

Meeting of the Governor's Salmon Workgroup

November 12, 2020

Zoom Meeting

Workgroup Member Roll

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

Introduction – Dr. Katherine Himes

- Welcome everyone to November 2020 meeting
- *Gave background and purpose of group and showed technical topics covered*
- Next meeting is December 2nd
- *Workgroup members introduced themselves*

Draft Policy Recommendations

- Katherine Himes
 - We have 3 types of draft recommendations to look at today
 - I will pull them up on my screen and explain
 - *Put up recommendations on screen*
 - Have ones that were discussed in October and then sent to small group to refine.
Highlighted yellow in these slides
 - We'll talk about the yellow ones first

- Some things are in hot pink. Those were sent to the full workgroup for consideration after the October meeting
- Some workgroup members provided recommendations to modify policy language since the October meeting and the Workgroup needs to decide how to handle those suggestions
- I will move between this power point and the actual language as we discuss
- First one we'll look at is funding. Habitat funding language
- This is the language that the funding small group considered to see if that captures the Workgroups October discussion
- Senator Dan Johnson
 - Representative wood and I talked about this additional recommendation from the habitat group and thought we had a pretty full discussion
 - We did some additional word smithing and discussed bullet point by point
 - With the 4 states agreement and the statement we drafted should be able to cover the funding requests
 - We didn't feel too comfortable venturing too far from the statement highlighted in gray
 - Definitely willing to answer any questions
 - I shared some language with Mike and Katherine from 20 years ago and it was interesting because it talked about marshalling State resources
 - I thought maybe there was something in there we could borrow and use today but it sounds like that there was no coordinated or formal effort then like we have today
 - Considering the change in the landscape with the 4 States agreement we feel very comfortable with the language on the screed
 - Any Questions?
 - One of the changes we did make was change a shall to will to commit the State to look at some Idaho specific funding strategies
 - From the legislative side, we will work with the Governor's office to see what that may look like
- Katherine Himes
 - The proposal is that the language in grey be the funding policy recommendations
- Joe Oatman
 - Thank you
 - To make sure I'm following, the shaded grey area would be the new policy recommendation. Are the bullets still applicable or no?
- Senator Johnson
 - We discussed that and went through the bullets and thought that the language would cover all of the bullet points
 - I think whatever the 4 States agreement comes up with will address the federal sources of funding and our intent was to see how we could take on that effort specifically in Idaho

- To find new sources of funding we will have to get the support of other legislators around the state
- Katherine Himes
 - Any concerns with this language
- Justin Hayes
 - I have an observation not really a concern
 - There is some language that's coming up in a few places and there may be an opportunity to be concise
 - The CBP consistency language shows up in a lot of recommendations and perhaps we could do a more overarching statement to make it less repetitive
- Chad Colter
 - I want to support what was just stated. I think once we start naming off specific recommendations that should be consistent with CBP or not it gets risky
 - The tribe's goals are not always matched with the states
 - I just want to see where the tribes fit into this when it's talking about finding Idaho specific policies
 - The Tribes goals are not always incorporated into state driven policies
- Senator Johnson
 - I think that's where the devil will be in the details as we work to identify the Idaho specific funding strategies
 - Will take a lot of work with the Tribes to find mutual goals we can meet
- Brett Dumas
 - There's a number of references to CBP task force and their goals and I have a concern with that from the standpoint just from the fact that I'm not as intimately familiar with those goals and how it could change any of the intent of our policy recommendations
 - If we're going that direction, then I agree with Justin about having some language describing how the CBP goals apply to our recommendations instead of having them in each individual one
- Paul Arrington
 - I think we do already point to the CBP Goals in the Healthy and Harvestable document and not sure if we need to do it again
 - I don't need to reference the CBP or the 4 State's agreement
 - Ultimately, we are talking Healthy and harvestable stocks and it's irrespective of those other groups. The funding is independent of those groups
 - I think that the consistency with CBP is understood and doesn't need to be written everywhere
- Kira Finkler
 - I think that TU put that in a few places because we were trying to refer back to the Mission Statement and Goals document we all agreed to
 - If there's a way to make that clear in one section of the report, that's find. We just didn't want to lose the overarching goal that we all agreed to
- Katherine Himes

- I think there are two parts to this conversation
- First, don't think I'm hearing any disagreement with the proposed language
- I think the other part is what to do with the CBP language in some recommendations and not others
- Is this something where we go recommendation by recommendation or remove the CBP language and have the language elsewhere and share it with the group
- Just not sure where we landed on that
- Paul Arrington
 - I would ask Kira whether the Mission Statement and Goals cover that concern
 - Those are positioned in the report in what guided us in our decisions. Is that enough or what else would we need
 - They are quoted and the mission statement is the first statement in the report and the Goals language is in there
- Kira Finkler
 - I can relook at the report to see the Mission statement and Goals and how they're framed
- Dave Doeringsfeld
 - Instead of repeating CBP goals all through the document I would rather see a reference to it in the beginning of the document
 - This is supposed to be Idaho specific and there may be things that don't have a basin-wide impact but are more Idaho specific
 - I think one reference up front may be enough
- Katherine Himes
 - I think that will require looking at all of the draft recommendations to remove language that is duplicative
 - Do we want to tackle that today or do you want me to work on that and share it back with you for review?
- Mike Edmondson
 - I believe our Mission Statement references the CBP goals
 - Maybe we can simplify this by referencing our Missions Statement
 - Maybe we could replace that with our mission statement instead
- Katherine Himes
 - Looking at the language, how would this read if we replaced it
- Kira Finkler
 - Maybe we could reference Mission and Goals statement
- Paul Arrington
 - The only tweak I would suggest is to move our Mission and Goals statement to the front and not need to mention the CBP or Columbia Collaborative because those are the drivers
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok, for times sake we'll move on to the next small group. Ocean and Commercial fishing
 - There is new language from that group that I'll share now

- We discussed this in October, and it was sent back to a small group
- Joe Oatman
 - I can provide some context for those changes
 - I'll go through the conversation I had with Jim Fredricks on this
 - There was a request that Jim Fredricks look at this and I volunteered
 - Looked through available information on Ocean fishing and its impact on salmon and steelhead
 - Looked at NOAA recovery plans
 - Fall chinook is most harvested in the ocean due to their migratory patterns
 - Given that information we thought it would be prudent to revise the language to what you see before you
 - Here we would have Idaho engage in regional forums to give input on impacts to fall chinook salmon
 - This language promotes stakeholder involvement in regional forums that Idaho participates in
 - Idaho has a seat at some particular regional tables
- Brett Dumas
 - I just wanted some clarification. In the comments there are several bullets, are those intended to accompany the recommendation or no? my understanding is that they were not needed with the new language but want to make sure I understand the intent
- Katherine Himes
 - These were the notes from the new language and some of it for the older language
- Joe Oatman
 - We put this together for information purposes for the Workgroup to show that this is what we looked at to lead to the revised language
 - Wanted folks to understand how we got to where we did
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok, Next up is Basin Mortality small group
- Scott Hauser
 - Trying to pull up the language. In conversations I had with Lytle
 - Could we circle back to this?
 - When we talked with Lytle at the ShoBans we were thinking that the policy wasn't needed
- Lytle Denny
 - I did send an email to Scott and others and the argument that I was making is that our Hatchery policies cover basin mortality in the SAR discussion, but it also goes beyond that to look at out of basin mortality
 - Question was whether we wanted to tear apart SARs or just have them encompass that basin mortality concept
- Katherine Himes
 - Is this a question to the Workgroup on whether we want to go into that detail or is the recommendation that there is no policy needed?

