

Governor's Salmon Workgroup Meeting
September 29, 2020
Video Meeting
Public Comment

Workgroup members present

- Mark Menlove
- Scott Houser
- Kira Finkler
- Justin Hayes
- Paul Arrington
- Brian Brooks
- Aaron Lieberman
- Richard Scully
- Mike Edmondson
- Katherine Himes
- Dan Johnson
- Stacey Satterlee
- Brett Dumas
- Joe Oatman
- Merrill Beyeler
- Will Hart
- Dave Doeringsfeld

Intro: Mike Edmonson

- *Gave background of group and instructions for public comment*
- If no questions, then we'll get started

Public Comment

- Dave Cannamela
 - *The German, Yonhan Wolfhan quote*
 - One of my friends told me that ships are safe in the harbor but that's not what they're for
 - Vision and courage are two prerequisites for leadership
 - We have an obligation to restore the snake river and the anadromous fish runs
 - We owe it to many different people
 - We owe it to future generations who depend on us to preserve the treasures of this planet
 - The best and brightest future has a free flowing Snake River

- The Dams have reached their life expectancy and it is time to retire them and begin anew
- The Lower Snake must be restored to restore our fish runs
- We have proof that dam removal is a highly reliable recovery effort
- All that remains to be seen is what the Governor will do
- Will he come together to work with other states or stay in the harbor
- Many negative things with inaction
- Jonas Seiler
 - I am a river and fishing guide in Salmon Idaho with Wilderness Outfitters
 - Couple things to add this time around and that is to encourage you to keep the big picture in your mind
 - Some reports coming in that steelhead numbers are looking better this year but let's keep in mind that the long run is what matters here
 - We're shooting for abundant runs in the long term and not just "better" in the short term
 - I think we need to focus on our guides and outfitters not just with the effects of the low numbers but also detriments from the pandemic
 - Encourage you all to consider really bold action in considering removing the lower 4 Snake River dams
 - If that is not possible in the short term, I encourage you to recommend to the governor everything else that will help our salmon
 - Let's not be the generation to lose salmon and steelhead
 - These fish are one of the reasons that I moved to Idaho
 - I am reminded the enormity of their journey
 - I encourage you to visit their spawning grounds to understand how amazing it is
 - Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I know this is not an easy process
 - I really hope you can give the Governor some informed and helpful recommendations
- Julie Sheen
 - I am speaking today because your leadership is urgently needed to recover salmon and steelhead
 - We know that the only action to recover salmon is to remove the lower snake dams
 - I think Idahoans would be amazed at how much tax money has been spent with no improvement
 - As a rural state we need thriving rural economies
 - The science is simple, the dams make the water too warm for salmon
 - ICL has outlined a 10 year plan for replacing the function of the dams along with conservation matters for salmon and steelhead
 - The least we can do now is to start in on renewable energy, irrigation, and navigation options to make it possible
 - I'm a farmer in Idaho and so is my family and we all care about this issue deeply

- You are experts on Idaho salmon and steelhead and must know better than anyone how important breaching is
- Nic Nelson
 - Good evening and to the moderators
 - I'm the Executive Director of Idaho Rivers United
 - *Cited fish return numbers*
 - Recent return numbers celebrated in the media should not be celebrated
 - Salmon and steelhead brought me to Idaho
 - I attended U of I for its quality of education, but Salmon and Steelhead fishing brought the real allure
 - Science is clear that bringing down the dams is necessary for recovery
 - Recovery must be about people too
 - Must ensure that farmers can irrigate and transport their crops
 - Must make port of Lewiston whole
 - Must consider fisheries
 - Remember what your charge was from the Governor
 - If we make bold decisions, we can be proud of what we recovered
 - While you represent your constituencies, you must represent how committed your constituents are to salmon recovery
 - Each of you has the opportunity to play a role in the largest river restoration in history
- Julia Page
 - I am here simply as a friend of wild salmon
 - I've attended a few meetings and mostly what I've heard is rehashing of what has been going on and where we are now
 - Where we are now is on a perilous decline
 - I'm stressed and asking what is the matter?
 - Why is the Workgroup not looking at the one option that holds our hope to restore sustainable numbers of salmon?
 - I spent 26 years as owner/operator on Yellowstone river
 - I've seen the Snake above lower Granite and that is not a river. That is a dead pool
 - How the poor fish make it through that, I don't know
 - I hope that the Workgroup will start exploring all the things that need to be done to restore salmon
 - Look at the problems we need to solve
 - Irrigations
 - Transportation
 - My Husband played a trick on me when we first arrived. went to dagger falls and when a fish finally came and tried to jump up through the falls it was the most amazing sight.
 - We have something special here in Idaho and if we're not careful they will go extinct

- Alex Ode
 - I'm a farmer born and raised in Boise
 - We know what needs to be done and must act now
 - We must remove the Lower Snake dams
 - The science is simple
 - Before the dams were built it took smolts about a week, now it takes about a month
 - We can look at the Yakima river to see what kind of returns we may have
 - Their returns have not been affected like our Idaho returns have been affected
 - When both populations only had 4 dams to navigate, they were both healthy, now ours are not
 - This path towards extinction can be reversed and if we do the whole ecosystem will be restored
 - Restoring a free flowing river is essential
 - Do the right thing for Idaho salmon and breach the dams
- Asa Menlove
 - Just a few weeks ago I wrapped up my first week of guiding
 - It really is a dream job
 - The river is a gathering place for all the best things in life
 - Salmon and steelhead are inextricably linked to the health of the ecosystem
 - This season I saw just 3 reds
 - This pattern is unsustainable and if it continues, they will go extinct
 - Cannot allow Salmon to be the victim of industrialism
 - Past Idahoans have done a tremendous job of protecting our jewels like the Wilderness Act
 - Your generation is failing to ensure that it thrives
 - Need to tell Governor the truth, the Lower Snake river dams need to be removed
 - Anything less than that is inadequate
 - How will you be remembered
- Shiva Rajbhandari
 - Thank you for opportunity to comment
 - Right now is the time to act to
 - The land in question is stolen land from tribes
 - What is left are agreements that say that there will be fish in the river
 - Change is scary
 - My dad grew up in a monarchy in which there was a 30% literacy rate and books were banned
 - Now there is a 90% literacy rate
 - Lower 4 dams will be breached
 - They are unnecessary in light of other power sources
 - All this workgroup and the Governor (kings of Idaho) get to decide when the dams come down
 - Could forsake all we could gain for all the things we could lose

- The day I caught my first fish was one of the best days of my life
- They continue to be a source of happiness and pride for Idahoans
- Please think of that joy for the next 100 years when you make recommendations
- Jeff Bitton
 - Thank you work group for your work on this process
 - I am here to remind you of the industry and river communities that have been impacted from the lack of fish
 - Your job is to look at the whole picture and find a path forward
 - I hope you will consider the rural areas that depend on the salmon and steelhead for their livelihood
 - I live in Stanley and we used to have many people come for the fish and now they don't
 - I encourage you to consider that as you make your recommendations
- Ed Cannady
 - Thank you for taking my comment
 - I know how difficult this task is
 - If it was easy it would have been done a long time ago
 - For the last 25 years I was responsible for monitoring Chinook in Salmon, ID
 - These fish are true miracles of nature
 - We could not imagine up creatures this amazing and we hold their fate in our hands
 - Please always keep the fish foremost in your mind
 - We humans have options to meet our needs, but the fish only have one option
 - I ask you to have the same courage as Congressmen Simpson to restore runs
 - Please imagine the amazing journey of Salmon and steelhead going out to the Ocean and finding their way all the way back to Idaho and back to Salmon to their natal gravel
 - I am in awe of their magnificence and they deserve our utmost efforts to recover them
 - Do we want our legacy to be losing these fish?
 - Thank you again for your efforts
- Bill Belknap
 - Retired professional biologist
 - Born in Nampa Idaho and I hunted and fished in Idaho all my life
 - The Snake river from Swan falls to Marsing was my playground
 - In the fall you didn't play much because the stench of the dead salmon was overwhelming
 - I took a trip when they were building Brownlee and saw the fish trap. It was not working, and they were closing the bypass
 - Idaho power came to the rescue with Hatcheries
 - People came up with millions of dollars for modifications to try to get fish passed dams

