

**Governor's Salmon Workgroup Meeting
October 27, 2020
Video Meeting**

Workgroup Member Roll

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

Introductions 9:00: Katherine Himes and Mike Edmondson

Public Comment

Dave Canamela-

Will effort move us toward abundant salmon, steelhead and lamprey runs. One thing we know is salmon will do their part as long as possible. Salmon don't waste time.

Tess McEnroe

River guide in the Salmon River drainage, representing a very average voice. Important to acknowledge tribes on the land, Shoshone and Nez Perce people. In the Middle Fork drainage, I have firsthand observations of the redds, MF rangers post the numbers and every year we see a decline. There's been a drastic decline. Salmon as a keystone species support many species. We have a responsibility and opportunity to do our part. Only 124... returned to the Stanley Basin...over that short time Coho have become extinct. We've lost 50-70% of our fish runs and it's clear that Lower Snake River Dams need to be removed.

Jeff Bitton

You have been tasked with finding policy solutions to bring salmon and steelhead back to abundance. Biggest roadblock is number of fish dying in 4 lower Snake River dams. This is difficult to resolve without solving baseload power supplies from those dams. Policy recommendation for governor to keep supporting development of Small Nuclear reactors being developed in Idaho. They would allow power to all coop and entities in southern and eastern Idaho. Combined that would be similar to retirement of one Snake River Dam. One policy needs to focus on energy production. Please consider this while you consider how to have abundant salmon in Idaho

Lori Ode

Thank you for allowing me to testify, it would be a great legacy if we could achieve recovery of salmon. Allowing sportfishing to contribute to viability of our state and exercise of treaty rights. Very pleased that Governors have reached agreement to work together to recover salmon and steelhead stocks. Don't let the Federal Plan drive salmon recovery while protecting Idaho farmers.

Shiva Rajbhandari

Sophomore at Boise High, saving Idaho's salmon is not rocket science. The board will make recommendation to Governor. If you want fish to survive you must breach the 4 lower Snake Dams. We need sustainable transportation and energy. Dams are leaking money, now other people think of the solutions and all leaders have to do is approve them. They can be replaced with renewables. Breach the dams.

Erin Ray

Expressing my support for the Governor's agreement and support for removal of the 4 lower Snake Dams. I grew up in Idaho and now live in Boston. I'm proud to say I'm from Idaho, if we are able to save salmon it will be another thing for Idaho to be proud of.

From Isabelle Guthrie to Everyone (message in chat box): 09:18 AM

Thank you for holding this meeting. I would just like to share a written comment. My name is Isabelle Guthrie, and I am a river guide in Idaho. When I was 6 years old, I went on my first river trip down the Main Salmon River. This river trip changed my life and sparked a desire to become a guide. I have now been guiding for 13 years and feel a connection to the salmon as I do the rivers in Idaho. I understand the detriment of our decreasing salmon population and the effects that it has on our entire ecosystem. My father was a salmon fisherman, my brother works for Idaho Fish and Game and my sister is a Fisheries biologist for the United States Forest Service. Salmon and steelhead are important to my family and me, and I would love to see the removal of the 4 dams on the lower snake. Thank you.

Carl Hoerger

2 options. Breach dams and watch recovery or leave dams and watch salmon dwindle. Put proposals together to see what the issues would be and how to reduce impact to various

economic sectors. If we leave the dams what would the economic realities be and what would the impacts on salmon be.

Kelsey Helfrich

Outfitter in Oregon and Idaho. 4th generation outfitter and have watched salmon situation closely, been tough for my family to watch the decline. I had a talk with my daughter and she asked what was up with the lower Snake Dams. After explaining the issue, she said we need to get rid of them. We've been asked to be patient for 100 years to find a solution and we're still waiting. Do your best to make it right by future generations. We see the fish coming up its super rare to see these fish now. We are missing large amounts of biomass from lack of salmon. I hope you can get beyond the political issues to do what needs to be done. Let's solve it before it's too late.

Nina Sarmiento

Work for nonprofit, Damsense, educates in independent forums for dams, salmon and orcas. The COE EIS recognized that dam breaching was best for salmon recovery. Breaching could be done in months. Called into question why anyone would wait as salmon don't have much time left.

Intro: Katherine Himes

- Purpose of this Workgroup is to bring together diverse group to develop collaborative solutions for Idaho Salmon recovery. Have 2 additional meetings scheduled...workgroup has seen a lot of technical topics as described on the technical topics chart. Reminder that workgroup agendas are developed by the agenda subcommittee.
- Recommendations were color coded for varying levels of consensus. Today look at light green and dark green and have October small groups to share what your modifications were to draft policies.
- Starting w/ power point file

Dark Green and Light Green Policy Recommendations: Draft Policy Recommendations Summary and Small Group Assignments Oct 2020.