- Lytle Denny
 - My take is that if we just have a measure for in basin mortality is that it's really just a piece of the SARs and I guess the question is whether the Workgroup wants a more specific policy on in basin mortality
- Lytle Denny
 - To summarize the proposal, I think the in basin mortality policy is not needed if everyone is on agreement on the Hatchery policy because it will incorporate in basin mortality among other things through the SARs
 - If everyone agrees on Hatchery, then probably don't need the in basin mortality
- David Doeringsfeld
 - I guess we would have to denote that there were some revisions to the Hatchery policy so as we move forward, we need to make sure we encompass that
- Scott Hauser
 - I may have to jump off and restart my internet
- Paul Arrington
 - We probably should talk about this in conjunction with the next one because we consolidated some Hatchery language
- Katherine Himes
 - Optimize hatcheries is next and I don't have any new language, so I'll put up the old language
- David Doeringsfeld
 - What's in red was added as a suggestion and I would suggest the CBP portion come out
 - The comment from the Workgroup last time was to make it more forward looking
 - Our small group didn't get an opportunity to discuss this optimized practice piece so it would be whether the Workgroup is comfortable with this language
- Paul Arrington
 - So, what I was meaning is that some of the hatchery policies were consolidated with the idea that some would go away
 - The consolidated one does not include that language that Lytle discussed
 - Maybe we need to put it in the consolidated one or take the optimization language out of the title
- Dave Doeringsfeld
 - I guess I didn't understand that the optimization one would go away
- Joe Oatman
 - I know this one has some twists and turns to it since the last meeting
 - We did provide some alternative language to this one in particular
 - We were supportive of keeping it more general and high level than what we see here and think we would be interested in that still
 - We thought it wasn't necessary for some of this language to be stated explicitly and that a more general statement would include some of these concepts
- Dave Doeringsfeld

- Joe, I know you provided input and thank you. Our group was not able to get together and discuss that
- Joe, what would be your concern with listing some of those things out because I think that I may be important to include this description?
- Brett Dumas
 - Suggest that there are enough outstanding issues that this small group should continue to work on it and bring it back to the group
- Katherine Himes
 - Looking at the supplementation piece, the blue language is from October meeting. What's in the comment box is feedback received since the October meeting and there is enough there that the small workgroup should probably look at it further
 - There are some other aspects of Hatchery that we will cover later that didn't get covered in October
 - Looks like this group meets on the 16th
 - Good news is that we've moved through everything that we sent back to a small group at the October meeting.
 - Now we will turn to what we didn't get to cover at the October meeting. Highlighted in hot pink in the work document
 - The first one is a better title for Collaborative Efforts
 - Any thoughts here on the title
- Paul Arrington
 - Collaborative Focus would be my vote
- Katherine Himes
 - With no objection we'll change to Collaborative Focus
 - *Group agreed*
 - Ok, now looking at Downstream Non-tribal recreational and commercial fishing
 - Some suggestions around whether to support federal legislation, having IDFG go on Columbia river compact, and moving some language
 - *Put suggested edits on screen*
- Lance Hebdon
 - If I could get some clarification on what we're looking for on the 70% buffer for managing spring fisheries
- Richard Scully
 - By the time the spring fisheries make through downstream fisheries and pinnipeds, by the time they get to Idaho there isn't much for us to harvest o get brood stock
- Paul Arrington
 - For my perspective, the language that forecasts come in "well below" forecasts only make sense to people familiar with the process
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Maybe we're on the same page and ask if there is a better way to quantify and to see that if there is a way to make sure that stocks that come in under forecasts are not overharvested

- Lance Hebdon
 - So, the buffers apply to fishing and commercial fisheries below Bonneville
 - Was never designed to address fair sharing runs with Idaho
 - It has functioned to pass fish to Idaho but when the runs are very low it doesn't function quite as well in that effort
 - Joe has a good handle on this if he'd like to comment
- Joe Oatman
 - I think that what Lance provided is accurate in that the buffer was put in place to address non-treaty fisheries that were harvesting more fish than the tribes were able to
 - Was in large part to address sport fishery and was a concern to the tribe to achieve fair harvest and meet 50/50 harvest
 - I think what is reflected in this first bullet is that the buffer should be even more considering concerns that Idaho has
 - The change to reflect seeking standing this seems to be really focused and maybe it should be stated to be clear
- Katherine Himes
 - It seems like there is significant conversation to still be had on this one so I would suggest moving it to a small group to address it and bring it back to the group
 - Would the Brian, Joe, Toby group be willing to take this up?
 - *Agreed*
- Toby Wyatt
 - Been really busy but I'm willing to take it on
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok, let's move on to the next one, Predation management
 - *Put proposed edits on screen*
 - Three minor verb changes and a lot of more specific predator language
- Paul Arrington
 - As I look at second bullet about reducing factors that favor predators. I read the three new proposed bullets as specific examples and don't know that we need them specifically if they are encompassed in the more broad statement
- Katherine Himes
 - I think this gets back to the question of whether the Workgroup wants to list specific projects
 - I think where we landed last time was to stay more general to avoid leaving projects out
- Richard Scully
 - Those bullets are mine and they came to me as I read the more broad bullet
 - These are very obvious or important actions to be taken in regard to predation
 - I don't know if we'll have an area to list things we want to make sure things don't fall through the cracks