- It used to be that in Stanley you could drive along the river and see 10-20 salmon in each hole and now you have a hard time finding any salmon in that river
- Biologists have studied the river and recommend that the dams be removed
- Is this a card game you have to play? Do you have the options to remove the dams?
- Mike Crapo did the Owyhee Initiative and Simpson did White Clouds and were both successful
- **JB Harts**
 - I've been very fortunate to spend time in central Idaho and headwaters of salmon river
 - Beautiful place that is dependent on returning salmon for a thriving ecosystem
 - Please keep in mind that those returning salmon are critical for that ecosystem
 - It is a livelihood for many people and is a pleasure to fish
 - The few fish that return are a wonderful treasure but we need to do more
 - The dams are not an answer
 - The warm water and slow movement to the ocean are a big factor in reducing populations
 - The dams are not helping Central Idaho, its economy, or the environment
 - Please do what is necessary
- **Matt Woodard**
 - I'm a lifelong Idahoan
 - I started out as an Idaho dry farmer then spent about 10 years working for John Deere
 - Spent about the last 12 years in my life with Trout Unlimited
 - I think the time is now to save Idaho Salmon and steelhead by removing the lower 4 snake river dams
 - I think we've studied this issue long enough and we've just got to grab the reigns and get it done
 - If we don't do something quick, we will lose this iconic species and Idaho will not be the same
 - Thank you to the Workgroup for your efforts and I hope you are successful
- **Liz Paul**
 - I am going to read comments from Emily Pinkney who published this in the Tacoma News
 - Was happy to hear that the Orca gave birth to a healthy new calf
 - Every new calf is precious
 - I am concerned still that these orcas must search for ever scarce salmon
 - Over 100 species rely on salmon
 - They support countless rural communities
 - They are a keystone tribal culture and food source
 - Today salmon are reaching a tipping point
 - Other river systems need attention too

- Recently these Snake River dams were implicated in making water temps lethal to salmon
- Models show that removing the dams would be the single most impactful action for salmon and orcas
- Salmon built and defined this region
- What is good for the salmon is good for all
- Do we want a future where orcas and humans can thrive?
- Colby Blair (provided written comment in chat box)
 - Thank you to the whole group for your attention on the issues of steelhead and salmon. I am an outfitter in Idaho, and our clients provide a lot of boost to the local economies around the state. As we plan our future business and monitor the actions of Idaho, we're hopeful that the decisions made are favorable to the salmon and steelhead industry, and all industries in the state, in a balanced way. I'm looking forward to seeing the leaders work together, and not leaving our industry out. How well they do this will determine how much business and economy companies like us can provide to Idaho.

Adjourned 5:59PM

Governor's Salmon Workgroup

September 30, 2020

Virtual Meeting

Workgroup Members Present

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

Introduction – Katherine Himes and Mike Edmondson

- Katherine Himes
 - Gave welcome and Purpose and History of Workgroup
 - *Put up slide of covered topics*
 - All future meetings are listed on the Governor's Office of Species Conservation website
 - *Had Workgroup members introduce themselves*
 - Thank you, public and workgroup members, for meeting
 - Introduced Sam Eaton

Update from Governor's Office – Sam Eaton

- Sam Eaton

- Good morning. Good to see you all again. Really getting to know your living rooms
- I'll try to be quick and then answer questions
- I've been filling in the Governor and he keeps more appraised of this issue than you probably realize
- From his and my perspective we think you've made huge progress since June
- I know it's been a lot of work and tough conversations, but you've handled it impressively
- I know we've got 3 months until this wraps up but its like the last few miles in a marathon
- Each of you know why you were selected for this workgroup. Expertise and your ability to collaborate and move issues forward
- Also because of your ability to make decisions in real time which will be essential in this final part of the process
- The perspective of the Governor for this Workgroup was not to change opinions but to gather perspectives and educate each other and then coalesce around areas of agreement
- With the time left in the process I think it's time to focus on the issues that can have consensus and not get hung up on the ones you know will not
- I have gotten questions on consensus items and non-consensus items
- I'll repeat what the Governor said at first meeting, you are the architects of your own destiny. Not meant to be a state run process and it was meant for you to decide what makes it into the final report
- Consensus is hard to describe but you know it when you see it
- Many of you have been on collaborative groups and know how it works
- May not require voting or a unanimous approval
- Personally, I don't think voting is a helpful exercise and don't be afraid to let items fall off the table
- The report was not intended to be a technical document. It was meant for the Governor and Public to be able to read and understand
- I think the body needs to be as concise as you can get it, but it may be important for context to have those recommendations that don't make it in an appendix.
- For the actual body of the report, I think it is important that it is clear and concise
- I think it's important that you don't get hung up on the items that won't reach consensus or fall of the table. May be tough to navigate but I would hate for anyone on the workgroup to not support a recommendation because they don't think it moves the needle as far as they think they should
- I've seen a lot of good recommendations in the draft material
- Species recovery is a world of incrementalism. Doesn't mean you shouldn't aim high but need to recognize that an incremental move is still a move
- The fact that this group is moving in a positive direction is something to be proud of
- Don't let the perfect become the enemy of the good.

- I'll stop rambling and take questions.
- Justin Hayes
 - Thanks for joining us Sam.
 - Could you spend some time talking about your perspective about the merging of the 4 governors process? Could you provide some context on that and how this workgroup may be helpful in that?
- Sam Eaton
 - Absolutely. There has been a lot of conversations around this idea. Jim and Mike have been involved in the discussions quite a bit.
 - The Governor knows about the idea and has a lot of questions and we're actually working through it this week.
 - Right now, the process is more of an agreement to agree because it's a big enough of a beast that it'll take some time to put together
 - I think it's likely that he signs because it is a nonbinding agreement
 - I think this Workgroup could help a lot
 - In making your recommendations to the Governor those will have a heavy influence on the States positioning in any forum including a 4 states one.
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Thanks for the update
 - I was trying to take notes as you were going
 - One thing I'm unclear on is that we as a Workgroup is that we haven't had a real discussion on what consensus means
 - Definitely been lurking in the background
 - Do you have any more rounded advice with how we deal with areas there is general agreement but not unanimity?
 - Could you help ground it or do we have to figure it out
- Sam Eaton
 - I think it is something that you will have to figure it out.
 - Intent was not to have the state, or the Governor drive this process
 - I don't have a good answer on what consensus is exactly
 - There are possibly other groups to look at
 - I do know that other groups did not always have a unanimous requirement
 - Everything is on the table, but some may fall off and you or the facilitators will have to work out how that looks
 - I don't think that a recommendation should not go forward because one person objected but don't have a clear answer on how to draw that line
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Say that we agree that consensus is about one or two dissenters, can you help give me a sense of what the overall discussion of areas that we don't have consensus but should be discussed based on the groups charge?
- Sam Eaton
 - There will be things in there that half may agree on but don't go make it forward because it doesn't reach consensus

- I think everyone knows that the final recommendations won't cover everything topic comprehensively
- Obviously having the coalescence of this group puts weight behind a recommendation but just because one doesn't get consensus doesn't necessarily mean it is just done
- If the Governor sees one that he likes that didn't get consensus he could still choose to do it. He can direct policy as he sees fit.
- Really focus on the things that can receive consensus and for the other items each group has their own advocacy forums to push those other items
- Joe Oatman
 - Start with observation: You've mentioned multiple times that we are the architect of our own destinies. We have set forth what we want to accomplish here. Healthy and Harvestable Goals document. That is not what we have now.
 - I'm having trouble squaring incremental benefits with achieving healthy and harvestable
 - What would your perspective be of a package that may fall short of that but includes items that could get us there but may not have consensus? That's one thing I would like to get a better understanding of
- Sam Eaton
 - Thanks Joe. I think that has been a question of Workgroup members and public all along
 - I think the goal was for this goal to do as much as they with the knowledge of all their various groups they represent
 - The purpose was not meant to change anyone's mind on positions that they hold
 - To the extent that is possible, everyone needs to remain whole
 - The CBP goals are on 25-50-100 year time frames
 - I think everyone agrees that there is no silver bullet to this issue
 - I know that there is a desire to get as far as you can but must recognize the limitations of the group and that there are other avenues that each group can pursue individually
 - The hope for this group is that we do as much as we can within its limits to do what we can no to make the issue better with the input of broad stakeholders
 - I don't think the expectation from anybody was that this group's purpose would be to find the silver bullet to the issue
 - I think it's recognized that this issue will take time and will be incremental
- Brian Brooks
 - Joe kind of asked my question but want to get your perspective on this
 - Maybe we could put together our recommendations and shop them around to scientists and experts to make sure that they move us in the right way
 - My second comment is on the 4 Governors process
 - I sensed some gray area in the Governor's commitment
 - I would implore the governor to take part in a process with the other governors and congressional representatives

- It's become clear that this is not something that the Governor cannot accomplish on his own and it will likely take federal action
- It would mean a lot to a lot of people if he participated in a forum like that
- Sam Eaton
 - If I signaled a reluctance, I apologize
 - The Governor is fully supportive of a regional dialogue
 - Efforts like the CBP are good efforts but there is a recognition that the effort needs to be elevated
 - To be candid, he is the minority governor among the 4 governors
 - I don't want him to be boxed into a position
 - We're fully supportive but want to make sure that it is not set up that it would box the governor into a position
 - As a staffer, I am being cautious as possible, but we are fully supportive
 - Want to make sure we the process that is set up is something we can agree to
- Richard Scully
 - On consensus items, if you have items like breaching you may have 10 people in favor or not you may have the same vote if you ask if you don't want to breach
 - It's an item that is important to a lot of people
 - Many believe that without breaching we won't reach recovery
 - I feel like the dams may not be a silver bullet but that it would be the most powerful one we have
 - I would support the governor engaging in dialogue with other governors on the issue
- Sam Eaton
 - Justin asked at the first meeting about his position
 - On the consensus issue you answered it with the 10-10 vote, this group won't reach consensus on that issue
 - Honestly, I know that won't reach consensus on that issue and it may be a time suck at this point but that is just my opinion
- Merrill Beyeler
 - I look at our policy recommendations and beyond to action items
 - I heard you say that you don't want 1000 ideas from different directions
 - I'm wondering how we form a pathway to bring specific action items under our recommendations? Do you have any ideas?
- Sam Eaton
 - I think it's a balance of keeping the report clear and concise but also clearly explaining what needs to be done to accomplish it
 - Some of the recommendations may require on the ground actions
 - I'm thinking that the Governor can take your recommendations and take it to experts to get the detail of what we need to do to act and accomplish those recommendations
 - He'll know who to rely on to get the needed further detail and get the recommendation accomplished