Harvest and Predation- In-state non-tribal recreational fishing-

- Most harvest recommendations are least controversial. Sportsman are interested in equitable harvest including down river states. Sportfishing community wanted to make notes that equipment restrictions and flexibility should be prioritized if we have multi-species closures.
- Silence needs to be concurrence otherwise it won't be efficient.
- Can we go back through the Oatman matrix and discuss what the next steps are going to be? To look for the effort/benefit matrix?
- Regional Dialogue-

- Important to recognize the 4 state agreement but not limit it to that process. Added or subsequent agreements. Also made point of reiterating abundant, harvestable populations. Felt like we covered intent of various regional dialogue recommendations.
 - David Doeringsfeld: What does “reasonable security” mean. I’m not comfortable with that statement
 - Mark Menlove: Most of the terms in the policy statement are somewhat vague. Rather than define what “reasonable security” means we felt it important to include but not go down the rabbit hole and try to define it
 - David Doeringsfeld I would be more comfortable with “ensuring impacted stakeholders and interests are kept whole..”
 - Mark Menlove: That leads to what about stakeholders that are not whole now?
 - Take out “kept” and put “made” or change to “kept and/or made” whole.
 - Scott Hauser: Tribes are not stakeholders or interests. Add impacted tribes.

Mitigation

- **Joe Oatman**: Put forth commitment on State of Idaho’s part that mitigation goals are met consistently and annually.

Harvest and Predation - Ocean Commercial Fishing-

- Secure greater involvement in regional forums that discuss and regulate Ocean harvest. Pacific Salmon Treaty and NOF process. SR steelhead and spring/summer chinook Ocean fisheries are considered negligible. SR Fall Chinook are impacted in those fisheries. Ocean fisheries adoption each state get input from their constituents. Opportunity for Idaho sport fisheries to be better represented in that process and provide guidance during the March/April meetings.
- Tribes have developed position paper. Topic sent back to team- Brian, Joe, Toby/Roy, David, Scott

Hatchery Optimize Practices

- Joe Oatman: No connection in the statements to harvest.
- Richard Scully: Express concern that if wild populations continue at low densities and maybe go lower, do they move into the era where these statements indicate that they need supplementation to keep them from extirpation? We should focus recovery efforts on rebuilding. So, we don’t need to look at those populations as needing supplementation.
- Brett Dumas: Supplementation is limited. Given the pressures that populations have we should be looking at better uses for supplementation and the tools that have evolved. This is one of the few tools we have that we have control over. Need to use it over a broader range of populations. Need to be more aggressive. Would like this to be more forward looking. Disappointing really.
- Kira Finkler: Being cognizant that silence is acquiescence. Helpful comments. Need a few more days to digest this before agreeing.

- Joe Oatman: Policy seems to be designed to maintain status quo. Could expand what we do now or do more in other places. Could be improved by ensuring that we don't limit ourselves in this type of policy. Would be willing to make some changes to this.
- Recommendation to thank Chad Lytle and David.

Blocked Areas-

- Lots of back and forth on this one and discussion of ESA listing issues. Hatchery component is limiting factor.
- With respect to recommendation text.
 - Joe Oatman: Comment that this would come from the state's allocation or were folks looking to access some of this from the treaty share.
 - Scott Hauser: Not our intent to re-allocate the Nez Perce share, focus was Idaho's share.
 - Paul Arrington: In previous draft we had bullets which spoke to the how to issue. Had to craft language around Idaho policy to not take resources from existing fisheries/recovery efforts in connected areas. No intention of taking fish from the treaty tribes. Arrington
- Send back to small group.

Hydro- Max Spill

- Observed that ROD suggests more spill is better for fish, ROD shoots a relatively low bar to avoid extinction, not rebuilding.
 - Paul Arrington: Discussions on how which should or should not stay in the report, flex spill vs aggressive spill. Is flex spill with adaptive management substantively different?
 - Jim Yost: Need some qualifications. Spill is not good all the time, like late summer for fall chinook. Not going to just aggressively spill more water.
 - David Doeringsfeld: Have TDG levels we have never seen before. Jury's still out on whether we are hurting our fish. I support flex spill w/ adaptive management not more aggressive.
 - Joe Oatman: from NPT perspective flex spill was not a long term mgt application. Flex was improvement over past operations. Modeling shows close to delisting fish returns. We think max spill might have merit. We have not tried it yet.
 - Richard Scully: flex spill which is preferred alternative will get has projected SARs up to 2% based on modeling. Looking at Cis about 1/3 of years you would see SARs below 1 and decrease population sizes. So, it's not nearly high enough to get to our goal significantly toward recovery. MO4 max spill showed higher SAR. Our group said to improve spill or provide more spill not max spill. Sometimes you don't need more spill when there's few fish moving through. Be flexible with the program. Trying to say provide more spill when its beneficial.
- Send back to small group (Hayes, Yost, Arrington, Hart, Dumas, Oatman) to resolve flex v max spill- there's not agreement.