- On the second one in particular, the levels of removal aren't close to what they are authorized to take and not enough to make a difference
- They are specific but they would be helpful. I don't know that they should go in here as line items or not, but I want to make sure that providing generalities to allow the agencies doing the predation work to avoid these ones that may be difficult but need to be done
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I do believe we discussed whether to include specific suggestions in the policy body or appendix and I think we decided the latter
 - I don't disagree with Richard that these are important, but I think that they may need some additional clarification and may be more appropriate in the appendix
 - I think per our discussions earlier that they may not hurt to put in appendix instead of body
- Katherine Himes
 - We do have time this afternoon to talk about what goes in appendix
- John Simpson
 - At the top of this section about Predation management, is this focused on Idaho stocks or just in general?
 - Are there predation management actions that could be specially directed towards Idaho stocks? Like a timeframe where they more affect Idaho stocks or would it be a more general predation approach to all stocks
- Mike Edmondson
 - There are some tendencies for timing to affect predation and it is being studied
 - Could also look at the "rising tide raises all boats" approach
- Toby Wyatt
 - I like Richard's bullets and like the idea of adding brainstorm ideas into an appendix and I think that it could be a good place to have some ideas for the Governor to check out
- David Doeringsfeld
 - Thanks Richard. I think these are good examples and would like to see them in appendix
 - In the section about federal funding for predator control, I would like to see it say aggressive predator control to emphasize that we need to do something here
 - Not married to the idea but would like to make the point that the program needs to be more aggressive
- Brian Brooks
 - It also seems that the issue is that it's a process thing in that right now it's a lot of work to remove a single predator
 - Is there language to support streamlining that process?
- Mike Edmondson
 - Some things have happened since our last update on this and I don't think it would be beneficial to detail a recommendation on this
 - Could do an update as thing progresses

- Progress has been made on quite a few fronts
- Justin Hayes
 - We are getting way down in the weeds and not sure that we're adding much other than what everyone's group wants in there
 - Worry that we could be making it harder to get consensus
 - I think it's tough to see some good recommendations be short and others be really long
 - I think that we may need to make some structural changes to make this document coherent
- Katherine Himes
 - Any more comments?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think that I'm with Justin on this and feel that we're in agreement on this one and would be best served to move on to ones where some more contentious language may have been introduced
- Katherine Himes
 - Thanks Aaron
 - Any concerns with the proposals?
 - Ok, don't hear any
 - We still have some recommendations to tackle but we are scheduled to take a break
 - I think we'll keep this going and move back the impacts and scale a little bit

Break

- Katherine Himes
 - Ok welcome back
 - *Showed proposed edits to next topic Hatchery, Maintenance and Enhancement*
 - I'll give you a moment to read and see if there are any concerns
- Paul Arrington
 - One quick thought, on the fourth bullet. What's the difference between essential funding and just funding? Does that add anything
 - And then on main body, it used to say "where appropriate" and now says "where needed" and would like to know the reasoning behind that change
- Kira Finkler
 - I think I changed that but would be ok with sticking with "where appropriate"
- Paul Arrington
 - I don't know that I care either way but just want to know the purpose
- Justin Hayes
 - I'm not sure that these 4 different bullet points say anything different
 - I wonder if the bullets are even needed or if we could draft a policy statement that encompasses them all
- Aaron Lieberman

- I think that we probably could do that
 - I think that this is Team Dragon's consolidation and could further consolidate
 - I worry about pushing too many things to small groups considering our timeline
- Joe Oatman
 - I think I have a different perspective that it may be a good opportunity to send this to a small group that is addressing other topics already. I think that there are some related aspects that may be good to have a group address collectively
- Kira Finkler
 - I agree with Joe
- Katherine Himes
 - So, the Chad, Lytle, Joe, David, Brett group would cover it
- Kira Finkler
 - I invited myself to that group as well
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok so that group now has 4 things to cover
 - Ok, we will move to Hydro: Flow Augmentation
 - *Put edits up on screen*
 - Are there any concerns with the proposed changes?
- Paul Arrington
 - I'm concerned with the word expand. Originally, we talked about continuing to support these programs but are there ways under current programs to optimize to better support fish
 - Timing, coordination, etc.?
 - Expand to me means sending more Idaho water down the river and that is something that I couldn't get behind
 - I don't know if that was the intent of the language but would be interested to know the thought of including expand in that language
- Justin Hayes
 - I think I am likely one of the people who said something about this
 - My observation on the use of the word continue is that it didn't fit with the discussions we talked about where we agreed we need to do more in general
 - Not necessarily meant to expand and Paul's suggestion of using optimize may be good to capture what we want which is efficiency using the system
 - Sensitive to Paul's concerns
- John Simpson
 - We want to continue to improve conditions. That's where we're trying to get to
 - Think we can word smith it to capture that and emphasize that we're not advocating for status quo
- Brett Dumas
 - In the first bullet where we replaced advocate for support. I read that as someone has already identified operational modifications and I thought we were more along the lines of advocating for operational modifications. I'm curious if advocating may be a better fit for what we're trying to get across

- David Doeringsfeld
 - I was just thinking that we could combine first and third bullet point and advocate for modification and flow augmentation at Dworshak because after that they pretty much read the same
- Justin Hayes
 - Is the second bullet needed?
- Joe Oatman
 - For the first bullet that involves an agreement that the tribes are involved in, we're not looking for more water than what that agreement provides for and just wanted to make clear that that was my interpretation of the language here
- Katherine Himes
 - Do you think we need to add language to make that clear?
 - Maybe as we're looking to modify some of the intro language do you think we need similar language for existing agreements in there or should it be policy by policy?
- Joe Oatman
 - A part of me thinks that having the qualifier would be more helpful than no
 - Don't want folks to read this and think that there is an opportunity to change the amount of water that is released at Dworshak under those agreements
 - May be best to have some qualifier inserted here to avoid any confusion or misinterpretation
- Paul Arrington
 - As you're doing that, I don't know that the two remaining bullets say anything that the main sentence doesn't say
 - Especially the second one and possibly the first
 - May not be necessary
- Justin Hayes
 - The only thing I'd add is that the way that we changed the first sentence it focuses on existing agreements and first bullet has some different suggestions
 - I think we should get rid of the bullets but modify that first sentence
 - I think it can all be said in one sentence
- Senator Dan Johnson
 - I think that Joe is correct that we need to be careful about what we put in here
 - If we include operational modifications to Dworshak Dam, that raises a lot of red flags in this country and that if we remove the bullet points then we don't raise a lot of those flags
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok, so we're down to one sentence and want to make sure we're ok with it before we move on
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think it's largely fine
 - To say consistent with agreements makes me unsure of what we're adding there