- Aaron Lieberman
 - Brian brought up the idea of having a third party review to see the effect of our recommendations
 - It seems that it is very unlikely that there will be a dam retirement recommendation
 - You also mentioned that we are the only group issue which shows that we are a singular group to address a singular problem.
 - I know there is disagreement about it but as they stand now, I am concerned for the folks I represent that it will not get us to the goal of the workgroup
 - To that end it seems useful as a Workgroup and a State to reflect on our recommendations to weigh the reasonable impact they may have.
 - Perhaps if it falls short of healthy and harvestable perhaps that could signal a continuation of our work
 - I would hope that the Governor would support that so the group could accomplish its goal
 - Would the Governor be willing to continue the effort with this workgroup if that be the case?
- Sam Eaton
 - To be honest, the scientific review is a new proposal to me, so I'll need to consider that before I give an answer
 - I'm not familiar with all the recommendations but my understanding is that at least some have been reviewed by experts for their effectiveness
 - As far as continuing the group based on how far the needle moves, that's new as well and I'd have to think on it
 - Right now, I would suggest just focus on the recommendations and we'll have a better understanding of how it will look it will be easier to determine if a review would be valuable or doable
- Brett Dumas
 - This group was put together because it represents a variety of groups that care about fish
 - I don't think it's fair at this point to punt it to experts to see if this is worth it
 - The information is already out there on these issues
 - The issue is that we're discussing policy in light of the science. The governor brought us together to get our different perspectives on the issue
 - I don't think we can just boil it down at the end to what the subject matter experts say
 - I think the purpose is for us to come together to see what could be done in light of all our interests
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I just want to make sure that the Governor continues to engage on the thing that matters so much to the people I represent
 - I really hope that the Governor will continue to push on this issue because it's very important to many people

- Katherine Himes
 - Well thank you Sam for being here and thank you for answering questions

Draft Policy Recommendations Summary and Discussion – Katherine Himes

- Katherine Himes
 - So, we're going to shift gears
 - I'm going to share with you the summary of the homework assignment
 - We had a lot of draft policy recommendations that Workgroup members put together themselves in the spring and shared those around. They were grouped by topic. Then we formed small groups and talked through them and refined them and provided feedback.
 - Then an excel file was created (thanks ICL) that captured all the small group work and shared it with the workgroup. Summarized thing like likelihood of consensus and impact
 - Workgroup members and put it through the "Oatman Matrix" and scored them.
 - I'm going to share with you the results of that last assignment and may help us decide where we're going between this meeting and the next meeting
 - *Shared screen with the results on it*
 - *Described Oatman Matrix*
 - *Have slides by topic area*
- David Doeringsfeld
 - How many people responded to the assignment? Doesn't equal 20
- Katherine Himes
 - You're right, the highest total is 16. 4 people did not respond, and some did not give responses on all the topics?
 - I remember Brett asking what to do if there were multiple versions of a recommendation to deal with? That was a little tough to navigate
 - In some cases, I was trying to compare apples to apples but there were some challenges.
 - Did my best to compile the relevant information.
 - Part of the purpose of showing you is to help give an idea of where we may be going.
 - We need to get from the summary tables into actual policy recommendation language
 - I would like to take habitat because it had a lot of responses and consensus
 - If the workgroup agrees, I could take the high consensus ones and try to put it into language for the Workgroup to consider
 - Some of the areas don't have high consensus and the Workgroup will need to discuss whether to include them in the final report
 - I am looking for Workgroup members to volunteer on areas of interest for small groups and then work on those sticking areas in a way that could move them to consensus
- Paul Arrington

- I really struggle to see how this exercise is valuable to reaching consensus
- Also, could you explain the number of responses and how they add up?
- I really don't get how the matrix leads us towards consensus so maybe you could help explain that as we go along.
- I know as I went through, I didn't answer some because I knew that I didn't have all the knowledge to make a call on some of those.
- Katherine Himes
 - Yes, the columns are split so you don't add all together but each of the separate columns should come out equally
 - Not all the topics were responded to at the same rate
 - Also, some of them have different levels of notes
 - The way this is presented may be helpful to some members and some may not
 - I think it will also depend on what level of detail this report should go into.
 - Each member may have different opinions on what is most important to include in the final report
 - The purpose was really just to take the work you've done and summarize it to begin a discussion of how we move this into actual policy recommendations
- Richard Scully
 - For clarification, the major/minor impact, is that impact on our mission?
 - It would be nice to have an ongoing column to show if it's something we're already doing. May not provide a meaningful impact if we're already doing it
- Katherine Himes
 - Going to the assignment all of these scores are how each Workgroup member scored it so I can't really answer how each member interpreted impact
 - Some people did list whether the activities or recommendations are ongoing
 - Some are close enough to those activities to know that they're ongoing and some are not so it would be hard to include a column like that
- Mark Menlove
 - This is probably not a good time to bring this up but there are two different versions of the Oatman Matrix that swap the number 2 and number 3 are swapped.
 - Depending on which version each person used it could have affected the results
- Katherine Himes
 - If Workgroup members know that you used the first instead of the second, please resubmit your assignment
 - I think it would be good to decide if this would be helpful to the Workgroup in making the final recommendations
 - Is impact or effort something that the Workgroup wants to include in the report?
 - Would it be worth including or do you think that the Governor will be able to use his experts to discern that info? These are things that the Workgroup will need to decide
- Mark Menlove

- I think they are helpful but at this point I don't know how we do that if there is a difference in scoring
- Justin Hayes
 - I think looking at Breach, it looked like most everyone used the same matrix
- Katherine Himes
 - Good. If someone does recognize they used the wrong one, please resubmit
- Dave Doeringsfeld
 - For clarification, each measure like under Habitat/restoration. Like Justin mentioned in the last meeting is that there was some tyranny of the last group in what ended up being the final
 - When I ranked them, I looked at all 4 and ranked it based on the one I liked best
 - Curious if everyone ranked based on all 4 or just the last one?
- Katherine Himes
 - Sometimes it depended. Some stayed mostly the same throughout the whole process and some did change.
 - The feedback I received indicated a specific version or the final, but I don't have numbers is how many times that happened, but I do have all those notes
 - *Moved to harvest and predation on slides*
 - This one shows that there are notes to show that there are some topics only discussed by one small group. However, just because one group discussed it does not mean it should not be presented to the whole workgroup
 - In the small groups you will get all of the files and notes to see all of what people thought so the group can try to move it towards consensus
- Richard Scully
 - Could you repeat the difference between the different colors?
- Katherine Himes
 - Dark Green = Consensus, a lot of members scored it as likely consensus
 - Light Green = Some consensus but had lower level or lots of notes or concerns
 - Yellow = Less consensus
 - Red = Unlikely to reach consensus
- Joe Oatman
 - When I reviewed the spreadsheet on Harvest/Predation and looking at this today, there is one recommendation that was put forward by the Kline group that was not included today
 - There wasn't really anything that describes what we want for fisheries in the state and how it aligns with our goals, but it was not included in our review. Just wanted to flag that
- Katherine Himes
 - Thank you for flagging that Joe. I'm glad you caught that. I think that was just human error
 - Do want to share another slide that captured all of your draft recommendations. What we flagged is that there are still good ideas that have not been discussed by small group or overall Workgroup and there is still some opportunity there