Funding Policy Recommendations

- Ongoing funding source rather than one time infusion would be preferable. Some editing of the original agreement. Clarified that the Columbia Basin Partnership goals were adopted by MAFAC.

Break for Lunch

1:15 Katherine welcomes back the group and Continues with Dark and Light Green Policy Recommendations report from the small groups

Katherine Himes – moves to Harvest/Predation

- Idaho Fisheries
 - Joe Oatman: we added harvest shares between treaty and non-treaty fisheries since there could be access issues for multi-species fisheries in the fall.
 - No comments
- LSRCMP Mitigation
 - Joe Oatman: removed “update” from the LSRCMP recommendation because Idaho wouldn’t be doing that on its own.
 - No comments
- Ocean Commercial Fishing
 - Joe Oatman: changed list of regional forums that discuss Pacific Ocean fishing to PFMC.
 - Richard Scully: Idaho could request a larger share of Fall Chinook at PFMC.
 - Brian Brooks: I wonder if we should add in that this is specifically pointed at fall chinook.
- Regional Dialogue
 - David Doeringsfeld: objects to “providing reasonable security”, and would supply “ensure they’re made whole”
 - Mark Menlove: that’s fine.
 - Scott Hauser: should add “tribes” to the list of those that must be made whole
 - Kira Finkler: agreed.

Katherine Himes – moves to Hatcheries

- Wild Reproduction
 - Richard Scully: need to increase SARs for wild fish so we don’t even think about hatchery impacts.
 - Brett Dumas: we should be looking at “better uses of supplementation” for many populations.
 - Kira Finkler: we at TU need time to digest this.
- Supplementation
- Optimize Practices

Katherine Himes – moves to Blocked Areas

- Scott Hauser: combined each blocked areas topic into one policy. Consulted with Eric Crawford from TU on this as well.
- Justin Hayes: can this be used beyond Hells Canyon blocked areas so Idaho can enter into talks on Upper Columbia and other blocked areas outside the state?

- Paul Arrington: this language would not be applicable to Upper Columbia blocked areas. Other groups likely wouldn't want it to, either, since it's in line with Idaho state policy.
- Joe Oatman: where are these hatchery fish coming from? Which harvest share?
 - Scott Hauser: they'd be coming out of Idaho's harvest share, not NPT's. Good catch.
 - Paul Arrington: need to avoid taking fish away from existing fisheries in connected areas.

Katherine Himes – moves to Max Spill

- Justin Hayes: agreed that we need more aggressive spill to benefit salmon/steelhead.
 - Mike Edmondson: this subject is complicated.
- Paul Arrington: I don't see the difference between the aggressive spill recommendation and the flex spill recommendation. How does this do more than the adaptive management section of the flex spill framework?
- Jim Yost: first, we don't have all the results we need from the flex spill agreement to make changes to it. We have adaptive management. There are indications that we shouldn't be spilling at all in August. I'm not going to support a policy that pushes the state to advocate for more aggressive spill without that information. Trying to hold the revenue impact low for BPA, and we have to take that into consideration.
- David Doeringsfeld: agree with Jim. My concern is that flex spill is creating gas supersaturation levels that we've never seen before. I would support flex spill, adaptive management, but not max spill.

Q Brett Dumas: was there any discussion about aggressive spill and NWPPA amendments?

A Justin Hayes: no.

- Joe Oatman: we haven't tried max spill yet, so we should try it.
 - Richard Scully: flex spill under the PA gets somewhere near 2% SARs.
 - Aaron Lieberman: this recommendation leaves the adaptive management framework in place. It doesn't preclude the flex spill agreement framework from taking place.
 - Justin Hayes: some folks have said there's no information that more spill is good, and that's just not true. We did include adaptive management purposefully here, since that's important. The focus on preserving BPA's bottom line is not the goal, we need to recover and protect fish, and should direct Idaho to embrace that priority as well.
 - Will Hart: I think we've seen there's no agreement here between max spill and flex spill here. Need to figure out how to reconcile those differences in the text.

