- We have been working with partners to figure out how to operate past that
- Goal is to negotiate a new long term agreement with partnerships
- On CRSO EIS
- The original Accords form 2008 accomplished a lot of good work
- The extensions have been able to maintain the productive working relationships
- One specific thing the Corp has done is highlight support for solving Lamprey passage
- Recently received an additional \$20 million to help with passage

Q and A

- Justin Hayes
 - 2 questions. 1. You mentioned the pride of the Flex Spill agreement, but it strikes me that the majority of the parties that negotiated that agreement had accords. Seemed like the ones that didn't have it were better positioned to push you a little bit.
 - 2. I'm interested to hear discussion on the restrictions on those that sign onto them. There's been much talk about those potential limitations on Idaho., I'd like to hear your description of the language. *Read limitation language*. So, you sign the accord and then you can't advocate the issues. Seems like a gag order
 - **Tim Dykstra:** I just wanted to stress the importance of relationships and in those efforts, we had the conversations about how to best move forward for the region. We did talk to and get a lot of good ideas from Accord members for the Flex Spill agreement. Want to highlight that without the established relationships in the

- region, we would not be as far as we are today. Need to be able to have honest, open, frank communication. Want to operate on a no-surprise communication
- **Dori Welch:** Accords created a collaborative relationship which makes it possible to.
 - **Tim Dykstra:** I do not at all see the limitations as a gag order. What it is intended to be is to create a space for conversations to happen and that those conversations are more productive when we work together. From my perspective it has yielded more benefit than conflict in the court room. To me it has led to important conversations and having productive collaborative path forward instead of court issues
 - **Jim Yost:** First of all, there was no limitations to Idaho in those 10 years. Idaho agreed with the EIS and where the government was going and if we agreed, why would we want to object. There were a few disagreements and where we wanted to get clarification and the point of the Accords was to bring everyone into a conversation and we found solutions that way. There are offramps we could take if need be but when you can agree with your partners then there isn't a reason to criticize. You may not have agreed but the State did, and we supported the accords
- Joe Oatman
 - First part is comment. I would challenge that a prerequisite to having a partnership to do good for fish in Columbia.
 - Question in your description of 2018 description, you said there was a desire to bring other collaborative efforts to fruition, could you elaborate more on that?
 - **Dori Welch:** With the Rod for the CRSO EIS coming up, there have been many conversations about how is best to move forward after that. And we think a collaborative effort is the best way for us to move forward to achieve our goals for the region. We're just looking to have those conversations to further those goals. Want to be able to maintain the honest and open communication. This Workgroup is a great example of those regional conversations that are happening
 - Brian Brooks
 - 2 comments before agreement. The collaborating for the Flex Spill agreement only came after the threat of a lawsuit. I keep hearing that the Accord has provided benefits, but they are congressionally mandated.
 - BPA Plan says they'll meet their federal borrowing cap by 2023. How do you see the Accords changing after you hit that borrowing cap and how do you see that affecting Idaho?
 - **Dori Welch:** the majority of the money we provide to Accords is expense money and is not money that is borrowed from Congress so shouldn't be affected by limit. Projects that are capital dependent would be things like Hatchery construction and we are not seeing impacts to those
 - **Crystal Ball**
 - BPA has obligations under the Northwest Power Act, but we collect that money from rate payers, and we will set that at appropriate levels to cover that. We plan on holding cost below the rate of inflation.
 - Richard Scully
 - In 1993 Idaho Fish and Game disagreed that the CRSO would not cause jeopardy for salmon and they sued NOAA. Since then we haven't done that.
 - Since the Accords they say that they Idaho will agree and support the operations
 - *Read part of Accords*

- I see Idaho's comments on the draft really mirror what the CRSO EIS preferred alternative was. The Preferred Alternative does not get SARs where they need to be for delisting
- Other science says we needed MO3 or MO4 to recovery Salmon
- Why did the State of Idaho not support that kind of request instead of something more impactful to Salmon?
- To me it sounds like it's because of the Accords
- **Jim Yost**
 - The reason we supported the preferred alternative because MO4 was bad for parts of Idaho
 - Breach was not something that is going to add anything for fish in the near term
 - The people on today didn't have anything to do with the Accords, it was Idaho
 - There are advantages of the Accord
 - One of the Things we did in Idaho is as we negotiate the new accords, we are modifying some of the language to protect the sovereignty of the State
 - You're off base though thinking the Feds or the Accords had anything to do with that decision
- **Mike Edmondson**
 - We were a cooperating agency and helped create all of the alternatives to the CRSO EIS.
 - We made many comments, none of which were covered by the Accord
- Justin Hayes
 - Good to hear from Jim that the state is considering this issue
 - From my organizations thinking is that the positive things that could come from an Accord is a floor on funding to provide certainty to certain projects.
 - I see some benefit to it but the language that I called the gag order is really the issue there
 - I think if we do well here, we could find consensus here in Idaho on things that are bigger and better than we've done before. Not breach, but maybe spill
 - I worry that if Idaho signs an accord that limits the State's sovereignty, that it will limit what we can come to consensus on in this group about what we can do as a state
 - I think there are some good things in the Accords and but there are also red flags
 - I appreciate some of the benefits of the Accords and look to see how they could be crafted without the binding language and still provide the certainty needed.
- **Dori Welch:**
 - We certainly recognize that there a lot of moving parts and conversations happening trying to find big and innovative solutions to problems
 - It's totally fair for the state to have concerns about taking a position on something that has not been finalized
 - We are working with the State and tribes to figure out how this plays out over the next 2 years and see how that will affect another long term agreement
- **Justin Hayes**
 - Are you saying the next two years will be a reup of the previous agreement or provide the flexibility?
- **Dori Welch**

- We are committed to working with our partners within the framework of the Accords to have the conversations
- **Tim Dykstra:** we are trying to create a space where we're having productive conversations and we think that it's more productive to have them collaboratively rather than in court and that's what we're working towards.
- Justin Hayes
 - I'll post the language and people can read it and I would point out that if anyone holds the upper hand in a relationship then it's not a collaborative relationship

Daniel Stone (Shoshone Bannock Tribes)