- Here is the slide from may with the summary of idea from the Workgroup members that got woven into the small group assignments and the slides today
- However, we highlighted the ones that did not make it into a small group analysis
- So, while you are looking to volunteer, also think about what is in this slide and it also may inform our “What’s missing” discussion this afternoon
- This is on the technical topic side
- *Shared slides and showed highlighted areas*
- Any questions on that?
- Brett Dumas
 - Were those just missed or is it possible that they were considered and included or dropped off intentionally
 - I know in our group, we took 30 different policy statements and incorporated them into 6 different recommendations
- Katherine Himes
 - So, all small groups had access to this, but I think it depends on each group whether each aspect was incorporated or dropped off
 - We just wanted to go back and make sure that something brought up before wasn’t inadvertently left out of the final report
- Brett Dumas
 - So, you’re asking us to review individually to make sure nothing fell through the cracks?
- Katherine Himes
 - Sort of
 - This is also something I want you to keep in mind as we go forward into October meeting and putting together the small groups
 - Can check to make sure that all the boxes are checked in your specific area that you cover
- Brett Dumas
 - It kind of seems like we’re rehashing where we’ve been and I’m having trouble tracking the value but that’s ok
- Katherine Himes
 - Purpose is not to rehash but just to make sure we didn’t miss anything unintentionally
- Paul Arrington
 - I tend to feel like this is rehashing
 - When we went through the predation topic, we coalesced everything. Then every group had the opportunity to review it to see if any of their thoughts were left out so I’m not seeing the value of doing it again
- Katherine Himes
 - I don’t want you to think that this is a mandate or intended to rehash. Really just wanted to bring those topics to light to make sure the Workgroup is aware so they can check them if they want and that members can check them if they wish
 - Shouldn’t feel duplicative or redundant

- Paul Arrington
 - I appreciate that but I'm having trouble seeing how we're moving the ball down the field. Spending a lot of time here
- Katherine Himes
 - So, in moving the ball down the field, the slides I showed you earlier I would take the dark green topics and put them into language for the Workgroup review.
 - On the other topics that are not dark green that need more discussion, that is where the small groups will be helpful in moving those issues towards consensus and move the ball forward.
 - When you volunteer for the topic, you'll be given all the info with the goal of moving something from non-consensus to consensus
 - Purpose is not to rehash but to look at all of the concerns and see if they can be addressed in a manner to make the recommendation reach consensus
 - Don't want to feel like revisiting as much as revising to try to get to that consensus point
- Paul Arrington
 - I appreciate that and I'm excited to move into that phase
 - I'm concerned in bogging ourselves down with issues that may have been considered by the small groups and incorporated or not considered.
- Kira Finkler
 - Want to make sure I understand the dark green categories
 - Everything you've labeled won't go to the small groups, but you'll write those up for our consideration. Is that right?
 - And will it include the notes from the small groups?
- Katherine Himes
 - That's right. I'll take everything you've given to me and try to frame it in a way that would go in the report
 - What the workgroup would get from me is how it would look going into the report without the notes.
- Kira Finkler
 - When you showed some notes this morning; are you planning to capture the major/minor aspect in your recommendation language?
 - Think that it may be good information for the governor to have and he can do with it what he will.
 - I'm just trying to understand how the end product may look and I didn't just want to gloss over where there may be differences in the voting by narrow margins
- Katherine Himes
 - Got it. The Workgroup needs to decide whether capturing that information is something they want to include
 - If the Workgroup wants that info to be included, we certainly can but if the Workgroup decides it's too granular, then we don't need to put it in there.
 - In my summary, I was just trying to show the homework results in a helpful way.

- I'll do what the Workgroup wants but it is a conversation that the Workgroup needs to have
- I think at this point, it's the meat of the recommendation that is the most important to flesh out
- Kira Finkler
 - I think it may be hard for you to write up without having those answers first, but I'll defer to you on that
- Richard Scully
 - During the break I looked at the input I provided on the homework and saw I used the old graph
 - So, on breach, if there is an easy minor one of them was probably me. I may need to redo mine
 - Looking at the results, would the major/minor and simple/complex result in recommendations being discarded?
- Katherine Himes
 - That is something the Workgroup needs to decide. I don't get to decide what goes into the final report.
 - Workgroup need to discuss how you want to include recommendations and how you want to address major/minor impacts and simple/complex efforts
 - What I'll be doing with the dark green is just drafting potential language for them, but it is the Workgroup that has the final say if it gets included
- Joe Oatman
 - To clarify for Richard, the early version of the Matrix that was set out was an early draft version. The second version was the final and correct version to use
- Katherine Himes
 - *Went back to slides of homework*
 - We'll keep going though, topic by topic and think of areas you may want to volunteer for
 - *Went through slides*
- Mike Edmondson
 - In reading through the materials, Joe Oatman could you speak a little to the Flex Spill implementation feedback. You made a good point in your notes on the CRSO and brought forward some more information. Could you give some insight on that?
- Joe Oatman
 - Thanks Mike
 - This is one area I identified as an issue
 - I would be happy to address that at another time but would prefer to not try to do it impromptu at this time
- Katherine Himes
 - *Moved back to slides*
 - These slides will also be sent out to the group so you can review as you please

- The goal here is for the Workgroup to see where the levels of consensus are and to think about volunteering for certain topics to try to move them towards consensus
- Paul Arrington
 - Looking for volunteers right now?
 - I'm happy to help up with anything but there are some topics I don't know much about like Hatchery or Harvest
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Could you explain again how the colored areas got scored
- Katherine Himes
 - Each small group had a color ranking system and they applied those to each of the things they looked at
 - If it stayed green all the way through, then it came out dark green
 - If there was green but some notes or concerns or low responses, it moved into light green
 - If more concerns or notes, then could move to yellow
 - Red just meant that there was not consensus all the way through
 - Was mostly trying to weight the colors that were assigned, notes people left, and expressed concerns
- Mark Menlove
 - A clarification, you are asking for volunteers for single line items or broader topics?
- Katherine Himes
 - The easiest way to assign is by category but with the cross over it might not be quite that neat
 - Crystal could make a poll but want to make it as efficient as possible so I can get assignment to you tomorrow
 - If you have multiple categories, then let us know
 - Those that are dark green are assumed to make it into recommendations and not need small group input?
 - My intent is to take those Green ones and put them into language for review but that doesn't mean they automatically make it in or won't have more discussion
 - Just trying to be efficient and helpful
- Mark Menlove
 - Ok, makes sense. Some of the comments on those are that they don't rise to recommendations
 - I would be very interested in the regional forum topic but am not sure what topic that would fall under. May need to have discussion on that
- Brett Dumas
 - I thought we may be signing up for specific categories
- Katherine Himes
 - If that is the case, then definitely let us know. That's fine

- Also, if everyone signs up for Hydro then we will need to have some reassignment
- Scott Hauser
 - Speaking to Brett's question and the Hydro interest. USRT wants to be engaged in any topic that discusses blocked areas and that may go across several categories
 - Just not sure how that may work with the process
- Katherine Himes
 - Good questions and I'll try to be clear about what's next
 - We want to help groups of 2-3 Workgroup members to work together to draft policy recommendations to move close to consensus topics to full consensus and share it with other Workgroup members
 - So, if a group is working on blocked areas it is totally appropriate to contact other workgroup members
 - The small group is not the only opportunity you'll have to look at this content
- Justin Hayes
 - I think us just throwing our names in the chat box without having a chance to review the topics is not a good process
 - I would appreciate a document to review and volunteer more thoughtfully and feel that this process right now is not awesome
- Katherine Himes
 - Justin, that's fair. If anyone wants to volunteer in the chat, they can but if you'd prefer to do it by email at a later time that is fine too.
 - I don't want it to feel breezy or flippant in any manner, the chat feedback happened more organically but is not required right now
- Richard Scully
 - It sounds like we're trying to move towards light green, and yellow towards green. Is there a path to weigh them and decide that they drop off instead of refining them?
- Katherine Himes
 - Certainly, can be and as Sam mentioned this morning could be an Appendix to show that there are other topics that were discussed that didn't reach consensus
 - My job as facilitator is to support you so I'm encouraging you to work on the things are close but if it doesn't work out then it shouldn't be shoehorned
- Joe Oatman
 - If I'm following correctly, we'll not be looking at red?
- Katherine Himes
 - I was not going to assign red. The goal for right now was to look at the things that are near consensus that could potentially be moved toward consensus with some more refinement. Wasn't going to address red
 - Are there any further questions on the homework summary or where we're going?
 - Ok, after lunch there will be time to speak about what is missing and guiding principles.

- This is captured in the slide from early May. I'll send that slide from May along with the homework summary.
- The exercise from May contains the overarching ideas and the Workgroup talked about returning to them. Part of the conversation after lunch will be discussing what we want to do with those
- Also contains the ideas that weren't explicitly called out in the policy recommendations that we discussed earlier
- Scott Hauser
 - So, we'll break into small groups and we'll have a lot of work to do
 - So, the work we'll be asked to have done, will you articulate that more clearly in the email you send out to make sure we know exactly what our task is?
- Katherine Himes
 - Sure. We're asking you to be in small groups that will receive all the content on certain topics that has been generated so far. You will work in these small groups until probably around October 20th to refine that language to get the recommendation in the realm of consensus. Then your revised language will be formally shared with the Workgroup and then discuss it at the October meeting
 - Definitely ok to share it informally beforehand as well to get feedback.
 - Our goal is to keep drilling down to see what may make it into the final report
 - In the meantime, I'll provide language in mid-October on the topics that are already dark green for your review to see if it is something that the Workgroup is comfortable with.
- Richard Scully
 - As far as whether a statement should go forward as a final policy recommendation, I want to look at them through a lens of whether they will move us towards our mission statement
 - So, if I see something that may be nice but won't get us towards our goal, how do I handle that.
 - How do I rate something that I don't think is going to move the needle?
 - So that will be kind of my criteria
- Mike Edmondson
 - You're free to choose your criteria as you wish but I would caution that if that is your criteria, then nothing my move forward because no policy statement by itself is going to get it there by itself.
 - Would recommend that you need to look at it as a group of actions
- Katherine Himes
 - I also think that this a group action which can be challenging.
 - A really great thing about working in this forum is that if everybody gives a little, we can gain a lot
 - As Sam said this morning, we can't let the perfect be the enemy of the good
 - If everyone holds out because everything isn't perfect, what will our final recommendation look like?