Katherine – moves to Funding

- Senator Johnson: Idaho should develop funding strategies to support the four-state agreement and advance partnership objectives.
 - A Scott Hauser: can we strengthen "should develop" to "will develop"? There's potentially a \$537M budget surplus, which could be used for this effort.
 - Senator Johnson: that's a good suggestion.
 - Will Hart: we don't necessarily want to tie the state to the CBP goals, which haven't been formed yet.

- Scott Hauser: I presented to MAFAC last week along with Paul A. Our Phase II report was approved by MAFAC. You intimated that the Phase II report was still in question, but it has been adopted.
- Will Hart: must have been misinformed. That's great news. I've got no problems with this.

Katherine Himes – moves to Surface Passage

- No comments

Katherine Himes – moves to Outreach/Education

- Combined all existing policies.
 - Q Scott Hauser: should there be any emphasis toward youth, or should it just be Idahoans?
 - Will Hart: not necessarily.

Katherine Himes – moves to Water Broadly

- Q Joe Oatman: this area previously mentioned biological needs of fish. What happened to that?
 - Paul Arrington: this is what was in the matrix.
 - Joe Oatman: ok, so can we put it in?
 - Paul Arrington: sure.
- Justin Hayes: I'd like to explore removing "collaborative and consistent with Idaho law" because that's not always what this is about. Collaborative is also redundant, as its mentioned first. This isn't an approach that leads to new solutions.
 - Paul Arrington: that's fine.
 - Merrill Beyeler: collaboration is key – very few things are done with mandates in Idaho.

Katherine Himes – moves to Science-Driven Policy

- No comments

Katherine Himes – moves to Climate Change

- Q Justin Hayes: support the intent here, and I want it to be well-received. I think there's some different voices in how we say different things throughout these recommendations. Are we putting our best foot forward with our language there, especially considering this is a spiny subject for some?
 - David Doeringsfeld: I'm with Justin.
 - Jim Yost: same.
 - Scott Hauser: we need consistency between what we're recommending here.
- Q Merrill Beyeler: maybe we should remove the "unambiguous position" part of the recommendation?
 - A Justin Hayes: I'll speak up in favor of the position, because that's what's missing, and I think others here noted the same.
- CRSO PA Implementation
 - Richard Scully: this is good to me. Just have to see what happens.

- Q Scott Hauser: do you foresee that with the four state process moving forward, that this will be a component of that process? Will they be talking about the results of the CRSO ROD?
- A Jim Yost: I'm sure it will be.
- A Merrill Beyeler: we want to avoid being redundant, so if someone else is looking at those results, I don't think that group will in any depth.
- A Jim Yost: there are 30-40 regional fora that are looking at this in some way.
- Q Joe Oatman: I thought this was dropped earlier?
- A Will Hart: it was by some groups. We clearly have no agreement here.

Katherine Himes – moves to monitoring and history – life history and research
 Aaron Lieberman presents for group

- Is this a novel policy recommendation or too science heavy?
 - Q Richard Scully: seems like we are getting off of the topic of salmon recovery. I'm not sure how this moves the needle, am I missing something?
 - Aaron Lieberman: I don't think you are. Does anyone have insight into why this was put forward as a policy recommendation I would be interested in hearing it.
 - Jim Yost: no one is going to do very much about fall chinook, we have those coming out, we don't have spring and summer and steelhead. You have to take a look at those. So, there is value in highlighting this area.
- Aaron Lieberman: asks if there are qualms to moving this to dark green
 - No objections

Katherine – moved to monitoring and evaluation – goals and timeline for recovery

- Aaron Lieberman presents for group
 - Changes language for consistency

Katherine Himes – gives a time check

- Katherine Himes: Asks how group would like to process
 - gives an overview of what we have left to talk about
- One on my concerns is if we talk about the yellow are, we going to short cut other things?
 - Aaron Lieberman: I would like to have time to talk about the pre-amble group and tightening group
- My proposal is that people look at the dark green language that I sent and if people have a critical edit, send it to me by November 4th. On the 5th I'll put everything together and on the 12th we will walk through those then
- Notes that two of four groups were able to meet over lunch and make some refinements
- Justin Hayes: with regards to the spill one I think we could deal with that one in like five minutes
- Aaron Lieberman: insofar as we do the yellow between now and the next meeting, we don't get to the refinement of the dark green, or the pre-amble/tightening group, between now and the next meeting
- Katherine Himes: draws WG members attention to chat

- Brett Dumas: seems to me we should focus on getting through the policies – that’s our primary objective for being a workgroup
- Will Hart: agrees with Brett
- David Doeringsfeld: agree with Brett

Preamble

Katherine Himes– shares pre-amble document on the screen

Mark Menlove gives initial presentation

- Safe to say this is longer than what any of us intended to come up as a pre-amble but we had several additions and instead of trying to fit them all together we just put them in.
 - Moves to the four bullet points
- Kira Finkler: something that is important to TU is recognizing the limitations that we are all working under.