- Thank you everybody for allowing me to share the Tribe's perspective on the Fish Accord
- Want to share Chad's perspective as well. Recognize the partnership with BPA and efforts in region
- Shoshone Bannock are an amalgamation of peoples across the basin. All of these bands were eventually moved to reservation in Fort Hall.
- One term of the treaty was that the Tribe reserved the right to harvest wildlife from their homelands
- One of the foundational pieces of the culture was the return of anadromous fish into these watersheds
- One example we like to use is subsistence diet information which shows average tribal member consumed 100-200 salmon per year per person
- When we talk about contemporary harvest, we talk about a ½ pound per person per year
- In response to declining numbers, the ShoBan implemented a policy for the river system
- From a ridgetop to ridgetop perspective, our goal has always been to restore those systems to a more natural condition
- It's hard to really see how far from a natural system we really are
- Recognition that given the amount of development that we can't restore a fully normative system, we have to work in the areas that we can
- Looking at court cases for decades we see challenges on Biological Opinions and operation measures
- Had significant studies about lower 4 snake river dams and managing the river
- When we entered into 2008 Fish Accord agreements, we had our eyes wide open
- What we decided at that point was to enter into a collaborative relationship with the federal agencies instead of a litigious one.
- Would help us do work in specific watersheds that had been overlooked up to that point
- BiOps and such haven't always had everything we wanted in them, but we were able to talk with our partners about certain issues
- Watershed level project planning requires funding on a longer timeline to build capacity and support to complete
 - Before the maximum timeline for funding on a non-Accord project was 3 years
 - Didn't allow us to work on a ridgetop to ridgetop watershed basis
- This allows the tribes to work directly with our funding agencies as partners as opposed through working through an intermediary and allowed us to do our priority work that was important to us
- I've heard a lot of the concerns this morning, but I would like to highlight that a lot of the work that has been done has happened as a cooperative agency

- If you're interested in the tribe's opinion on CRSO EIS there is a summary or full text in that document
- Overall themes of projects: there was a large focus on natal habitat in 2008 agreements
- We wanted to study the effect of marine derived nutrients on natal habitat
- The primary purpose of investigating nutrient enhancement is to study the effect of abundant salmon on the landscape and how the lack of salmon may affect
- Numerous peer reviewed studies have been studied
- Idea had come from traditional ecological knowledge
- Makes sense that a 2 inch fish that leaves Idaho and comes back as a 40 pound fish brings a lot of nutrients from the ocean
- We wanted to see what the effect may be of long term absence of such nutrients
- Due to the scale of some projects, funding was need on a 10 year timeline
- We have done significant work in Yankee Fork
 - *Gave some specific project aspects*
- It became clear to the tribes that abundance was a limiting factor in the basin
 - We designed 3 projects related to those
- Put together an education program over the last 10 years that has resulted in many degrees
- From an all H management paradigm, we see some benefits of engaging in these longer term discussions in being able to influence the types of projects that we engage in
- We operate on a 7th generation principle
 - My ancestors sat in a treaty council 150 years ago and made a decision to significantly change their lifestyle because they thought it would be a benefit to us now

Questions

Crystal Ball from BPA

- Want to express my gratitude to Daniel. I haven't been in this job long but I'm learning a lot from him and appreciate his willingness to share the successes of the program

Richard Scully

- Do you feel optimistic that the CRSO EIS will lead to the abundance of salmon that your descendants will be looking for or is something larger necessary?
- **Daniel Stone** – I would point back to the CRSO EIS that has the tribal perspective in detail. Our perspective is that systemic modification to the lower snake river corridor would be the largest benefit and could be done in a manner that benefits the economy and fish and could improve the energy grid without waiting for cascading effects like we see in California.
 - Large scale systemic solutions and with all the federal authorizations it would take
 - We would like to see a large scale action from congress that handles the issues at once rather than one at a time in a piecemeal fashion

Mike Edmondson

- I think that most things that has been said about the Accords has been said
- The state's experience certainly reflects that of the Tribes
- I'll share a few thoughts
- We are in the middle of negotiating an extension and are in a good time

- A lot of the concerns that were expressed in 2018 are affecting our conversations that we are having now
- This Workgroup is important, we don't want to get ahead of the group
- The extension is a short term agreement and will give us an opportunity to finish this groups work and have time to analyze it for the next round of negotiations
- Because we are in the middle of negotiations, I won't quote anything, but we are very aware of the sovereignty issue
- I think you can see the bridge between this group and future negotiation opportunities
- 2008-2018 Accord did have the language that Justin has posted
 - I posted the current Accord extension and in negotiations we addressed that language and it was revised (I posted in the chat)
 - I think it better describes what we were trying to with that language in creating a space for open and honest conversation
- Like Jim said, we agreed with the system of operations at the time
- I know that people will continue concerns about it and I want you to know that we have heard them, and it has influence and will continue to influence negotiations
- And I think we can get to a place that puts Idaho in a good position
- Through the extension the Accord affords us a lot more latitude to make it easier to implement projects in general but also larger projects
- The value since 2018 is over \$63 million

Questions

- Brian Brooks
 - You answered most of my question. Thank you everyone for taking sharp questions. I know they seem like digs, but many people are frustrated with the situation our fish our in. They come from a place of concern and we do appreciate your work
 - I'll reiterate, that the clarity needed on the Northwest Power Act obligations and how they differ from the Accord funding. It seems like we have this act with a directive and then the Accords and how they differ? Could you give a more direct answer?
- Crystal Ball
 - To be more clear, the Accords are a tool for BPA to implement their Fish and Wildlife program. The projects that we rely on for project sponsors to implement are captured in appendix A. Essentially the Accords are a tool to implement the projects we're required to do
- Aaron Lieberman
 - One area where I have concerns is not necessarily what Idaho supports currently but, in a situation, where Idaho did not support a federal action, the State would be stuck not being able to challenge it. What way could draw out the Accord potentially impact Idaho negatively? What are the structural consequences?
- Mike Edmondson
 - This is a bit of scenario planning. I see the Accord as the tool to bring people to the table to express concerns. If things aren't working, then we would take that approach to try to address and resolve concerns. If the disagreement remains, there is off ramp language that would allow us to take legal action
 - So basically, implementing communication route and then the offramp avenue if necessary

- Aaron Lieberman
 - If we took that offramp and not have seat at the table, would there be potential immediate consequences to the available funding?
- Mike Edmondson
 - Yes, in there hypothetical there probably would. Feds have to ensure their actions are consistent with BiOp, can't cause jeopardy. Standard is not recovery, it's a jeopardy standard
 - If we back out, then the feds have to examine the effect of Idaho's projects that allows them to avoid jeopardy
 - Idaho would advocate to continue all actions but good question for action agency
- Crystal Ball
 - Want to make sure to make clear that BPA will continue to fund Fish and Wildlife program because we are required to
 - We prefer to have a close relationship with project sponsors so we can work together to get on the groundwork done
- Richard Scully
 - As you are negotiating the extension, will there be some place in the process for the public to review a draft and comment on it
- Mike Edmondson
 - This agreement is not subject to any process. This is similar to an MOU or MOA and there won't be a public comment process
 - Part of it is due to timing
 - Moving forward to next agreement and there are two years to possibly plan it
- Richard Scully
 - Why is it that programs can only last for three years if they are not part of the Accord?
- Crystal Ball
 - I know of no requirement to limit a project to 3 years. Prior to the Accords that we were building budgets for projects based on amount of money we could collect from ratepayers. What the accords did was provide certainty to ratepayers and project sponsors over 10 years
- Mike Edmondson
 - Practically too, they were previously 1 year governmental contracts and it led to it being difficult to create the certainty to commit a long term project
- Joe Oatman
 - Based off what I head, I have an observation. BPA recognizes that over the next 2 years in the regional discussions that are occurring that they want to come up with new and innovative ideas for fish. Could be used to craft next long term agreement. I think this is indeed what we're trying to do here in this group. In Idaho accords describes ongoing efforts to benefit fish. I think it will important to understand what more can be done to reach healthy and harvestable. From our perspective we don't want to be limited to just efforts that have been done.
- Justin Hayes
 - Quick question on urgency of resigning. I wonder what happens if we don't get Accord signed. Will BPA stop funding the projects during negotiations?
- Crystal Ball