Lunch Break

What's Missing and Guiding Principles Discussion – Katherine Himes and Mike Edmondson

- Mike Edmondson
 - Welcome back
 - Just want to remind that it is possible to record this meeting
 - We have a good number of guests.
 - We now have an hour for the guiding principles and what's missing
 - Those were generated at another time
 - I'll turn it over to Katherine
- Katherine Himes
 - During this next hour we will revisit the spring homework assignment
 - Some of the ideas fit nicely into categories but some were left over that didn't fit well and some Workgroup members suggested we return to those and discuss what to do with those ideas.
 - *Shared screen to show leftover Overarching Ideas*
 - Some ideas, do these belong in the report, appendix, etc.?
- Mark Menlove
 - I certainly think that some of these belong in the report and that we should definitely have a process to address these
 - Some of us have asked that there should be something like a preamble that includes on some of these ideas
- Katherine Himes
 - Mark, do you have an idea or a strawman of how that could look
- Mark Menlove
 - No but I could work on putting something together
- Katherine Himes
 - So, Mark, are you saying that these statements are coalesced and included in the report
- Mark Menlove
 - Yes. Certainly not all of them but that some of them should certainly be incorporated somehow in the final report
 - The Social/Human aspect is one in particular that I think should be discussed
- Brett Dumas
 - I agree with Mark that some of them belong but a lot of them are value statements that represent the diversity of interests of the groups we have here
 - If you want real feedback, I'd suggest you'd send them out to see which people think belong and where they may belong
 - Some of the value statements don't represent the group as a whole
- Joe Oatman

- From my perspective follows what Mark and Brett provided. I think focusing on the Social/human is key for us to do.
- Determining where some info may be captured deserves some thought
- When I think about this, I think about over the course of the process we've talked about what salmon mean to us.
- We talked about what success meant to us and a lot of that was motivated by the social/human aspect that fish provide
- I think that each of us are looking at the policy through our own lens on the social/human aspect
- Think its important to include in some part of the report
- I think we have an opportunity to tell a little bit more
- David Doeringsfeld
 - I'm more skeptical or unsure.
 - It seems these are value statements or discussion points and have been incorporated in policy statements
 - Are we making new policies or incorporating these into existing policies or in a preamble?
 - Think that there is a broad range of areas they could fit in
 - I agree with Brett that maybe that we could review them
- Mark Menlove
 - Certainly, agree that some of these are value statements and could provide a lens that all of our recommendations could be run
 - I'd be willing to take this section on with a small group to try and come up with a couple of recommendations for the group
 - If we do that, I would recommend that a member of the tribes be included
- Will Hart
 - We spent a lot of time working on a mission statement with a subgroup and worked in a collaborative way on the mission statement
 - Then some felt we needed more, and that subgroup collaborated to develop the goals document
 - For me, whether I liked everything in those documents or not, those were our overarching guiding principles
 - Now we're in September
 - Some of our subgroups took overarching ideas out a couple of times
 - Seems like these are value statements where there isn't a lot of consensus and that we may be going backwards in rehashing discussion we've already had
 - There's a lot of stuff on here that is just not a value statement that I would be supportive of
 - My group is not in favor of free flowing system but it's one of the things on there
 - I don't know if we need to get back into groups and go through all these again and debate and risk entrenchment.
 - I think what we're attempting to do is to collaborate and pontificate and here I see a can of worms that I don't know if is worth it

- Justin Hayes
 - Having had a brief chance to look
 - These are not easy issues for us to grapple with. There's biological stuff, cultural stuff, and political stuff all wrapped up in there
 - If we just followed science without considering the socio-economic impacts our recommendations may look different but that is something that we have to consider
 - I think some of these statements are important in showing how we expect our constituency to be treated and how we will give consideration to others
 - I think it is difficult task to represent our constituency while considering all of the other groups
 - I do think that there is real value in continuing to talk about these things.
 - Doesn't mean they make it into the recommendations but could be included in our narrative or context for the report
 - Some of the things we've discussed haven't necessarily tied to fish recovery
 - Gave example of mitigation fund for outfitters and guides
- Mark Menlove
 - To respond to Will. That's exactly why I said that all of these don't belong here
 - I do think there are a place for the overarching social/human concepts as perhaps a preamble
 - When we set this topic aside, I never believed we were taking it out and I see value in taking it up again
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think we're all largely saying the same thing
 - Will, I think you're on point that a lot of what we could agree on is already incorporated in our work
 - I think a preamble may be a place to incorporate the intent of the workgroup and show that the workgroup engaged the process of a certain lens but also with recognition of the complex socio economic impacts tied up in the issue
 - I think there is quite a bit on the slides that we can agree that much of the stuff on there doesn't belong
 - But some of the best parts about the workgroup could be worthwhile to be included
 - I don't think we need multiple subgroups to work on it but if Mark volunteers to have a group, I think they could get it done
 - Does that make sense to people?
- Will Hart
 - I think that sounds good
 - I think you could write down that right there and it could serve as the intro to provide the context for the report
- Katherine Himes
 - Want to get some sense from the group that they are ok with that plan going forward

- Scott Hauser
 - I would be more than happy to help Mark and provide some Tribal perspective
- Joe Oatman
 - I would also be interested
- Richard Scully
 - In this preamble or whatever it turns out to be.
 - It seems to me that the Governor put to group to recover Idaho salmon that has a diverse set of interests
 - I think that if recovering salmon was easy and it would have been done a long time ago
 - I think with this group of diverse interests it is difficult to find consensus on things that would really move the needle. Not sure if that would be something that would be included in that preamble
- Katherine Himes
 - I think what we're describing here is a statement that avoids value statements but captures the ideas on the page
- Brian Brooks
 - Volunteered for small workgroup
- Katherine Himes
 - When we built the agenda, we wanted to make sure there was ample time for questions and discussions. So, time until our break now can be used to discuss anything up to this point. Open conversation time now.
- Dave Doeringsfeld
 - The narrative of the report, that draft that was put together
 - We all provided some comments on that, but I don't think we've addressed that yet
 - I think its been done pretty well so far but may like to see where that's going
- Katherine Himes
 - We'll talk about that at 2:15
- Paul Arrington
 - I want to make sure I understand our next steps
 - You'll send out small group assignments tomorrow and before the next meeting they will work on those policy recommendations to try and get them to a consensus area and then turn them in to the workgroup
- Katherine Himes
 - Perfect
- Merrill Beyeler
 - Is this the appropriate time to volunteer for small groups?
 - I would volunteer for water broadly and some Habitat issues. There are ones there that I think we could work to consensus on.
- Aaron Lieberman

- I made a quick google form that we could use to sign up and everything would be in one place
- Could be something we could use neatly
- Katherine Himes
 - Haven't had a chance to look at it
 - I know people have volunteered already but recognize that you haven't had a chance to dig into all the topics
 - We could certainly use it if it makes sense
 - The issue with the Google approach is that not everybody can access that
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I'll share it and I think I have it set up to where everyone could access it
- Mark Menlove
 - Mark Davidson is leaving us to be Executive Director of another group and wanted to take the chance to publicly thank him and let everyone know
- Katherine Himes
 - Aaron, we can look at your spreadsheet, but the goal is to get these groups put together quite quickly so they can get to work
 - Want to make sure that there is time for everyone to review before next meeting so we're not coming into that meeting cold
 - Any other questions or comments?
 - Just want to remind that in conjunction with the small group work I will work on drafting language for the dark green topics
- Paul Arrington
 - In these small groups do we need to be putting them in some specific format that may be included in the final report
 - Is there a particular format or verbiage that it should take?
- Katherine Himes
 - I think it would be great if your group could get there and I hope you can, but I think some topic areas may not get there
 - I could share some examples of reports with the group
 - If that helps, I can send you the format that I'm going to follow
- Paul Arrington
 - I think maybe that if you could put one together and send it out quickly, we could use it as a template
- Katherine Himes
 - Deal.
- Aaron Lieberman
 - In some of the light green areas, I wonder if there are any subset of those that you would classify differently
 - Are there areas that we could address now to move some of those to green? Any commonalities to address together?
- Katherine Himes
 - One common one was that only one small group considered an idea