- It does seem that if we put language into these recommendations to explore and improve things then confine it to existing agreements it seems to suggest sticking to status quo
- Definitely people who understand these better than I do, and I just wanted to raise the point
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok, moving on to Barging
 - *Put up edits on the screen*
 - Thoughts?
- Justin Hayes
 - I'm open to cutting this one but if it stays, I don't think the bullets add anything to it
- David Doeringsfeld
 - I think Justin has a good point
 - I'm ok with cutting the bullets but would like to see the sentence included
- Richard Scully
 - I think that it's an ongoing process whether it's the Fish Passage Center or Hydro group that oversees operation and they make decisions every year to decide how much barging is going on
 - I don't know what we're adding here by telling them to continue doing what they're doing
- Katherine Himes
 - Some support for cutting bullets so is everyone ok with the single sentence left?
 - Any concerns?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Not opposed to cutting bullets here but want to ask whether we want to move to Appendix or cut them completely?
- Katherine Himes
 - We could discuss that during the appendix discussion
 - Next topic is Blocked Areas outside of Idaho
 - *Put edits up on screen*
 - Proposal is that this one be removed because it's captured elsewhere
 - Thoughts?
- Paul Arrington
 - To be clear, I don't think that this is wrapped up in the other Blocked Area languages
 - That other language talks about restoring fisheries above blocked areas in Idaho
- Joe Oatman
 - I don't recall if there was any consideration previous to where we are at today on this topic
 - We do potentially have an interest in this matter as a state as the 4 State agreement and other efforts go on in the basin
 - Also have Coeur d'Alene and Kootenai Tribe where it may be applicable to them

- Just wanted to raise those points
- Paul Arrington
 - My only thought on that, to the extent that the other Blocked Areas policy addresses restoring fisheries would address the other tribes' interests, right?
- Joe Oatman
 - I think that we would need to affirm that. Here just raises that there are other dams outside of Idaho that impact fish that used to return to areas within the state
 - I think this is something where we can figure out where it best fits. Could fit in other policy
- Scott Hauser
 - I had a call with several members of Coeur d'Alene tribe last week
 - Didn't discuss this specifically but did talk about whether they would like to include a perspective in the document
 - In looking at the other Blocked Area policy it seems to me it says consistent with State policy and not just Idaho state policy so I don't know that we would need to retro fit our current policy because it may address other state blocked area initiatives
- Katherine Himes
 - So, several points made that this may need to go back to Blocked Areas group
 - Don't hear a leading idea though
- Joe Oatman
 - I think what Scott just commented on, that the other policy may be adequate to address those concerns
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok so sounds like proposal is deletion. Any concerns
 - Seeing none, we'll move on to Climate Change recommendations
 - *Put edits on screen*
 - Several suggestions to delete because the other recommendation captures it. Any thoughts?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think Jim and I had this last and I don't remember there being multiple
- Katherine Himes
 - Correct. Because one fell within the Dark Green category, it did not go out to a small group
 - Any concerns on deleting?
- Joe Oatman
 - In the sentence where we recognize that Climate Change will affect anadromous fish, is that captured below?
 - If we delete the one, I would like to keep the "significantly impact" language
- Katherine Himes
 - Yes, First bullet
 - Any concerns with that language?

- Richard Scully
 - I would like to make sure to try to maintain that Idaho should try to take measures to insulate salmon and steelhead from Climate Change
- Katherine Himes
 - Thanks Richard that's another topic we need to talk about
 - Let's finish the recommendation about the other section and then we'll go to that
 - One last sweep, any concerns about eliminating the first recommendation?
 - Seeing none, we'll shift to the next Policy Recommendations that need to be discussed
 - Some language has been proposed on some recommendations that were discussed in October
 - How do we want to handle those proposed changes? Tackle now or send back to small group?
 - There is a whole batch that have this kind of proposed language.
 - Need to consider timing
- Paul Arrington
 - We've already addressed one faction of a lot of the comments in addressing the CBP language
 - If we don't go through them now, we'll have to do it at next meeting
 - At some point we need to decide to stop making changes. I thought we were there already after we went through these as a group but don't think that it was explicitly stated
 - At first blush I suggest we keep it as we had it after the October meeting after we all discussed it and moved on
- Katherine Himes
 - Wondering if group could shift to working lunch and address these because 4:30 will come fast and there will likely still be things to discuss
 - I don't hear any concerns about shifting the plan so that we can tackle the whole agenda
 - Ok, we'll start at the top and move through it
 - First up, Restoration, Connectivity, and Protection
 - *Put edits up on screen*
- Justin Hayes
 - As we revisit these with fresh eyes in the context of work of last two months. I think this is the time to discuss the bullets and see if we can get our recommendations into one or two sentences and then move the specifics to the appendix
- Kira Finkler
 - I added that phrase and would be ok to keep the sentence and move bullets to the appendix
- John Simpson
 - To the suggested phrase, is that SARs was one of the metrics to measure success and don't think one should be called out specifically

- Katherine Himes
 - Any concerns with Kira's plan
- David Doeringsfeld
 - So, in the appendix would we just restate the sentence with the bullets underneath in the appendix?
- Justin Hayes
 - Don't think there's an agreement on a plan but there is just so much varying levels of minutia in each one but I think we need to figure out how it needs to look
- David Doeringsfeld
 - I agree but if someone's reading this will they need to read through the main document and then go to the appendix to get the rest of it? Worry that someone just won't do that and would be worried about taking some of those things out
 - It's not like we're adding a lot of pages and I just wanted to make it easy for the reader
- Justin Hayes
 - Maybe as we're reading through this whole thing, we need to revise the policy recommendations to encompass all of the bullets and get the main points
- David Doeringsfeld
 - Good point but don't know if we have the time in the day
- Justin Hayes
 - Agree that not today but maybe in the coming days
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I tend to think that keeping the bullets we've negotiated to keep in the appendix and as we go through, we can talk about whether they are essential to the recommendation or if it would fit better in the appendix
- Katherine Himes
 - Would note that we have Governor's update this afternoon and possibly could get guidance there
- Richard Scully
 - Want to concur with Brett and others that separating the main sentence from the information that it refers to could make it hard for the reader to get the concept
 - Maybe could do it like Justin said or just to leave the bullets there with the initial statement and try to streamline them
 - I have a concern trying to put the meat in the appendix and have only the topics up front
- Brian Brooks
 - At first, I was in favor of cutting it down but if the audience is the Governor then I have full confidence that they could make it through the whole document and would support just putting everything up front
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok, we'll go through some more of the proposed edits

- *Scrolled through some of the edits*
 - Here's one on Harvest and Predation: Mitigation
 - Thoughts?
- John Simpson
 - What do we mean by partnership? If it's intended to mean input or comments by stakeholders to the state?
- Kira Finkler
 - That was my recommendation and it was meant to ensure input so that they review and consider input from interested stakeholders
 - If you want to change that word that's fine with me
- John Simpson
 - I think input would be more appropriate. Partnership suggests some sort of legal relationship
- Katherine Himes
 - Any concerns with changing to "input from"
- Justin Hayes
 - Do we need that in a predator bucket still?
- Paul Arrington
 - When our group put the prior draft of the recommendations into report, we put them into buckets and this one would probably go into a different bucket
- Katherine Himes
 - I'll make a note that the title may change
 - We'll move on
 - Ok, this is Hydro: Education
 - *Put proposed edits on screen*
- Kira Finkler
 - That one was mine and you can delete that
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok there is one more suggested phrase, thoughts?
- Joe Oatman
 - I think that this one could be included
 - We are certainly considering in this group additional things necessary to recover salmon and steelhead so may be appropriate to include
- Katherine Himes
 - Concerns about adding this phrase?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I don't have concerns, but it seems like the language is a little repetitive and could be consolidated
 - I could consolidate quickly, and we can move on
- Mark Menlove
 - Could just end it with "what more needs to be done for recovery"
- Katherine Himes