- We talked a lot about the benefits of the Accord today and I think that if we weren't able to get an agreement signed it would make the relationship because there will be less certainty. BPA will continue to fund Fish and Wildlife program. We would like to carry out the intent of the extension to 2022
- Mike Edmondson
 - I think the phrase “reasonably certain to occur” is helpful here
 - They used to ask around the region to see the likelihood of getting projects on the ground to be able to demonstrate that they are meeting the obligations
- Justin Hayes
 - It sounds like the urgency is more on BPA's side than the State's side
- Richard Scully
 - Would it be possible to wait to enter a new accord until the Workgroup completes their policy recommendations to ensure that there is no conflict?
- Will Hart
 - The Governor's not beholden to the Workgroup
- Mike Edmondson
 - From a practical timing standpoint probably not
 - After the conclusion of this group concludes their recommendations would inform the next round of negotiations that would need to be completed within a year and a half after the conclusion of this group
 - As Crystal described, there are funding levels set for a certain time and then they have to be re-evaluated and there is no certainty on funding levels.
- Katherine Himes
 - After the break we have to shift the schedule because Senator Johnson cannot join us until this afternoon.

Policy Recommendations Format Discussion Dr. Katherine Himes, UI and Mike Edmondson, OSC (Aaron Lieberman, Stacey Satterlee, Mark Menlove)

- *Aaron Shared document on the screen for potential timeline*
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I don't think there is anything to deep here. We just took the final recommendation deadline and worked backwards from there to set some goals for deliverables
 - *Went through the various deadlines and deliverables in document*
 - Added in a deadline for members to identify sticking points that need full group consideration.
- Stacey Satterlee
 - Also thought that it would be good to give moderators some direction before the meeting, so we are not trying to wordsmith everything and are addressing those things that need the discussion and avoid line by line editing
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Added a time to bring up anything that member's think is missing
 - Also added a deadline to have Subject Matter Experts provide feedback on our recommendations to identify additional content needed and accuracy
- Justin Hayes
 - Trying to recall some small group discussions and one thing I took away is that if we're going to save salmon, we need to go big. I'm nervous about scoring things and ranking them because we need to do all of it.

- I think we're trying to create a bundle of goods that together will save fish and not a menu that someone can pick and choose from
- Aaron Lieberman
 - That is a good point on this
 - For us, like looking at Hatcheries there are some things that have higher impacts than other and it would provide some direction from the workgroup on if they have to choose, we have considered what would be most impactful
 - I think your concern is valid and I think that is part of the conversation we need to have
 - Have a deadline for finalized comments from the workgroup
 - Set the December 18th date to give us some wiggle room to have it in before the final date in case anything needs to be changed
- Stacey Satterlee
 - On scoring, I think right now we just have everything included and through a ranking process it could refine our thinking and could help us to sort into the recommendation or appendix. Could help us refine the document, like Mike said, we can't have 100 page document, and this could help us do that.
 - It's an aggressive schedule and this is an attempt to use the time we have left most efficiently and to set benchmarks to make sure we make it in December
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Want to emphasize that this is a draft and is certainly open to feedback and changes
- Joe Oatman
 - First, I'd suggest the guiding principles/what's missing. I think that the envisioning the future discussion yesterday laid out our positions on that. Could have notes or summary on envisioning the future idea
 - One of the key parts in all of this is to try and determine whether the policy recommendations will cause movement towards recovery and abundant stocks. Having some assessment of that aspect would be good to include
 - Could be bundles of things we put together that add up to substance
 - Could then possibly show that some sticks in the bundle did not have consensus but would be impactful
- Scott Hauser
 - Comment: on the Oct. 15 subject matter expert input. I fully support that, but we've heard the term Dueling Science thrown around. It's a fallacy because we have a scientific method that shows what is science and what is not science. In agreeing with that topic, how do we get around that issue of dueling science? Don't want that meeting to become contentious debate on science or non-science.
- Aaron Lieberman
 - We had discussed that to the best extent possible, that the feedback would stay removed from getting into the granularity of picking different models
- Kira Finkler
 - It seems to me that one of the first things we need to figure out is what the structure of the report will look like. Can't really talk about what will go in an appendix if we don't know what the structure will look like. Joe Oatman had shared a matrix with an impact/effort and other analysis that could be a good structure for us to look like
- Justin Hayes

- Going back to subject matter expert. I think that it's a potentially valuable thing but throughout this exercise there has been a tension in using SME to inform our decisions and not being told that we can't do something because that is not the way it has been done. Don't want them to just try to shape our recommendations into the current paradigm
- Paul Arrington
 - Comment: Our timeline is growing shorter and shorter and it seems to me that most of us will have to go back to our respective groups to make sure that we get final approval to put our organizations name on this. Need to have an idea of that process of making sure our groups are ok with putting our names on here
- Richard Scully
 - I was thinking about Joe Oatman's matrix and I think I would like to see all the measures that we are going to consider putting in the report ran through that matrix. If things are not going to be not-impactful that they should drop off the page
 - In order to recover salmon, I think that everything needs to be impactful
- Brian Brooks
 - Another flag to raise in regard to subject matter experts review our recommendations. Would it be possible that they will be bound by the Accord forbearance language that prevents advocacy?

Lunch

Policy Recommendations/Format

- Katherine Himes
 - This is a section to talk about how the final report may look
 - This is open time for the Workgroup to talk through how you would like to form your final draft
- David Doeringsfeld
 - Before lunch we talked about running our recommendations through a matrix and I think Joes was well put together but I am concerned about how much time it would take and how much of a difference it would make
 - I would think that maybe all we're doing is giving a straight up or down consensus vote but if we are trying to take each individual measure and rank it and figure out if there is a cut off line it will take a lot of time. I think we could move faster with just looking for general consensus
 - Richard makes the point of level of impact. As long as it's benefiting salmon then I think it warrants inclusion
 - I don't know that we need to come up with a ranking for the governor and need to work well with the time we have left
- Joe Oatman
 - I still come back to the assignment that we were originally assigned and bringing it back to the mission statement. Never got to part where we evaluate the package to see if it gets us where we want to be
 - I think having some analysis on the recommendations proposed on whether they get fish to recovery and then to healthy and harvestable. Makes part of the conversation whether the recommendations we make is getting us closer to our goals. As you remove stuff from the package you will likely move us further away from our goals. I think it would be a relatively simple thing to apply to each area.