- There were a number that were not scored because only one group reviewed them
 - That could be a good place to look if you wanted to try to move through a topic
 - Other than that, the reasons varied for why it would push a topic into light green
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Maybe it would be useful to decide how we are going to address those issues where there was not enough information or review
 - I can foresee there that it could be an issue that would benefit from group discussion
- Katherine Himes
 - *Pulled up homework info slides again*
 - If the criteria you want to use is “not enough technical information” I don’t think this slide provides that info
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think the question is that in certain cases there are issues that could arise
 - We should discuss what will cause a thing to fall off
 - If it doesn’t recover fish? If we don’t have enough technical info?
 - Would be beneficial to have a discussion so we approach it with a similar outline and procedure
 - I’d be interested in hearing from other Workgroup members on opinions on how to deal with specific instances where there are hang-ups
- Joe Oatman
 - Looking at supplementation. There were a number of presentations that provided information on those topics. I don’t think that we would be looking to get any additional information, I think that we are past that point. I may be more in line where the small group works out the details
 - I think it may make sense to have each small group do that
- Justin Hayes
 - I think it’s the case that these recommendations are going to have varying levels of information supporting them
 - I think a balance we’ll have to strike is ones that can be supported and implemented by the governor
 - When we say habitat, we are not saying a specific habitat to improve, just more needs to be done across the landscape
 - On supplementation, I think we could just recommend that they be implemented where appropriate
 - I don’t think we need to get too hung up on gathering more information. When they get implemented there will be a lot of study into where and when they are appropriate
 - Don’t think we need to get hung up on the minutia of support particularly

Report Draft Sections and Next Steps Discussion – Katherine Himes and Mike Edmondson

- Mike Edmondson
 - Welcome back. We have an hour to discuss the report draft

- Just a reminder that this meeting could be recorded
- Katherine Himes
 - We wanted to make sure there as ample time to discuss the draft, your feedback, and our proposed next steps
 - Want to talk about the types of feedback that we received
 - Not going to pull it up and go line by line. Going to stay higher level than that.
 - There were a lot of good line edits that expanded on some issues and honed certain aspects of the document.
 - The proposal for those items would be to accept those minor changes because they add value and improve readability
 - Some people shared their feedback with the full group and got support
 - There were a lot of comments of including additional items of discussion like tribal interests, recreational value, economic value of the river system etc.
 - What we are proposing are to have volunteer to work with Alli to try to draft those changes.
 - We are also proposing that Alli work with myself and OSC to work on 5 specific items that were commented on
 - Expand salmon and steelhead story
 - Expand on value of river
 - Include ESA listings in appendix
 - Maybe reframe the collaborative approach section
 - Find better graphs
 - If the group is comfortable, we could work on those while keeping the workgroup in the loop but really looking for volunteers to work with Alli on those other topics
 - That is our plan going forward
- David Doeringsfeld
 - I would like to see a share screen to get a better idea of what you're talking about specifically. Hard to give feedback if I'm not sure what exactly the topic is
- Katherine Himes
 - I'll share the report itself and show you what I mean
 - *Put draft report on screen*
 - There is a part I was referencing that pertains to the Environmental Value, Tribal Significance, and Economic and Recreational value
 - Our idea was to have workgroup members who are experts in this area that would help Alli expand this
- David Doeringsfeld
 - I made one comment that footnoting to Jim's study and that it should be cited to the actual study
- Katherine Himes
 - Correct, that is one of the line edits I recommend that we take care of while the Workgroup takes care of the larger sections that need more development.

- We're hoping that the minor updates could be done and shared with the workgroup around mid-October, but the major sections may take longer
- Any thoughts or comments on the proposed path forward?
- Paul Arrington
 - To make sure I understand, you Alli and John will work on all the comment boxes?
- Katherine Himes
 - Our intent is to cover the minor edits like minor line edits. The major aspects would be addressed by workgroup
- Paul Arrington
 - The thing in my mind is that it seems that the three sections you highlighted should provide the context that salmon is important and that there is value to the river system that is being used
 - Gives the opportunity to explain it to those who are either positively or negatively impacted by that system
 - Am I correct that the economic value section is where you would add those river value systems in?
- Katherine
 - Certainly. Several workgroup members requested an expanded section describing the value of the river system itself
 - I think that is why it will be important to have experts in those areas help Alli develop those sections
- David Doeringsfeld
 - I am really skeptical of trying to expand areas of economic studies because it could end up being longer than our report
 - In the CRSO EIS there were 1000s of pages dedicated to that
 - How do we include all the different aspects and where do we decide to stop?
 - Trying to roll in a broad overview of economic studies could fill volumes and I'm not sure we can condense it to fit here.
 - Not sure we need to go there
- Joe Oatman
 - In the same vein that Dave commented on
 - I think I would concur with the thought that trying to put in information on the benefits of navigation, irrigation, transportation etc. when we haven't had any specific presentations on those issues like we have the others I don't feel like I have any information on which I could base a review
 - I recognize the concerns and uses of the river but just don't have the info to review
 - As I understood the 3 proposed sections that it was focused on those folks that use fish in context of all the technical information that we've covered
 - I'm not sure how we fold in other economic benefits
- Aaron Lieberman

- One thing that was not in the CRSO was any look at the impact of recreational sport fishing
- I think there is a conversation to be had on whether it is worth to include economic material from other sources or if we recommend to the Governor that those be undertaken
- I think we'd be stronger as a state to be able to provide some figures to show why we want our fish back. I think that is where the utility of economic study lies
- Scott Hauser
 - I'm struggling with the idea that I want to volunteer for a lot of groups and looking at my calendar and its pretty full. I'm sure others are too
 - I just don't know that I can do justice to the report in the time scale that we're being given which is troublesome to me
 - We worked on a minor section of the appendix to a MAFAC report for months
 - I don't know I or all of us can do justice to the report in this time frame. I'll leave it at that
- Mike Edmondson
 - Harkening back to Sam's earlier remarks.
 - He suggested a concise report and possibly an appendix for expanded ideas
 - I think that we may be able to figure out to convey these things in a relatively short and elegant matter
 - We don't have to put the answers in this thing but could ask for actions to be explored instead
- Richard Scully
 - This makes me remember a comment that Jim Yost said at first meeting that it should be concise
 - Seems like we should be focusing on Salmon
 - History of the decline, history of the ESA status, the importance of Salmon in different areas. Seems like it should be the heart of the report and if we add all the river uses too it then it distracts from Salmon and that should be the focus
 - Don't get too broad and stick to salmon
- David Doeringsfeld
 - The CRSO did not deal with the economic impacts from revenue from fishing guides and the industry
 - I think that it should have been in there
 - The concept of constructing the rail to replace transportation was also not included
 - Definitely some holes in the analysis
 - If the economic analysis is needed, then that is something your group can advocate in other forums but that may not belong in our report
- Aaron Lieberman
 - My intent was not to say we need to economic impact analysis for the industry

- My point was that we don't need to include information on how bad we're hurting but that it would be helpful in different forums to have dollar figures to put to the impacts. Right now, we don't have that information to the state
 - Think it would be helpful to show how important sport fishing is important to the state economy
- David Doeringsfeld
 - What I am saying is that your group could go out and do that study
- Stacey Satterlee
 - I agree with Aaron and would like to say that the sections in the report need to be short.
 - This is not the most important part of our report.
 - Each section should be carefully crafted to be short and provide context for our recommendations, but it can't be all of these things
 - I would volunteer to work on a small group to work on this
 - This needs to be concise and get to our policy recommendations
- Mike Edmondson
 - One thing we talked about a few meetings ago was "who is the audience"?
 - I feel from Sam's remarks this morning is that the audience is the Governor.
 - I think that it needs just enough context to make the recommendations make sense
 - It's open for discussion but I think the audience is the governor and what is the amount of information we need to include to make the recommendations make sense
 - Dave, you made a good point that there are holes in the CRSO and that they could be really relevant topics for the 4 states effort
- Scott Hauser
 - I do feel that I would be remiss if I didn't challenge what Dave said a little bit.
 - The state of Idaho spends millions of dollars on tourism and a lot of that is focused on recreation
 - I do think we as a group have an obligation to make that kind of recommendation to the state and it shouldn't fall on smaller groups to address important issues like that
- Brian Brooks
 - I was wondering what the worry is about having that type of economic information
 - We have a good number of industry studies come out of U of I and I think it would be a feather in our cap to have that kind of important information gathered
 - I guess this is a question for Dave, what are your concerns?
- Dave Doeringsfeld
 - When you have an organization such as yours or Aarons and they want an economic impact analysis usually it's the organization that goes out and does those
 - If we are going to do that then we could recommend a lot of economic studies that would just as easily justifiable