- Ok, we'll come back to that one once Aaron has a chance to work on that
 - Moving on to Water Broadly: Water Management and Water Quality
 - *Put edits on screen*
- Kira Finkler
 - These edits were meant to try to reword it to address specific aspects of this topic
- Justin Hayes
 - Does the bullet add anything?
- Paul Arrington
 - Yes
- Katherine Himes
 - This did collapse 4 policies into one
 - I'm not hearing any other concerns, so we'll move on
 - Science Driven Policy *Put edits on screen*
 - Any thoughts
- Richard Scully
 - I support having that in there. I think all the discussion about different science or so forth, I think it needs an independent scientific review to see what is good and what's not
 - The feel here is that there is no certainty
 - It seems like the tobacco industry or climate change denying
 - Need to see what the preponderance of good solid science is and that we need to move forward with that
- Brett Dumas
 - I would take a different position and when it comes to this kind of science, we are going to have variability when it comes to modelling
 - The two major models conflict and I think it benefits to look at the issue in different ways
 - When it comes to modelling, I don't think there is one right way to model and having multiple may help to improve our overall understanding
- Justin Hayes
 - I don't understand the sentence at the beginning. What does it mean?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - If you go back to the previous version, it made infinitely less sense
 - This is just trying to make more sense of whatever was already there
 - I don't think that this is a meaningful statement but was trying to take existing language and move it to dark green
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok, thoughts on this potential bullet being deleted
- Justin Hayes
 - I think that to the degree that we're trying to reconcile different understandings, I think that may be good, but I don't know that this sentence does that

- I think that this recommendation makes no sense at all and if it's important could be rewritten to cover it and have no bullets
- Paul Arrington
 - The key is if it's important. Is this something we want to include?
- Mike Edmondson
 - This is something for the group to decide but this topic is being addresses at some regional forums
- Paul Arrington
 - Is there something that could be added to our other policies that would make it unnecessary to have this separate policy
- Mark Menlove
 - I don't think we have anything in the CBP language, right?
 - It does seem to come up regularly and may be important for us to address
 - Justin, is it the word accord that throws you off? Would it be better if that were changed?
- Justin Hayes
 - I'll let others duke this out. Feel like I'm wearing out my welcome on this
- Mark Menlove
 - To me it seems switching align for accord may help
- Katherine Himes
 - So, what do we want to do on this second bullet?
- Paul Arrington
 - I agree with Brett that we don't need it
- David Doeringsfeld
 - What if we just fold the first bullet into the first sentence and get rid of the bullet
- Mark Menlove
 - And don't need to repeat the agreement and could word it differently
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok, let's go back down to the one that Aaron was working on
 - Some options were put in the chat box, so what are the ideas on which is best
 - Ok Brett's option 3 is being copied into the document
 - Any concerns with this language?
 - Seeing none, I'll keep scrolling
 - Now we're back to Climate Change
 - *Put proposed edits on screen*
- Kira Finkler
 - The reason that I added different language is that it doesn't seem possible to insulate them from effects of climate changes
- David Doeringsfeld
 - I'll lobby for original language. Kira, I agree it's difficult to insulate but think it's equally difficult to make them resilient to climate change
- Justin Hayes

- To the degree that these recommendations should be something we could go do, I don't know that the first bullet adds anything that we can do or adds anything to the recommendation
- Richard Scully
 - There's still maybe a lot of people that don't accept or don't know that Climate Change is significantly affecting salmon and steelhead so it could be important sentence
- Mark Menlove
 - I agree, it's a fact statement but it shows why we have a recommendation on this topic
- Brett Dumas
 - I like Kira's addition, but I think we should do all of the above
 - Should insulate salmon and where we can't or in addition, we should look adaptive or resilient measures that could be taken
 - I would advocate that we do all of the above and that we'll need to do them all to counter the impacts
- Mark Menlove
 - I was going to agree that we can't insulate salmon but now having problem with managing them to be adaptive and resilient
 - Could optimize but don't think we can manage them
 - Could maybe take this one offline and wordsmith it some more
- Mike Edmondson
 - If you take it offline give me a call
 - Often, it's talked about in context of making habitat resilient
- Mark Menlove
 - Is it just optimizing habitat or whole river system?
 - I thought it was whole river system
 - I think we should probably tackle this offline
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think we can probably do better on the specific language
- Scott Hauser
 - The first bullet is a statement of fact and it seems like it should be included in the actual policy statement
- Mark Menlove
 - I think you're right. And one of the reasons it was suggested that we wanted a Climate Change topic in here is so that Idaho needs to do everything it can to offset the impacts of Climate Change to salmon and steelhead
 - Idaho needs to take an unambiguous stance on Climate Change and take action where we can
- Stacey Satterlee
 - When we discussed this in our small group, we got wise words from Rep Wood in that this report shouldn't focus on climate change or it will take away from the rest of the report

- If we start losing people because of the side issue, there are people who have different opinions on how to address or extent and would just put out those words of caution because this isn't a report on climate change
- Paul Arrington
 - I agree and I'll take another shot at cutting it down because I don't think we're saying anything additional
 - Some of these lines don't add any substance to the recommendation
- Katherine Himes
 - Does Aaron's proposed bullet address your concerns?
- Paul Arrington
 - The way that Mark suggested that just combining the language to just have the strong language of acknowledging and mitigating impacts of climate change makes the statement strong and eliminates the things that don't add substance to the recommendation
- Mark Menlove
 - I could go back and forth on the bullet and like Aaron's language. I wonder if we could flip some of the language in the first sentence as well.
 - I think I'm good with how it ended up on the screen
- Kira, Joe, Justin
 - Agree
- Katherine Himes
 - Any concerns with on screen language?
 - Seeing none moving to CRSO ROD
 - *Put edits on screen*
 - Any concerns?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I don't think it substantively changes anything so I'm fine with it there or not
- *Group agreed*
- Katherine Himes
 - Monitoring and Evaluation: Support Existing Programs is next
- Kira Finkler
 - I added the increased support language in an effort to get away from just restating the status quo
- Justin Hayes
 - I'm ok with the added and removed language but I think that the two sentences are redundant and should be made into one shorter sentence
- Katherine Himes
 - Has references to mission and goals statements that we discussed earlier
 - Is the second sentence necessary in light of our earlier discussions?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - *Suggested some alternative language*
- Justin Hayes