We did it with Hydro and may be easier than SME input. I have not received word that we've abandoned that assignment, so I think we still need to do it

- David Doeringsfeld
 - I think that's a thoughtful way to go through the process, but I am concerned about timeliness
 - I'm fine with giving it a shot on certain subject to see how quickly we can move through it. But just want to raise the concern that it could take a lot of time and not provide much benefit
- Joe Oatman
 - Thanks David. I know that when we presented this on Hydro
 - In order to streamline it may be beneficial to have SME's put together a strong impact/effort analysis
- David Doeringsfeld
 - I'd agree with that. Before we get married to it, I'd like to leave it open to give a shot but keep an eye on the clock and see if it will allow us to get through everything.
- Aaron Lieberman
 - David, holding to the timeline is a valid concern. I think some of our projected turnarounds is aggressive but attainable
 - Joe, I hadn't thought about having the SME's do impact/effort analysis
 - I do think it's an effective tool for this kind of function
 - Joe, the process appeals to me at face value but haven't had time to fully digest
 - I think everyone agrees we've been pretty efficient in our small groups
 - Could have another small group that takes a crack at the scoring, could be an alternative idea to keep us on target
- Jim Yost
 - I think the way we should start is go through recommendations and see where there is and isn't consensus and where we can resolve and divide in 3 groups
 - Allows us to focus time on non-consensus to see if it's possible to reach consensus
 - We could go through a lot of effort scoring and ranking but it comes down to consensus
 - We've had technical experts come it for a year and half and it hasn't changed anyone's position so don't know why we'd want to bring experts in again
 - Let's cut to the chase and find consensus where we can and then work to see if we can find consensus on the middle ground areas
- Will Hart
 - Jim covered most of my concerns
 - We've been listening to experts for a year and a half and use that info to make recommendations
 - If there is a ranking subgroup, I would definitely want to volunteer for it
 - There were some areas that we talked about that we may need more info in order to make a better recommendation
 - We've kind of adopted a lot of the CBP goals and they have timelines and metrics in there
 - I hope to avoid some rabbit holes
 - My organization sent me here to collaborate towards consensus based solutions and I have to be able to get their stamp on it.
 - I think we need to be fair as possible but not reinvent the wheel

- Richard Scully
 - I have some thoughts on consensus
 - What we're trying to do is get to abundant and harvestable
 - I don't want to provide governor with list of things that won't have impact
 - I really would like to see the recommendations categorized by impact
 - Maybe there won't be consensus on many things but is there a way to show levels of consensus
- Mike Edmondson
 - I think that the Workgroup needs to determine what they want to do
 - I did discuss this topic with Sam and there is interest in seeing almost-consensus ideas
- Scott Hauser
 - Process question
 - When we determine what report looks like, I would like to roll this out and speak with governor and present or is it just a put together report and dropped on his desk?
- Mike Edmondson
 - Hadn't contemplated but at the minimum it would be the latter
 - I think looking at our timeline, we finish right before the holiday, but we could look at some options and talk with Sam to see what they're thinking
- Joe Oatman
 - Could you provide more detail on the interest in non-consensus recommendations?
- Mike Edmondson
 - I simply asked if that was a possibility. Ran some scenarios where there's a majority on an issue but not pure consensus and they said they would look at that.
 - I would say there would be a prioritization based on some criteria,
 - I think we need to talk about how those may be presented
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I went back to Twin Falls notes and I think that is consistent with what Sam said there
 - I think that some sort of impact/analysis would be beneficial. And I agree with Joe that I don't think it would be too big of burden
 - Will, I wanted to clarify that what I thought you were suggesting was to have a small group to do the scoring, is that right?
- Will Hart
 - No, I think that would be a large group issue
 - I thin what I was saying was having a small group to figure out the details of how it would work
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Maybe at the conclusion of this meeting if we don't arrive at something maybe we could decide whether to have a small group address it
- Richard Scully
 - Katherine, is there a list of all the policy recommendations from all the subgroups in one document that we could look at?
- Katherine Himes
 - You have an email with all the info but there isn't a single document that includes everything

- You have the info that all the groups presented on yesterday
- Paul Arrington
 - The other issue that is hanging out there is that there are policy recommendations that overlap groups and perhaps it's time we consolidate those into single groups
 - Is that something that Crystal could do or a future small group, how do we go about that?
- Brian Brooks
 - I like the idea of the matrix. I think it would be a mistake to submit a list without having a discussion of the impact
 - We're not here to just improve the runs by one fish we're trying to reach healthy and harvestable runs
 - We need to be able to tell people whether the recommendations will get us there
 - I think it is a mistake to just say "this will be additive to fish"
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Brian, I certainly understand where you're coming from
 - Going back to moving forward in the process, there are questions on the timeline
 - Maybe the immediate answer is to desist for a certain period of time and try something
 - I don't think there hasn't been anybody that hasn't seen the value in the impact analysis
 - I think if we just choose one and go down and if it takes too long then we can reassess
 - Does anyone have any qualms with that?
 - Rather than spend more time trying to figure out how long it will take, how about we decide now on a manner to assess the impact/effort analysis and if we run into time issues then we can reassess but at least at that point we will have started down a road.
 - And then I like Mike's idea of identifying levels of consensus
 - The main thing I'm talking about is the actual scoring
 - A major part is using the Hydro 1 impact matrix
 - Would be a cleaning/scoring part but main point would be scoring
 - Are folks ok polling right now to see if that is a path forward?
- *Deliberation on how to vote*
- Will Hart
 - I think if we could send out the Oatman matrix again it will make it easier for us
- Katherine Himes
 - Could you talk more about the cleaning part
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think it's something we could put to an expert just to make sure everything into a proper category
 - If we need to do it as a subgroup or something, we certainly can
- Richard Scully
 - I think that that would be why I want a single document so we could go through and put them in category
- Will Hart
 - Are you talking about the first assignment or the recommendations of where we are now?
 - I think we have the latter readily available