- I don't argue that it wouldn't be useful information just that it isn't incumbent on the State to perform those studies
- Aaron Lieberman
 - When I say this, it isn't a way to get someone to get someone to pay the bills I can't cover
 - To me it seems crazy that there is pushback on adding these words suggesting the state look at a study for a large impact on a large part of the economy
- Richard Scully
 - I think that there should be economic studies of the economic benefits of fisheries
 - It's about time to get an updated
- Jim Fredricks
 - Want to point out that there have been some studies conducted. The last one related to anadromous fisheries was 2005
 - IDFG does studies on fishing in general in Idaho. the last one was in 2011 and another is slated for 2021
 - Where it gets sticky is where you start talking about the potential value of increased fisheries because we just look at direct expenditures
 - You can start getting into dueling economist arguments about what is the best models to use when you are trying to make predictions about future potential worth
- Katherine Himes
 - I'd like to circle back to the sections of the report and next steps
 - On the proposed next steps, I've heard a few different things
 - One person volunteered to work on a small group to tighten it down and comments on how to keep it manageable and focused on our charge
 - Would also like to solicit feedback on the other proposed net steps that we suggested earlier
 - What is most helpful as a next step? Tighten first and then send? Expand and then try to tighten? What does the group think would be most helpful?
- Paul Arrington
 - I don't know that we have time to extend it out. I think that we may need to do all of it at the same time
 - I don't think we'd have time to wait for another iteration and work on it some more
 - As I listen to other folks, I think I was swayed in thinking that the river use may not need to be a couple of sentences indicating that there are many other uses. Probably doesn't need to be a lot
- Scott Hauser
 - Looking at Joe's comment on tribal significance that covers economic and environmental value
 - If a group of people are working on an economic section and we're looking on a tribal section, then who is the gatekeeper to condense or combine those?
- Katherine Himes

- That is a good point
- I don't have the answer, but I think that there are a few forms that it could take
- Sounds like there is some interest in some people focusing on brevity and work on some other sections that need to be typed
- Then we have the preamble group of 6 working on that language
- I think the tightening group
- Brian Brooks
 - I'll volunteer to help
- Katherine Himes
 - I think from my perspective we've hit all the boxes we wanted to hit on our proposed path forward

Accords Update – Mike Edmondson and Jim Yost

- Mike Edmondson
 - Originally this was the slot for the Governor's update, but we had to move that to the morning
 - Some feedback was to add the Accord update, so we put it here. If you want, we can also talk about the 4 states effort. Open season, ask me anything
 - Yesterday Governor Little signed the 2018 extension of the Accord
 - I'm here to say that we listened to the concerns and it was addressed in the final language of the extension
 - The presentation last month about when the 2008 extension ended, we did an extension in 2018 to see how the CRSO EIS would come out
 - In that 2018 extension, it was designed to expire when the ROD was signed and that was signed
 - We have chosen to enter into an extension to allow us to realize what would have been done under the 2018 extension if it made its full term
 - We tried to address 6 specific items based on feedback we got
 - In talking with the action agencies, they are entering into about 16 agreements and they are waiting to roll this out until later
 - First item to touch on is that we are not obliged to affirm adequacy of the action
 - The offramp process has been amended and streamlined. We have an obligation to meet to attempt to resolve issues but preserve the right to litigate
 - The policy recommendations this group comes out with will be considered in the negotiation of a long term agreement after the 2 year extension ends
 - Any germane recommendations may be advocated for as we work to a longer term agreement
 - That's the short version and I'm sure that there are some questions
 - We've asked for an updated Attachment A with updated funding information so that we have all the most up to date information in one place
 - *Shared screen with language*
 - Want to highlight some important parts (*showed some of the edits*)

- Inserted language to show that Idaho is *not* obliged to affirm adequacy of the actions
- Litigation offramp only requires written notice
- Can also pursue legislation
- We have approximately 2 years to negotiate a successor agreement
 - Could also not enter into another agreement. There is no obligation
- We heard the concerns of the group and took them to the table to negotiate and it definitely helped that you raised them directly to the action agencies last month
- Richard Scully
 - If you do choose the offramp to litigate, do then we use the funding for the programs set out in the accord?
- Mike Edmondson
 - That's definitely possible but I don't think its probable
 - If we just walk away and BPA can't have those mitigation measures occur, then they may run afoul of the Biological Opinion
 - It's a bit of mutually assured destruction
- Richard Scully
 - One reason I asked is that the preferred alternative is that it will only increase SARs 38% and certainly not recover Idaho salmon
 - If we did see an obvious decline, then I would think that Idaho would want to pursue some kind of action to request a change in the system
- Mike Edmondson
 - To clarify some things, one thing is that the suite of compensatory actions for the accord is not to recover fish
 - If the action analyzed must not destroy critical habitat, cause jeopardy, etc. Have to take action so that the action does not jeopardize existing populations
 - The other thing I would comment on is that the preferred alternative is largely similar to the action in the ROD. They added some monitoring
 - The modeling exercises you referenced are just that, models. Now we'll be able to gather empirical data
 - We also saw what the flex spill operation may look like at our Lewiston meeting. At certain parts of the day it will focus on helping passage and limiting powerhouse encounters
 - We need to see where this goes
- Justin Hayes
 - Thank you for sharing
 - To help me understand the state's limitations on advocacy. The text showed that there was offramp for litigation but I'm wondering what your ability is in regard to advocacy.
 - Do you feel the State could be a strong advocate for something like max spill without taking an offramp?
- Mike Edmondson

- I think that if Idaho develops a policy on a specific level of spill then I think that they could advocate for that
- I don't think that this accord does not limit us from advocating for any policy our state sets even if it is outside of the CRSO EIS
- I think the Accord is a benefit that forces us and BPA to come to the table and discuss these things
- The distinction I'm trying to make is that we can advocate for the policy that our administration sets
- I think for at least the next two years, the ability to advocate is there
- Keep in mind that there are things that we get to negotiate over the next 2 years while we negotiate long term agreements
- Brian Brooks
 - Thank you for being receptive to our input
 - It seems like some of our issues were addressed although I would like to read it more closely
 - Without the forbearance language and the adequacy language, what is the benefit to BPA except fostering collaboration
- Mike Edmondson
 - Anything I would say would be speculative and I can't really speak for them
- Mark Menlove
 - Going back to Sam's talk about the 4 state forum
 - It sounded like that conversation may be tied to the Accord conversation. Could you clarify that and let us know where those conversations are?
- Mike Edmondson
 - In my view they are separate and distinct but that may not be true for the action agencies
 - I think they may see them as different legs on a stool to support their operations
 - We see it as independent, but the action agencies see it as a comprehensive strategy
- Richard Scully
 - If the State of Idaho through the signing of the accords says its ok with the ROD.
- Mike Edmondson
 - We're not affirming the adequacy
- Richard Scully
 - Let's say that the preferred alternative is not going to recover salmon and our workgroup is to recover salmon and the main limiting factor is SARs and we're not going to get higher SAR's without more aggressive action then where does our group end up
- Mike Edmondson
 - I think they are totally separate
 - Having a ROD to operate the river system is completely independent of recovery plans

- We haven't had a chance to address those but those are how we recover fish. Not through Section 7 consultations
- One thing that could be helpful would be to suggest an implementation plan to recover fish but wouldn't be part of the CRSO process
- David Doeringsfeld
 - Wanted to congratulate the team that negotiated and signed the accords. I appreciate your work
- Justin Hayes
 - Another clarification, you said something really important about the CRSO EIS in that it is not a recovery plan or that it seeks to be.
 - At some point us as a Workgroup will likely discuss whether implementing n the CRSO is helpful or trading water
 - Would it make sense for us to recommend that it would take more than the CRSO EIS to recover salmon?
- Mike Edmondson
 - I think in a broad context it takes many actions to recover fish. I think what we're trying to identify is what is in our control that we can do to recover fish
 - I think that we need to see how the Preferred alternative rolls out and performs
 - We're at the point where we can gather data
 - Fish Passage center just put out some outmigration data
 - We saw some modeling in our Twin Falls meeting and we can compare the data to the models to see how it performs in reality
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Justin could you repeat your question on the CRSO?
 - What was the actual question?
- Mike Edmondson
 - 4 States update
 - The 4 states are looking to sign a letter of intent to form a collaborative group
 - In talking with each other and tribal partners we knew we couldn't do an MOU in the short timeframe we had
 - We are in discussions to develop process to bring these states together to discuss these major issues
 - The letter is about 5 paragraphs that says we will get together. Has a maximum life of 2 years
 - Jim and I have a lot of work to do to make sure to address the concerns that Sam raised this morning
 - The letter is just a commitment to start the process
- Mark Menlove
 - It seems that the concern about putting yourself in a box or being a minority is exactly what the Governor asked everyone on this group to do
 - I would encourage the Governor to engage regardless of whether you may be a minority