- I think that tidies it up quite a bit
- Group agreed
- Katherine Himes
 - Life History Research is next
 - *Put edits on screen*
 - Concerns?
- Paul Arrington
 - My question is what are we really getting at here? What is the Governor or me or anyone supposed to take from this?
 - If no one knows I would advocate for removal
- Mike Edmondson
 - There has been some work by IDFG that talks about noticeable differences between populations
 - Could be support for that work
 - It is a little bit weedy and could be easily covered in other language or could be highlighted as something you specifically want us to look into
- Paul Arrington
 - It's hanging me up because it is so weedy and if it is encompassed in the prior recommendation, I don't know we need it
 - Won't be upset either way
- Joe Oatman
 - I think I'm coming from different direction
 - I think this is likely covered by one we just discussed on supporting ongoing efforts
 - I think we're probably there even without that
- Katherine Himes
 - Hit delete so Workgroup can see how that looks but should any of these details be moved into appendix?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Jim and I got that from the Kline group and if someone is married to it, they should speak up
- Paul Kline
 - I think the Hydro group got this as an existing recommendation, didn't create it. I think we commented that it was an interesting scientific question rather than a policy recommendation
 - Think our group agreed it didn't reach policy recommendation status
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok, moving on to Goals and Timeline for Recovery
 - *Put edits on screen*
- Mike Edmondson
 - Reference to 50s and 60s may not be necessary

- The way the mission statement is set up it refers back to the CBP goals and I think that it will be covered
 - Depends on if you want brevity or expressly stated
- Brett Dumas
 - This seems to be more associated with our missions and goals than a policy recommendation
 - Is this captured elsewhere where we could remove it from here?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - If I remember right, there was some support in codifying some of the Mission Statement as a policy recommendation
- Justin Hayes
 - I think a couple of us opined that we needed an overarching statement on where we want to go with Salmon recovery as a State
 - I think it may be in the wrong place but may be trying to address that issue
- Paul Arrington
 - I'm not sure with all practicable speed means and would put a period after salmon and steelhead because the rest doesn't add anything
 - I don't think we talk about a timeline and would like to understand the practicable speed language
- Richard Scully
 - I put in the 50s and 60s language to give the reader context
 - I would like to see the information relative to the SARs stay in the document whether it is here or somewhere else but let's not delete it
- Joe Oatman
 - I think in my review and with the all practicable speed language may be trying to convey the sense of urgency and has been used elsewhere like CBP processes and products. May be a way to get that point across
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think I put the practicable speed in there and that language was trying to see how we could get to a timeline intent without coming up with an actual statement
 - I think the quoted language comes from one of our goal's statements
- Katherine Himes
 - So, I'm hearing that the purpose was to create something to adopt the mission and goals statement of the workgroup
- Justin Hayes
 - I don't know if that was the intent but that would be a good thing and could morph this into that
- Katherine Himes
 - Paul, do you see how this could turn into that?
- Paul Arrington
 - I could try to do something

- My question is that in light of our earlier conversation about how our mission and goals weave through everything, does this add anything
- To Richards point, the SARs are in different areas of the report and will stay there
- Katherine Himes
 - Do you want to tackle it now or Paul and Justin tackle?
- Paul Arrington
 - Fine to tackle this offline with Paul and Justin
- Scott Hauser
 - Depending on where this goes, if the 2014 NWPC stays in I would include the 2021 amendment addendum
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok, we're behind schedule so let's turn to small group
 - Let's take a break and come back at one. Need to tackle the next three topics before 3 pm.
 - Let's take 10 minutes for lunch then come back

Impacts and Scale

- Katherine
 - Ok moving to Impacts and Scale. Who will be presenting?
- Joe Oatman
 - For this small team, we had two calls to try and review where we're at in trying to adjust the impact and scale aspects for the policies we developed
 - One of the things we discussed on the first call was the results of the impact assignment we did earlier
 - We looked at the results closely and the analysis and wanted to update the Workgroup on that review
 - At the time we did the last one, we had 57 policies. We looked into how the assignment and ranking was used and was it consistent with the grid
 - When we first broke into small groups it was first by the Hydro 1 team to assess those policy recommendations and assigned them into different boxes
 - The responses on the assignment were inputted into a spreadsheet for each recommendation and a mean value was produced and that assigned them into the most appropriate box
 - Boxes, Minor/simple, Major/Simple, Minor/Complex, Major/Complex
 - Not all policies received a score from every member
 - Some felt they didn't have enough knowledge to score every policy recommendation
 - Also, not every member scored them the same
 - Was also 4 versions of each policy so may have been confusion there
 - There is still the range to consider
 - We talked about how we're still refining the policy recommendations
 - After we reviewed the results, we started to think of how we could provide additional detail to that and what could be next steps

- One idea could be to do the exercise again once we have final recommendations with detailed instructions on how to conduct the exercise
- Also discussed when and how we want to do that
- The second consideration was while we have the impact/effort grid it could tell us how much an action might move the needle and how difficult it would be
- Discussed drafting some language for the report that would explain that concept
- Language would address that the recommendations are to a recovery plan, that some concepts are already existing, and that the existing things should be done bigger and better,
- For some we wanted to determine whether we are just supporting some ongoing and whether we are supporting others but on an increased scale
- That's where our group got, and I will stop there and see if other members think I've captured that accurately and answer any questions
- Paul Arrington
 - I think Joe summarized it well
 - I think the main question we have for the full Workgroup is whether there is value in doing this exercise again
 - There was not agreement in the small group on whether it would be valuable so we could use that direction from small group
 - I don't see the value in the rescoring as it relates into what we're doing here and what we're trying to accomplish
- Scott Hauser
 - I continue to advocate this
 - When I look at it, I obviously look to the blocked area that comes across as major/complex
 - I don't think I agree with that and in terms of the tribes it would have major effect but maybe not for fish
 - I think there is value in the rescoring exercise
- Joe Oatman
 - I think there is value in helping us see whether our recommendations are getting us towards healthy and harvestable like listed in the goals and mission statement
 - I was trying to come up with a way that would allow this workgroup to try and look at the recommendations through that lens
 - I think we can add instructions to make it more user friendly but recognize that we have different backgrounds and knowledge on some of these issues but that may just be an inherent limitation
 - I would support using this again. We'll be dealing with less policy recommendations and a single version and that it will be easier
- David Doeringsfeld
 - I commend Joe for putting all the work into this
 - Where I struggle is for the end result
 - We've got 37 recommendations and we're trying to get across what level of impact each may have to convey importance to the reader