- Richard Scully
 - I'm referring to the latter
- Brian Brooks
 - I think it may take someone who has been on these calls to be able to put them in the right place
- Paul Arrington
 - I feel like we're making this much more difficult than it needs to be
 - What if we just say that the existing small groups just do their topics
 - I think when you look at the diversity of the group it makes it not a simple exercise
 - Could just kick it back to small groups to see where it goes from there
- Stacey Satterlee
 - I am for progress and I think that most of our progress has come from small groups and that it may make sense to send this back to them
 - We haven't really boiled the recommendations down to what they need to be and at some point, we need to decide on what it is we're ranking
 - Are we going to revise further or take it as it stands and go with that?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think you're right and I think that the time to shore our recommendations up and I think that it is built into our proposed schedule
 - Maybe we return to our small groups and refine the language and send it out to workgroup
- Richard Scully
 - If this went back to the small groups, it would be ok if we could have the small groups review what the others did. That's why I'd like to do it as a whole workgroup
- Justin Hayes
 - I think that one of the challenges of looking at small groups efforts is the idea of the tyranny of the last editor.
 - We agree on things that work for the 5 of us but it gets changed and we changed other ones
 - Maybe we could get a list together of what has been included and dropped and such and then perhaps we could run those as homework on our own and then we would have that information where we could see consensus or not
- Will Hart
 - I echo support for Justin's idea
 - The tyranny of the last group idea, our group decided to keep the breach idea on the list because we knew it was important to others
 - Where do we mix in the idea or is it not worth it?
- David Doeringsfeld
 - Trying to process all this
 - Justin makes a good point
 - Even if we take these items into the matrix how does it get us anywhere?
 - It doesn't rank anything, and the matrix has subjective features with no scale.
 - I don't know that it moves us forward and that's a concern for me
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think Justin's idea would take care of the outliers that got dropped
 - To Dave, yes objectivity is a difficult place, but I mean to say is that we could take this exercise and aggregate averages

- I think we are going to run into that regardless, but I think this gets us started
- Joe Oatman
 - We talked about earlier about finalizing final drafts
 - Once we get the SME feedback
 - I think at some stage we'll need impact analysis
 - I think the idea of having experts help was to narrow the field
- Richard Scully
 - I support Justin's idea and support Aaron
 - It may be messy but I think it's a good place to start
 - Mean and range values could give us a table to work from
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Does anybody have issue with Joe's idea with SME's doing the matrix parallel?
 - I think it would be instructive
- Justin Hayes
 - I think it places people who have been helping us in a difficult spot
 - They would be state employees tied by the accords
- Mike Edmondson
 - That would not limit our ability to answer your questions
 - There are more realistic challenges such as time and workload
 - As long as they are willing to, we could try to do it
- Katherine Himes
 - I want to summarize before we shift gears so we're all on the same page
- Justin Hayes
 - I have some staffing capacity that could take the simple task of sorting and not doing any editing
- *People expressed agreement*
- Katherine Himes
 - Justin, to be clear it would be the compiling of all the things that all of the subgroups have done to show where they are the same
- Justin Hayes
 - Just volunteering to aggregate data
- Katherine Himes
 - And then when do you think they could have it completed and then how would we go about inserting into the Matrix
- Justin Hayes
 - We could get our part done by end of next week
 - Then I think we move into the homework assignment
- Brian Brooks
 - An idea I want to through out on the pros and cons of having SMEs going through matrix
 - Pros are that they have a lot of scientific knowledge and perhaps less influenced by interests
 - Cons we may be putting them in an uncomfortable spot
 - They are the ones closest to the science and may be informational to see what they have to say
- Katherine Himes
 - Would like to put a pin in that and save it for a later discussion section

Report Draft Sections and Next Steps Discussion Dr. Katherine Himes, UI

- Katherine Himes
 - Earlier you received a draft intro to the final report
 - Mainly process and informational
 - They are for your review at your pleasure and it is yours to review and provide any edits
 - The purpose today is just a general discussion is if this is helpful or in the vein of what you're looking for a final draft.
 - Just want to open the discussion and hear what you think
- Will Hart
 - I think that you are on the right track
 - I've been doing this type of stuff for a long time and what you've done here is similar to other things I've seen from other efforts
 - I think you're on the right track on how we would produce the product
- Joe Oatman
 - Comment: haven't gone through in detail
 - Need to take some more time to review
 - When I think about the outline
 - Maybe before number 3 in workgroup process we could lay out things that we were involved in
 - What does success look like to us?
 - Policy statement
 - Guiding principles
 - Provide a description of the assignment that was provided because it will lead into the policy drafting
 - Will help connect the dots from day one
 - What's striking to me on number 1 call to action – collaborative history
 - I don't recall that we had any information on those collaborative efforts and what the state successfully did on those efforts
 - Putting those in here raises question
 - I understand purpose of it, but I just haven't had info on those efforts and don't have the information to know how those worked
 - Get the spirit of the idea
- Scott Hauser
 - Want to confirm that you received my comments that I sent to you on August 17th
 - Joe touched on some of the things
- Katherine Himes
 - I received them as well
 - Also, as we look through, see if there are sections that you connect with and would like to help edit and add
 - Don't want to redline right now but would like you to send comments to me if you'd like
 - Think about how you would like to expand or edit sections
 - Are there any other comments, questions, ideas, etc.?
- Kira Finkler
 - Could you tell us what date to get you suggested edits?
- Katherine Himes
 - It's on the table as September 20th

- What we're looking forward today is general feelings and thoughts like Will and Joe provided
- Paul Arrington
 - Are we locked into that schedule? That vote was yes but want to make sure
- Katherine Himes
 - My plan was to send an email after this meeting with all the proposed deadlines
 - Keep in mind that you will also be doing your matrix homework around the same time
- Brian Brooks
 - I agree that it seems like it is going in the right direction and is a good starting point
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I sent back out the document from earlier with the comments on the calendar but some of them were decision points and would like to know how we handle those.
- Katherine Himes
 - Great questions, we have time on the agenda to discuss things like that a little later
- Joe Oatman
 - Going back throughs Jim Fredricks first presentation he had a lot of graphics on returns in relation to different goals
 - I think something like that in here would be helpful to give context of where we are right now
 - Also, could also have some information on estimated historical populations and that will provide the context for our group and mission statement, etc.
- Justin Hayes
 - I'm almost hesitant to raise this; we're kind of missing the elephant in the room.
 - I wonder if there needs to be discussion about the things in the now that keep the region from things from doing things that are apparent to that
 - We're not reaching consensus on dam breaching and its in relation to the impact it has on other communities and it may be worth including a description of that issue to show why it is not being done
- Mike Edmondson
 - This is a starting point and the workgroup is allowed to rewrite it
 - Goal was to give group a starting point, so they didn't have to start from scratch
- Mark Menlove
 - I'm wondering who our intended audience beyond the Governor?
 - Will it be bound and widely distributed or just for Governor?
 - I think that affects how relevant some of this information is
- Katherine Himes
 - Governor is certainly key audience but does seem like it will be of interest to others in the region
 - I think that is an important question for the workgroup to consider and talk about what level of understanding are we assuming the reader has
 - May affect how we handle things like the appendix as well
- Mike Edmondson
 - I reviewed it with the knowledge that the authors were given some examples that were well received, and it followed those
- Mark Menlove

- I do think it is a great start
-

Agenda Subgroup Update (Mark Menlove)