Draft Policy Recommendations and Subject Matter Experts – Katherine Himes

- Katherine Himes
 - There has been some conversation but no conclusion on the question of how the Workgroup wants to use subject matter experts to look at the final recommendations.
 - The propose would not be for them to say to do them or not but to say whether it would be viable
 - Want to have a discussion on where the Workgroup would like to go on this
 - On our draft timeline, there is time scheduled in for them to move but it could be changed.
- Justin Hayes
 - I'll say that we have benefitted from having a lot of discussion with SME's
 - I've also expressed some frustration because often those in the trenches often are aware of the current constraints of their position
 - It seems like sometimes they are reluctant to support things outside their comfort zone and would be hesitant to give them an editing pen
- Richard Scully
 - I would like them to provide information in an advisory role
 - A side thought is that there are subject matter experts that are not with the state like Jay Hesse from the tribe
 - Don't know if there's time for that but I'd appreciate that input as well
- Joe Oatman
 - So, we use the SMEs when we went trough review of the recommendations and their input has been helpful
 - I think that they could still add some value going forward but perhaps not at this juncture in the small group stage
 - I think once we get to a point where we're through those steps and have refined recommendations and bundled that it may be a good point to have SMEs review and input on those
 - May not need to address today but consider going forward
- Katherine Himes
 - I think the goal is to consider whether the Workgroup wants to use SMEs at any point to look at recommendations for technical accuracy or viability. Not necessarily now
 - We've just had this conversation but no conclusion and want to figure out if we're doing this or not so we can make a plan
- Will Hart
 - SME not needed from my perspective. The Governor can use any SME's he wants after he receives the report. Have had plenty of presentations
- Dave Doeringsfeld
 - Agree
- Aaron Lieberman

- In the Agenda group we discussed SME's in the limited context to obvious technical mistakes and not an assessment of value or efficacy
- I have a tough time seeing what we have to lose from having a review of technical mistakes
- I personally benefit from SME's evaluating the things I think I know
- Justin Hayes
 - Aaron raises a good point. The difference between being technically correct or evaluating efficacy is an important distinction. I think that we could find a place for expert review and could find people outside the team we are currently drawing from
- Katherine Himes
 - This conversation was meant to be framed in that technical mistake context
- Roy Akins
 - I agree with where this is going and would be a good opportunity for review before the final report is submitted
- Merrill Beyeler
 - I think using it just for technical accuracy would be a good direction
- Katherine Himes
 - Right now, it seems like the group is approving of this concept so if we don't hear any objection then I think we can go forward
- Jim Chandler (for Brett Dumas)
 - Brett had to leave but we are supportive of review for technical accuracy
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok, not hearing any opposition in reviewing strictly in a technical accuracy sense
 - Another aspect that came up was bringing in other technical experts
- Aaron Lieberman
 - One of the ways we talked about in the group is that the people we bring in should not be reviewing any policy aspects so there shouldn't be any disagreement so if there is disagreement then I think they're not providing the purely technical review we're looking for
 - Just want to make sure that's clear
- Richard Scully
 - I think another thing the SME's could provide is to tell us whether a recommendation doesn't make any sense

Objectives and "Completed by Date"

- Katherine Himes
 - Before we revisit the timeline, I want to share an update on the next steps we discussed this morning
 - Some people volunteered for broad sections and some for specific aspects
 - We're asking you to send to us by noon tomorrow, to send us your top 5 light green items so we can split them out into groups.

- We think this may make it easier to get everyone split out and cover all the topics
 - *Put proposed timeline up on screen*
- Aaron Lieberman
 - There hasn't been much change to the document we shared last time
 - I suppose the brief start would be to cross of the items we've accomplished and then discuss if there are other things, we would like to add
- Katherine Himes
 - One thing would be to figure out when the recommendations are ready for technical review by SMEs
- Aaron Lieberman
 - We could have the dark green ones done earlier and then the light green ones that the small groups are working on can be done later
 - That way we could chip away at it. Dark green could go out for review by Oct 15.
- Mike Edmondson
 - On dark green ones, would SMEs look at them after you put them together or look at info before you put it together?
- Katherine Himes
 - I want to be mindful if we're giving them content in waves, how can we structure it to be efficient
 - I think one thing is knowing exactly what we're asking them to do
- Jim Fredericks
 - I think that if we are going to tap other experts especially, that we need to be able to give them something concise to review
 - Right now, some of them are just amalgamations of ideas and not ready to review
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Ok, scratch the wave approach and we'll hold off until we have a concise package to send them
- Paul Arrington
 - Timing wise, October 27th says aggregate recommendations. If we're just looking at light greens and not yellows, how do we get it all done in that timeline?
- Katherine Himes
 - One thing that takes a lot of time is spending a good portion of November with a draft out to organizations and constituencies. If we could shorten that we could extend our timeline possibly. But that is what this conversation is meant to do is figure out how to use the rest of our time
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think Paul is right that this is a tight timeline
 - Why does this need to be done strictly by December 31st?
- Katherine Himes
 - Our work was supposed to be done by December
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I understand that but is there a certain purpose for that?

- If not, it may be worth asking if we can move if we feel that we cannot do that in that timeline we could extend it out
- Paul Arrington
 - That was the deadline gave by the governor and not sure we can move that
- Stacey Satterlee
 - One issue is that the legislature is in session and many of us will be working there and it would be difficult to schedule time to work on this
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Do we think it is still reasonable to have aggregate recommendations by October 27th?
- Katherine Himes
 - I think that the purpose is to have the small group work done by the 20th so that Workgroup members can have time to review before the Oct 27th meeting
- Aaron Lieberman
 - So, do we need to move this date?
- Merrill Beyeler
 - We have those already in dark green but there are 4 iterations of those things. Who's going to put those together and send them to the group?
- Katherine Himes
 - We talked earlier that the small groups may get there but some may not. It may look like it is final for the report or it may not quite get there and may need some more work after the October meeting. I think it depends on how much refining work you have in your small group to do
 - I will do the ones that are in dark green already
- Paul Arrington
 - It's going to be tight
- Kira Finkler
 - When you send out the dark green recommendation, do we need to have comments back to you by a specific date.
- Katherine Himes
 - I'll send one example out next week and then I think I can get the rest of them to you by mid-month. So, say October 6th for first one and mid-month for the rest
- Richard Scully
 - I would like to see a format that shows recommendations that are ongoing and ones that are novel so we can see what are some of our recommendations that are bold and breach the status quo.
 - Then we know what we're doing outside the box and getting towards recovery
- Aaron Lieberman
 - So, we'll have to delay the SME review until we have the full recommendations to give to them. Probably no sooner than November 12th
 - Then we can push circulation to other groups out
- Katherine Himes

- I'll also add the draft report groups work
- Aaron Lieberman
 - One thing we discussed is to keep the December meeting light to provide room for open discussion on final product, is that right Stacey?
- Stacey Satterlee
 - Maybe, but looking at that schedule it is very likely that we will still have work to do on the 2nd
- Katherine Himes
 - I'll add a discussion on what to do with our recommendations at the October meeting
- Scott Hauser
 - So, 25 years ago I read Thomas Hobbs' Leviathan. I feel like we again at the state of nature and I don't know what is really going on. I feel like I don't know what's going on
 - With structure are supposed to form our own groups and form our own groups and pick our own topics?
 - I'm lost and would like some clarification
- Katherine Himes
 - Let's walk through what our immediate next steps.
 - I think there is enough here for the Agenda group to work on the schedule
 - Let's make sure everyone is on the same page while we're all together
 - Before noon tomorrow you should send me your top 5 light green topics
 - Then the small groups will work on the small green topics
 - I will send you all the information associated with each topic and work to get it to a dark green consensus
 - Work on those until the 20th but can share informally before
 - Then share your work with whole workgroup so they can review before the October meeting
 - Meantime, I will take the dark green ones and work to put them in policy recommendation form
 - Also, the draft report section group will work to refine the draft report sections we already have
 - Then we'll take stock at October meeting of what we have
- Scott Hauser
 - Ok, I feel better. It's just unfortunate that we have such limited time
 - I still have significant concerns, but we'll get through this
- Justin Hayes
 - I'm looking for the 5 things and wondering how we're going to break that into small groups.
- Katherine Himes
 - The idea is a better way to sort people but if you want us to stick with what you sent before then we'll have to do our best at assigning
 - We just want to do it in a manner to do it quickly so you can get to work.

- The idea was that if you had 5, we could put you with people who had some of the same 5
- Why don't we scratch that and we'll use what we have?
- Richard Scully
 - You could look at the 5 topics and sort us and just put people where you need them
- Katherine Himes
 - Yes. That was the idea and if people are flexible, we could do that
- Aaron Lieberman
 - We didn't get through all of the agenda, but the takeaway is that there is not a lot of time and we can just tackle next steps
 - Is everyone ok if Agenda group updates and send out?
- Richard Scully
 - Since breach became red it seems to be put in the back closet
 - Heard it a lot from people last night too
 - Some place in the report to show the public that we considered it
- Aaron Lieberman
 - We did have on the agenda subcommittee that we need to figure out what to do with those contentious items
 - It was recognized that we do need to have that conversation
- Katherine Himes
 - Could be a number of ways to address that
 - Right now, is that we're not talking about it but that we're focusing on the green and light green where we are likely to find consensus
- Mark Menlove
 - Are we sending the 5 items?
- Katherine Himes
 - Let's not, lets just go with what we've got so far
 - We'll sort the groups but please realize that you may not get all the topics you want
- Mike Edmondson
 - Thank you everybody for your contribution and making it through all of our agenda
- Katherine Himes
 - Thank you for putting in so much time on zoom and participating and digging into these next steps

Adjourned: 5:08 PM