Group takes time to read over the document and decides that it is good to move to final editing.

Katherine Himes – moves to tightening group

Paul Arrington speaks on behalf of group

- Tried to be more concise and reduce some of the redundancy
- Notes that some of the redlining has come from moving things around, and then editing the language
- The one new substantive thing is breaching the lower four snake river dams
 - Language to recognize that it is a tough issue but that we talked about it and we recognize that continues discussion needs to be had

Q Richard Scully: do we now have an opportunity to read through the report as it stands and provide suggestions? When would you like to have that done?

A Paul Arrington: that is perhaps the next discussion. Even in the pre-amble we had this discussion we know there was still opportunities for everyone to look at it and decide if they were comfortable with it. That’s the long way of saying yes, I think there is time for people to look at it and improve the document.

Katherine Himes– shifts to impact discussion

- Time in the agenda to entrain thoughts on impact
- Justin Hayes: I think it is important we give some input into how impactful we think these things are. For example, giving education the same priority as improving water conditions because they are very different.
- Paul Arrington: I don’t think the exercise we went through led us to be able to give that result. I don’t know if I disagree with Justin I just don’t know if the matrix exercise has given us that foundation
- Joe Oatman: I struggle to try to think about how we could objectively go through and assign impact to any one of these impacts that we have developed up to the current stage. Lacking some uniform method, I think we would be even further away from assigning impact, whether it will move the needle for fish.
- Scott Hauser: I would advise us to look at the Washington Orca task force report
- Richard Scully: looking at smolt-to-adult impact

- Brett Dumas: Doesn't think we should take the time to run through the agencies. We should polish up these recommendations and let the governor decide what they want to do with them.
- David Doeringsfeld: highlights that time is short so we should let the governor decide if he wants to run them through the agencies
- Merrill Beyeler: the governor will give our recommendations to experts in the field so I'm thinking we just do the recommendations and pass it to the governor
- Aaron Lieberman: clarifies that he was suggesting we have people look at them and identify what we have done and what doesn't work.
- Justin Hayes: Advocates support for Aarons notion. It would be good and honest of us to clarify what is already occurring and what is new and novel. The second part, now that we have experimented with the impact matrix and we are trying to move the recommendations into the green. I think it would be good for us to redo that assignment. Before it would be helpful to know and understand what impact meant.
- Katherine Himes: I think it would be good for a small group to take this and determine how this goes into the report. Is it a paragraph or two on what impact means or is it taking the recommendations and noting whether they have already been done or that are new?
- Joe, Kira, Richard, Merrill, David, Brett, Aaron, Scott, Justin, Paul volunteer
- Richard Scully: would it be too much to ask for you to take all of the policy recommendations and put them together?
- Katherine Himes: Yes, we can do that but were not completely done with the revisions on that

Katherine Himes- moves to next step and timeline agenda item

- Katherine Himes: Shares screen of timeline and objective screen
 - Gives overview of what the timeline
- We still have dark green to cover
 - As well as the follow-ups from this morning
 - Can this all be done by November 4th?
- Question to the group on how to do editing and graphics
 - Most support that ICL works to edit and design
 - Recommend doing in track changes
- Asks if group wants to add a workgroup meeting in
- In terms of next steps
 - Drop the yellow recommendations and make sure we capture what we need to capture in basin mortality
 - Justin Hayes: notes that the state still lacks a uniform overarching principle on how the state approaches salmon and steelhead. Our mission statement and goals may feel like that. I think that would be a worthy endeavor that I would feel okay leading if others would like to participate.
 - Richard Scully: On the economic studies and breaching the lower four dams, I don't think we should promote that. In the CRSO they did some studies on that.
- Turns back to timeline
 - Nov. 4th workgroup is to send report feedback to small group
 - Nov. 6th report small group sends new version to workgroup

- Nov. 12th appendix to be sent out
- Moves to lunch discussion
 - Notes that two groups met and asks if either or both are ready to share
 - Supplementation:
 - Only the red and blue is added
 - Intent was to make it more forward looking and to involve harvest
 - Kira Finkler: would like to take a few more days to look this over
 - Spill:
 - The paragraph drafted over break would replace other two recommendations (flex spill and max spill recommendations) so that there would only be one recommendation
 - Ocean:
 - Katherine Himes edits the document as this group dictates the changes
- Moves to dark green recommendations

Adjourned: 5:37 PM