- Mark Menlove
 - Probably easiest to just run through the items that we've identified
 - We talked about evening for doing public comment
 - List of technical topics to be addressed
 - Run reconstruction
 - Regional returns
 - NOAA 5 year review/ recovery plans (no consensus yet)
 - Optimizing supplementation
 - Monitoring
 - More detail on Clearwater and Dworshak
 - Abundance and harvest
 - Update from Congressman Simpsons office
 - You've been given dates for future meetings
 - Another thing that came up was having a conversation of whether this group continues after the December deadline to gauge desire
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Mark, I think you covered it
 - One other thing I would bring up is that the technical topic items were largely carried over from previous agenda items
 - We talked about whether it was the best use of our time to go back into technical topics at this time
 - For my part I'm not sure that it is
- Mark Menlove
 - Good point, we're going to have full agendas already
- Richard Scully
 - It seemed to me that we pretty well covered all the technical information
 - I think the important thing is to figure out how to use the information we have to make a final product
- Chad Colter
 - On the NOAA 5 year report
 - Even if we decide to have a presentation on it won't be an updated report. They just started gathering this year
 - I don't think we'll gain anything from that when there's no report
- Mark Menlove
 - Are there any items on the list that we want to address or to we leave our agendas to fill with items on our proposed timeline?
- Richard Scully
 - The only one I'd like to hear from is Representative Simpson update
 - Over a year ago he was pretty upbeat about recovering Salmon
 - At his level, he can look at the different possibilities
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I believe that Mikes email said that they weren't available at this time
- Mike Edmondson
 - When I emailed you their message that they were not ready to deliver their position, but we should check back in with them later

- Joe Oatman
 - Should we work to figure out how incorporate public comment
 - Possibly include nature of comments instead of just number
 - We've identified high end goals and one thing of interest would be if we reached these goals, what would the level of harvest be? Tribe has done some study in this area and may be of interest
- Mike Edmondson
 - To the public comment, a few things that have been discussed have been an enumeration of the amount, hours, time etc. but not the nature of them
 - Good be an appendix or separate document. It's a high volume of material and it could be discussed
- David Doeringsfeld
 - I would suggest it lives on an OSC web page with everything available for review

Funding Senator Johnson and Representative Wood

- Senator Johnson
 - My concern and I think that of Rep Wood was peaked a little bit and saw all the comments in our documents about securing funding
 - None of them were very specific about where funding may come from. Someone will have to pay for these programs
 - I know many of you are better informed on these topics than me.
 - My comments today are my own and not anyone else's
 - One idea about team Dragon note, about increasing funding
 - Was talk about creating state dedicated funding
 - Also said state should be exhaustive and opportunistic in pursuing funding
 - Also recognize that we use BPA dollars as match for other grants so there is a large risk if we lose it
 - Had discussion on options we may have as representatives to explore funding opportunities
 - From a State level
 - If we had a resolution or statute that identified how to raise funds and where they would go, would it look like the OSC format?
 - Should we look at IDFG to work with other states to identify other sources of funding
 - Other states have salmon groups
 - Maybe working with some of these groups to explore some of these funding programs
 - I apologize to have missed so much of this meeting
 - I think from a legislative standpoint, we are interested of developing some sort of developed statement on funding and fine tune it
 - At that point I think we can begin to identify revenue and funding portions from the State level
 - I think all of the various comments should come under one funding umbrella policy recommendation
 - After all the time we've put into this, I would feel bad if we came up with effective recommendations for recovery but didn't have the money to do that
 - I've heard talk about ratepayers paying currently but I think we can look for new ideas

- Joe Oatman
 - Thank you, Senator Johnson. There were some interesting points in the BPA presentation this morning and they were talking about the Accord extension for the next 2 years to give people space for people to develop new and innovative ideas for Fish.
 - Could be an opportunity that the State has in long term accord to incorporate things that come from this workgroup
 - Previously we were considered on the agenda item, but the Nez Perce decided to not pursue an Accord
- Senator Johnson
 - Were there any new ideas that came out in the subgroups on specific opportunities to target funding? If there is something I can do legislatively I'd like to look into it.
- Richard Scully
 - Seems like BPA, Snake River Recovery, PCSRF, seems like a short list of funding sources and haven't heard of any new ones coming up
- David Doeringsfeld
 - Are there any general fund monies that go to salmon recovery?
- Senator Johnson
 - I'm not on appropriations so I don't know specifically how the monies are spent. We approve dedicated funds to agency programs and not sure how they get spent specifically
 - When it comes down to dollars coming from BPA and others and how it's distributed, we'd have to have a discussion with them
 - I think it's a good question to see if there is a place where the legislature could get involved through appropriating general funds if needed
 - Takes some creativity to develop those ideas and bring them to the legislature
- David Doeringsfeld
 - Makes sense that if funding is pervasive that we have one section on it and maybe call out General Funding
- Mark Menlove
 - If there are things where this group identifies where state dollars may be helpful, even if outside the recommendation, what would be the best format to bring those forward
- Senator Johnson
 - I wouldn't get too specific in report
 - If a framework was put together or a policy statement that says where the need is
 - Once we do that then we have some programs in place that could possibly gain funding
 - Question was asked earlier who is the end reader of this report
 - Obviously, the Governor and he needs to be able to work with it
 - I think if we develop ideas in open fashion it leaves opportunity
 - Example is permanent building fund, its very vague
 - Could have a similar policy on salmon and then the legislature can work out details of where money would best be spent
- Stacey Satterlee
 - Comment: if anything, I think this conversation is grounding for our group
 - Up till now we haven't really allowed lack of funding to limit ideas
 - Basically, just agreed that we need more

- Everyone thinks that their project is the most deserving of funding
- If this does go through it will take all of us to look together to find additional funding
- I think making a strong case in the report and some ideas it would be helpful
- There's a finite amount of money available and we'll have to fight to increase our share at all
- Chad Colter
 - Yesterday we were given 11 minutes to give our vision on the future
 - I gave ShoBan vision of returning to natural river through a funding program that would aid in keeping people whole
 - Also talked about bringing people who are not whole now back to being whole
 - Our long term vision is about removal of the lower snake river dams but recognizes that it's a federal decision. That's why I mention the Power Act 2.0
 - Discussing with my own people is where the idea came for a 20 year budget neutral program
 - Would allow BPA to increase borrowing authority
 - Would provide funding for dam removal, infrastructure improvements, Fish and wildlife mitigation efforts
 - Along with that comes opportunities for economic system, smart transmission system, job opportunities,
 - Funding for restoration of river corridor and irrigation improvements
 - The idea is that this Act needs to provide all the tools in the toolbox
 - Would move authority to regional group that gave Tribes a seat at the table
 - After yesterday, I really realized that we have the people to fill in the blanks on this idea
 - There are some ideas out there on funding, but it would take all of us coming together with an open mind
- Richard Scully
 - I realize that IDFG gets their funds separate from the legislature and ESA dollars probably go to OSC
 - Do you find that the legislature is generally sympathetic to the Salmon and Steelhead issue and its wide impacts?
- Senator Johnson
 - I think that is the question I am trying to answer.
 - When I was asked to provide comments in Lewiston and there was a slide with a million points on it
 - The statement I made was that if you looked at them like an equation and if you took the single issue and tried to solve any one topic area and you tried to optimize the solution
 - You could say using these dependent variables
 - When you are trying to solve them all at the same time the answers that you get independently will be smaller
 - There may be topics we've identified that the legislature would be very worried about
 - When we do budgeting there is some give and take
 - It was mentioned earlier about having to fight for these funds. Dollars are hard to come by