- I think that there is some difficulty in attempting to convey that impact
- You really need some sort of standard deviation as well
- The data can get skewed a little bit
- I'm not opposed to going through the matrix again, but I question what that value is going to be in providing that information in the future
- It's complex and may be difficult to convey
- Kira Finkler
 - I was on the small group and I think we can keep it simple
 - I think about it as the governor and what may be helpful to him
 - I think we would take an hour at the December meeting and do it like an in class quiz
 - I think that it would be helpful to the Governor
 - I think we don't even need to try to average it all
 - I think the perception of impact helps the Governor prioritize
 - And I do think it will be easier this time around
- Brett Dumas
 - To make sure I understand, we're basically using the same matrix but evaluate the benefits differently based on the category you get?
 - So, if you get socio economic benefits, are we evaluating them based on impacts to that category, etc.?
 - Also, I don't really understand the different values in the different quadrants.
 - Those are my two questions just to make sure I get it
- Paul Arrington
 - As to your last question is that the number of policy recommendations that fit into that box
 - To your first question, I think that we're grading things in a bubble
 - We've talked about this, because not all of these things will be done on their own
 - But it's each recommendations impact
- Brett Dumas
 - How am I evaluating the benefit? Is it in context of mission statement or do I evaluate it in the context of the recommendation?
 - Like Scott said, Blocked areas could have socio economic benefit but not for fish
- Joe Oatman
 - When we think about each axis on the grid
 - We compare that to the mission and goal statement it provides some context
 - All that we've learned over the course of being involved here is being put to use in this exercise
 - It would seem likely when reviewing this that the Governor may want to know how easy each one will be and how much of an impact it may have
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Just to make one clarification is that we did talk about how some of these recommendations don't get to the express goals of the workgroup
 - Some may have different values

- Brett Dumas
 - That's what I thought originally but I thought Paul said it was not going to be that way
- Paul Arrington
 - Then maybe I misunderstood your question because what Aaron explained is how I understand it
- Stacey Satterlee
 - I feel a little mired in here. I would question again what we would use this for and how it would help us in the next month
 - Does this affect our recommendations at all? We've done this before and got some data, but I don't think that it affected our recommendations
 - Think we need to focus on the finish line, and I don't see how this helps getting us there
- Richard Scully
 - I support doing the matrix again as refined because I think we could get some good information out of it
 - When I look at the impact analysis and look at breach and how it would have a major impact on our goal and the rest of them would be minor in comparison to that
 - So, I guess when I look at impactful it has to be in context of only the ones we have to consider and not overall impact
- Paul Arrington
 - Not sure of the answer but that illustrates the reason I'm hung up on this
 - I don't think any of these are impactful by themselves
 - Shouldn't be assessed in a vacuum
 - I think scoring one at a time tells us what each member thinks but don't see the value in that information
 - I struggle because I don't understand what valuable information, we're getting from this
 - How do we score this to make it meaningful?
- Kira Finkler
 - We've been talking impactful from almost day one
 - Governor said he wanted impactful recommendations
 - I think that comparing them to our goals and mission statement would be valuable
 - Every elected official has to prioritize, and I think that it would be valuable information for him to have
- David Doeringsfeld
 - When Richard says he's measuring against breaching or other measures, I think we measure it to our mission statement and goals
 - I'm not just going to rank them among the other policy recommendations that we have
- Mike Edmondson
 - Homework assignments are getting tougher for us to get complete

- Conversely, a lot is happening in small groups
- One thing to consider is that you may get more response from having a small group do it
- Not sure if that's what you want but just putting it out there as an observation
- Another part of this discussion is that some text was drafted and the folks who drafted would like to talk about it.
- Could do it now or later
- Justin Hayes
 - In discussing this topic, a variety of things came out and a narrative could be helpful to give context
 - The added text is a suggestion to add context to what the policy recommendations are that isn't addressed in other areas
 - One point is that we're not writing a recovery plan that we're making a consensus actions recommendations document that we can agree would be helpful for salmon. Recognizes some are ongoing and need to be done bigger and better
 - I think if this proceeds, it should be reviewed in context of full report but wanted to share it with the whole group now
- Brett Dumas
 - I like what you and Paul have put together. Captures the intent and is succinct
 - *Group agrees they like it*
- Mark Menlove
 - We discussed this and thought it may be good in the preamble or
- Aaron Lieberman
 - May be good here to frame the policy recommendations
- Justin Hayes
 - I think the next step is to give this to the draft report group and they can edit and place it where needed
 - If no objection, would like to forward it to that group
 - *Group agreed*

Report Draft

- Paul Arrington
 - Huge thank you to Alli for the heavy lift on putting together the original report
 - Katherine sent out the email with all the comments, thank you for providing comments
 - What we noticed when we were getting comments many of them were on the Introduction section that covered the background of this issue
 - What we found is that the section was not long enough to cover all the issues to everyone's satisfaction
 - We discussed how we referenced CBP for issues and they cover that background very well
 - We discussed tightening the report up instead of trying to cover all those issues in the Introduction section in such a short section

- We inserted a small paragraph that gives the just that fish are declining and points to the CBP report if the reader would like more detail
- We tightened up some other areas as well
- Still at about an 18 page document with some good information.
- We were able to incorporate all the comments that people provided
- There is a box at the hatchery section, and I think the hatchery group is trying to address how that language can cover everything.
- There was a comment on including tribal scenarios in appendix and I think we decided that since we're pointing to the CBP documents, you can find those scenarios there and not include them in this document
- Last thing I would add is that there was a suggestion of combining the lower snake river dam with the consensus section, but I know there were some thoughts of adding some of the removed detail back in
- Joe Oatman
 - There was some discussion on the information that was removed was the section on the information describing the tribes. Think it would be good to provide some info on tribes since they are sovereigns and managers and do a lot of work on this issue
 - May be helpful to describe the things they do on their own and in partnership with state and federal entities
 - Don't have any particular language on that. Have developed some strawman language with Chad and Scott
 - On the lower snake river dams section, I think that there could be some additional info provided for context. Can get that submitted and out for review. Think that the context could be helpful
 - The other thing that could be useful for the report, talking about decline and goal to get passed delisting to healthy and harvestable. Right now, we don't have any information to put that in context. Could put in some graphics from Jim Fredricks presentation that shows the runs and put everything into perspective
- Chad Colter
 - I agree with Joe
 - What I'm developing right now covers a lot of what Joe talked about
 - Sets the stage for treaty reserves and tribal interests
 - Talk about our involvement in this workgroup
 - It's one of the commonalities is because the low abundance is causing us all issues
 - We are a group here of diverse people that are all being impacted in some form by the low numbers of fish
 - Common thread is that we want to get abundance back in the picture
 - That's kind of the path I'm going down
 - We're here representing 5 tribes of Idaho and think it would be good to give a statement that goes beyond ourselves and speak to all the tribes of Idaho