- I think legislatures care very much about this issue. Many aspects affect different areas of interest.
- Justin Hayes
 - Through all of the small workgroup discussions that we've had we have observed that if we are to succeed, the work that is done needs to be increased in scope and scale
 - It's going to be important to find an Idaho funding source, but it will be small slice of pie
 - But need to work with congressional delegation to increase the pot of money
 - Need to imagine giant system change and increasing funding is going to be incredibly important and could be a strong recommendation of this group
- Brian Brooks
 - I think this is good conversation but we're already the most expensive species recovery effort in history
 - If we increase funding without addressing what the reason is that we're spending so much money, it will be to no avail
- Senator Johnson
 - When we talk about an Idaho solution we need to come up with concrete solution. Showing we're committed to this sends message to feds, congress, and partners that we are serious about this issue
 - I don't want to focus too much on money in the past but if there's things we could do in Idaho that can show we can manage that, I think that is beneficial
- Merrill Beyeler
 - Land and Water Conservation funding – Could that be applied to what we're trying to do here in Idaho?
- Mike Edmondson
 - We're looking at it, IDFG is looking at it, and partners but its new and we haven't found out yet

General Discussion and Next Steps Dr. Katherine Himes, UI and Mike Edmondson, OSC

- Mike Edmondson
 - *Gave summary of points made thus far in this meeting*
 - Need to have discussion on how these steps tie into the time frame
 - Maybe the folks that put the timeline together could offer some comments on how they think this might fit in
- Katherine Himes
 - *Put topics and table up on screen*
 - Don't yet have homework assignment on timeline
- Joe Oatman
 - I think relative to the homework assignment, that would take place at the October 27 deadline, right?
 - The other consideration would be to move it to September 30 deadline to give some time to process
- Katherine Himes
 - Does that timing make sense?
 - Want to make sure what we mean by that
- Justin Hayes
 - My sense is that if we get it to you by the 4th, I think if we tread water until October 27 then we are way behind schedule

- Paul Arrington
 - That seems like a really tight timeframe to turn around a document. I would leave it at the 20th and we'll get it to you, so you have time to put it together
- Mike Edmondson
 - Do we see anything that is missing?
- Kira Finkler
 - When you say that you will compile homework, does that mean you will show what the workgroup members all said for each one.
- Katherine Himes
 - I don't know for sure how it will play out. I'll have to play with it and see what makes sense
- Mike Edmondson
 - Your input here is helping develop a detailed roadmap so we can move through these next step
 - Are we good with this and move on to next item?
- Katherine Himes
 - Do we still want the small group, or did we move past that?
- Justin Hayes
 - We moved passed it
- Katherine Himes
 - Do we want to move other parts of the schedule up since we moved the other part up? What do we want to do in October?
- Paul Arrington
 - How do we fill in the gaps?
 - Also, getting the approval from our groups takes time so if we can leave a larger window on the backend to give that opportunity may be beneficial
- Katherine Himes
 - I've aspirationally moved the aggregation to October 27
- Stacey Satterlee
 - This was definitely made to be co-opted and added to and I think this has been useful
- Mark Menlove
 - I feel good about it and getting this draft on paper has relieved a lot of my concern. I'll admit to some concern about the element Paul brought up about getting this reviewed and approved by our organizations
 - Sounds like it creates the opportunity for not all group members to sign off on a final report
 - I think whatever we can do to avoid that and avoid negotiations would be best
- Mike Edmondson
 - I think offline it would be good to talk to some of the alumni of other efforts of how that has been dealt with.
- Brett Dumas
 - I think it's nice to have it laid out. It's what we've been needed
- Stacey Satterlee
 - As far as I'm concerned, this is where the Agenda sub committee will go
- Justin Hayes

- Just want to remind people that earlier we had wondered if the 18th would be a meeting with the Governor or if it would be a report
- Mike Edmondson
 - That date is essentially meaningless, I artificially chose it because it's a week before the traditional holidays start
 - We'll have to discuss that with the Governor's office to see if that's a possibility
 - Next on the list is how to handle consensus
 - Katherine what are some common ways that this is dealt with? May be helpful to have some menu items
- Katherine Himes
 - Lots of ways to do it and it depends on where the group is
 - There's always the show of hands where we go line by line and see where consensus is
 - Often, it's helpful if you have an issue with some language, you offer an alternative
 - I think that this group has talked about both.
 - I think there are opportunities to share and talk out sticking points
 - Also need to discuss the other part which is what about the things that have almost consensus?
- Mike Edmondson
 - I like iterative process myself to get easy work done first
 - Maybe identify the ones we do have consensus move them aside and then work on the ones we don't.
 - Try to get as many in consensus pile as possible. Need to use our time wisely
- Justin Hayes
 - I wonder if someone if someone on this group has some more experiences about this issue in other functional collaboratives
 - I think it may be good to hear if there are some best management practices that have been found
- Merrill Beyeler
 - I think all of the things that have been said fit right into those
 - I think we vote if we can't get consensus, we offer alternatives
 - I think mike is right about getting the easy stuff off the table first and then work to modify the ones that have near consensus
- Katherine Himes
 - Another thing I've seen is in an instance where you get close but can't get there, you put it in a small group and let them hash it out and bring it back
- Richard Scully
 - In this process for consensus, a concern I have is that I want to make sure that we don't come up with a long list of small impact recommendations
 - Don't want to give small impact and have it held up as sufficient to bring back Salmon
 - I want to make sure that in this list, we have some high impact
 - Don't want to just do the same things we've always done
 - We want to feel proud about this at the end
- Will Hart
 - I have stated before politely as possible but now I'm getting slightly offended of dismissing areas where we have consensus because of a perception of low impact

- I think we if we're working towards consensus then we may have to accept ideas that aren't our favorites
- I don't want to dismiss ideas that a lot of work has been done
- Can't be non-collaborative just because there are things on there that you don't like
- I think in the spirit of collaboration lets get those things done and then have conversations about the more difficult issues
- Joe Oatman
 - I appreciate this conversation
 - In other groups we applied the idea that some of things address things that are already happening
 - How we characterize those things that are ongoing may affect how we move forward
- Merrill Beyeler
 - I think as we go through this consensus process, we do have to take the first step on the things we can agree on
 - Then we start to ask whether collectively whether what we recommend would move the needle in the right direction
 - Small step is important to building trust
- Kira Finkler
 - Thank you Will. You have always been very upfront about your feelings. I will share a little different perspective
 - My organization feels just as strongly about not recommending meaningful action to the governor as you and your group feels against recommending breaching
 - I want to be as upfront with you as you've been with us
- Mark Menlove
 - Building on what Merrill has said
 - There are members of group that have worked on other groups
 - I would be happy to share some of my staff that has worked on some issues like this and they could be an asset
- Mike Edmondson
 - Just a few minutes left and a few topics
 - We'll go to topic rotation
- Katherine Himes
 - The point is that some of the added topics to small groups have not been seen by all the groups like all the 4 H's were
 - Is there something that needs to be visited by another small group? Do we need another rotation
- David Doeringsfeld
 - Until we get the compilation, I don't know what we've missed and then I could identify what I've missed.
- Katherine Himes
 - The really new stuff is
 - Funding, economic impact studies, and monitoring
- Brett Dumas
 - I think that the small workgroups are seeing diminishing returns in efforts and I don't see the value in rehashing it again
 - Maybe something targeted to focus on funding but not a new whole cycle

Break

Public Comment

- Aimee Christensen: Irrigation ditch Valley Cr steelhead example. Works with energy and environment. Inspired to build a better world the critical and only solution is to breach LSRD. To meet goals cost effectively is to beach. We have the resources. We underestimate ourselves. We can meet all needs and the Governor's charge.
- Nic Nelson: IRU: Speaking on behalf of 5000 members & Volunteers. Signed Accord on May 2, 2008 in exchange. NWP. CWA. ESA etc. in exchange for funding. Current process is not in the public realm. 2008/2010. States Accord is unlawful or NEPA is unlawful. Unhappy that 2018 Accord focuses on accomplishments. Asks that workgroup make formal recommendation that Idaho not sign Accord and do NEPA.
- Dave Cannamela: Yesterday's meeting did exactly what we needed. Science is clear we need to eliminate LSRD. Very important point: dams made many losers and few winners. We were supposed to be kept whole. Tribes have suffered much more and much longer. There is hardline opposition to dam removal and we need to seize on hope and opportunity. Hauser's photo of kids on the Malheur capture's my vision for the future. All easy things are done and only the hard things can achieve the future we need. Dam breaching has taught us it works every time. There are not enough crumbs to make a cake.
- Jo Philpott: Thank you for chance to speak. Lives in Salmon: guides, research, habitat improvement as background. IN order to move forward we need to get out of silos and walk in each other's shoes and move forward. What compromises we each can make. Restructure this house of cards we have built. The whole is greater than the sum of its parts.
- Ettie Philpott: I am 6 years old. I went on a paddleboard with my Mom and saw a salmon. Please get salmon back.
- Gillian Philpott: I am 5 years old. I went to the creek with my grandpa and saw a steelhead. Please bring them back.
- Terry Myers: Yesterday I listened in to the meetings. Aaron question to Yost was a look back and didn't give me hope. Restoring abundant salmon is our charge and didn't hear what could work. You all are leaders and you need to have hope in the time of change. Energy and environment are the most changeable and adaptable. Come together and work hard for solutions and not work to maintain a status-quo. Thank you.
- Jerry Myers: Retired river outfitter and guide and tired grandpa. Live on ranch down the Salmon river. Thank you for your work. Listened to the envisioning the future section and suggest that we schedule a session of just Q & A between workgroup members. We care about the resource and intrinsic value of these fish. Fish advocates understand the gift that fish are. Tribes are not fulfilled. Technology is changing the way we make power. What will BPA do with the dams that are not viable in the future. Will BPA run the system for transportation. Justin is looking 20 years ahead that is doable and I will do my part to support the workgroup. Get out on a river.
- Debbie Stempf: I am from Spokane. Thank you for taking my comments. I go to Stanley basin every summer to enjoy the beauty. I go to look for the salmon and cheer when they jump up the waterfall and boo when they fall back. Salmon bring the goodness of the ocean to the center of this state Salmon have given their full measure and I am saddened by this drop in our iconic fish. Some industries seem to be more important than our fish and people in central Idaho. Tribes were guaranteed by the govt. to fish. I am disappointed we are not fulfilling our promise. Our fish are disappearing. \$17B and no

fish. Dams and salmon are not compatible. Hatcheries are a myth that have been perpetuated. Salmon are not the problem they are the blessing.

- Will Stubb: I am an educator and a river guide from Teton valley, ID. I was lucky enough to go down the MFSR soon after I moved to Idaho. I got to see a salmon in a small tributary to the MFSR. I am always educating our guests and they are always impacted by this story. We are not doing what we need to do to recover the salmon. Breach. I do not support the extension of the Idaho fish accord.
- Julie Sheen: I am a farmer from southeast Idaho. The only result that will save the salmon is the removal of the lower snake river dams. I do not support the Accord and it might hinder the workgroup. We now have solar and wind and can replace the dams and plan for their replacement. I fear we will have something like a dead river. I learned in school of the immense salmon runs and their return to their native river. Idaho is our home and is more than an arbitrary land mass and a home is a place that provides abundance. Beech the dams now to save the salmon.
- Stephen Pfeiffer: Conservation Associate with Idaho Salmon and Steelhead United. Runs are down and old timers recall the abundant returns to Idaho, ESA saved are fish and they are still headed toward extinction. Salmon will not be saved with piecemeal projects in isolated locations. I am worried that we are headed to the end/beginning of this recovery cycle and the populations will oscillate back towards extinction. I urge you all to think bigger. I ask you to think about the what ifs behind a NWPA v2.0. I urge you all to tackle this issue head on. Advocate for regional leadership and congressional legislation.
- Bill Caccia: Thank you for hosting. I am an old Idaho teacher and river guide. I remember fishing in the 50's. It was an incredible life-changing experience. Related bring clients to experience salmon in the tributaries of the MFSR. Noted salmon return down to salmon river until tributaries cool down. Salmon face many struggles. My family farms grain in norther Idaho. Train transportation works. Beach Lower 4 SRDS.
- Bert Bowler: Been watching the last 2 days. Been working Idaho salmon issue for the last 4 decades. GSW's work is quite impressive. Describes two modeling efforts in CRSO converging on Alt 3 as best for salmon. Delayed mortality is a red herring and included in SARS. Compensating the benefits of the FCRPS is justified. Justin concept of the Salmon surge makes sense. Supports Simpson's NWP Act 2.0 and dovetails nicely with Justin's idea.
- Ann Christiansen: I arrive in Stanley in 1978 and bought the Circle A ranch. Found salmon in their irrigation ditches. Saved the spawner and thus began her love of the salmon. The science is there and we know that the only way to save our salmon is too breach the dams. The salmon will do their job once they can get through. Judge Redden was right and I don't want to outlive the salmon. They bring the ocean nutrients to the mountains. Please Governor think about what you are doing and how it will go down in the history books. This in the only place that climate change won't destroy. Please save the salmon.

Adjourn