- Some tribes are in even worse positions in that they don't have access to those fish anymore
- Tough to have to do cultural retraining for things that used to be second nature
- Brian Brooks
 - I'm fine
 - Going back to Paul's original comments and think that the original Introduction section turned into a battle of words and support deletion of that and support inclusion of tribal section
- Scott Hauser
 - Something I'm planning on submitting is a tribal section I put together for the CBP report
 - Speaking to Coeur d'Alene last week they didn't fully commit to have one but seemed interested
 - Kootenai declined to provide one
 - I'll have to reach out to them and see if they'd be ok with the language Chad put together
- Justin Hayes
 - I want to affirm my support for a good report that captures all the important elements that captures tribal elements
 - I think it's important to be a concise good read
 - I think that instead of making the words count we just added more text and I support that but want to make sure we are not cutting out key concepts
- Richard Scully
 - I would like to add some more information on the breach paragraph
 - With all the comment we got on supporting breach it should be more detailed
- Paul Arrington
 - I would caution that we are not writing a document for each of our groups and we've been surgical with the language
 - I'm not saying don't send anything but just want to be sure to be mindful of that

Report Appendix

- Katherine Himes
 - One thing we're asking is if the small group doing the report may have things to put things in there and to discuss just generally what should or should not go in there
- Paul Arrington
 - We talked about it briefly and we came up with, public comment, iterations of the policy recommendations, listings,
 - It's pretty easy on public comment and iterations of recommendations but need to figure out what else we want to be on there
 - A lot of it will likely be a link to the webpage that may house a lot of the information
- Mike Edmondson

- I think the webpage is a good repository for info
- There was a theme today of “lets stick it in the appendix” so what should that look like?
- Links, specific projects/improvements etc.?
- Paul Arrington
 - I would add that if the appendix includes prior iterations of policy recommendations that it covers a lot of the comment this morning
 - I think we need clarification on what we need to include
- Mike Edmondson
 - Particular projects?
 - Could discuss what a table of contents may look like
- Proposed Appendix
 - Public comment
 - Agendas and materials covered by recommendation
 - Evolution of policy recommendations
 - Projects
- David Doeringsfeld
 - Why are we putting iterations of policy recommendations in the appendix, seems like it would just make it messy
 - Don't think it's necessary
- Paul Arrington
 - I agree with that and I think that there has been discussion on where to put recommendations that we couldn't agree on and that's where they would go
 - Agree that it can make the document cumbersome
- David Doeringsfeld
 - I think that we can include the agenda, notes, etc. and that would cover it
- Aaron Lieberman
 - We're talking different iterations and not non-consensus recommendations
- David Doeringsfeld
 - I would say both would be covered. I don't think we need the non-consensus items because it would be in the notes
- Paul Arrington
 - I like David's idea to rely on the meeting notes and not have the iterations of recommendations and that the non-consensus item of breach is in the report
 - If folks are good with that then I think that is good to do
 - Don't know what non-consensus items besides breach would be included
- Mark Menlove
 - Are there any others that people can think of?
- Katherine Himes
 - We had some yellow and dark red items
 - *Read off other items that fell off and why*
- Aaron Lieberman

- I don't think that it's too significant
- I see the logic of referencing notes
- There aren't that many things there and I don't see what we lose by including it
- Do we lose any utility, but we may gain a little bit?
- Paul Arrington
 - I don't think we lose anything, and it would be easy to include the yellows and reds and attach as Appendix C
- Aaron Lieberman
 - One thing I think of is the reservoir drawdown. That's been mentioned in public comment and it shows them that we addressed it and not make them have to go through the notes
- Richard Scully
 - Curious about the public comment
 - Its electronic and not paper, would all the public comments be listed as they were written in the document
 - Will there be any kind of tally of oral comments?
- Mike Edmondson
 - The public comment is captured in the notes and all the written comments are easily compiled
 - There is no public comment that has been lost
 - Oral comments are not captured verbatim, but the spirit is captured
 - We are also working on tallying the amount of comment that we have received
- Katherine Himes
 - Alli has tallied the number of oral commenters we've had
- Aaron Lieberman
 - When we run through that was there a suggestion of particular projects go into its own section
- Mike Edmondson
 - I think that's its own question right now
- Paul Arrington
 - We've discussed kind of how to deal with those. At one point we discussed a cover letter and today we discussed an appendix.
 - Haven't decided specifically how we want to do that.

Break

Update from Governor's Office – Sam Eaton

- Sam Eaton
 - Thank you Workgroup members another fun filled and exciting day
 - I feel like you're all at the stage now when the teacher says pencil down and you're trying to get in your last thoughts
 - I apologize that I've missed much of today's meeting, but we've been preparing for another Covid conference tomorrow

- The question of impact has come up a few times and I don't have enough knowledge to give direction but would caution that with the time you have left that it may be difficult
- I know that you are all good at your jobs and good and making your positions known
- On this issue a couple thoughts, we've got a lot of experts on the State side between OSC and IDFG that understand this issue and we're happy to have conversations with people
- I think the Governor and his team will be able to understand which will be most impactful and an idea of level of effort
- I wouldn't spend a lot of time getting spun out on that
- I think with the Governor's agency help, he'll be able to understand which are most impactful
- I appreciate all your guys hard work. I don't think we fathomed how much effort this would take especially with the effects of Covid
- You've all done very well, and all dialogue has been civil even on difficult topics
- I appreciate this groups willingness to do that and recognizing everyone's different perspectives
- With that I'll stand for questions
- Brett Dumas
 - What are your thoughts on an approach to take advantage of the 4 state agreement? How does the governor take advantage of that for Idaho?
- Sam Eaton
 - Good question and not sure where to start
 - Right now, we're in the agree to agree phase
 - Understand now that it is the Columbia Basin Collaborative
 - Mike and Jim have been in those conversations
 - The recommendations that you will put forward to the governor are just that, and I don't see any problems with them.
 - Not perfectly sure how we are going to utilize the recommendations, but one benefit is that they will be a playbook or starting point in negotiations with the other 3 states
 - We've got a new governor in Montana and new staff. Not sure how that will affect the Power Council
 - New Governor was not a signatory and I have a sneaking suspicion that Inslee may be getting a cabinet position and not be governor of Washington for too long
- Richard Scully
 - Regarding public comment – I recognize it's not a random sample of Idaho citizens and I've been impressed by the all the comment we've received. Has the governor had any opportunity to look over the public comment or is it mainly just for us?
- Sam Eaton
 - The Governor pretty much just reads anything that's put in front of him

- We get comments and letters that comment on the issue
- He's seen some of the comment and has followed all the news pieces and Op-Eds
- It's not a random sampling but does give you an idea of how the people who are paying attention to the issue are feeling
- He has not seen every comment but has been seen much and kept up on the issue in general
- Joe Oatman
 - You touched on impactfulness and described that the state has experts that could rely upon. Could you elaborate a bit on when we get the recommendations submitted, is there going to be any feedback to the workgroup on the ones that we think are impactful relative to the Mission Statement and Goals Statement?
 - Second questions that came up earlier in our workgroup discussion, one of the policies we're considering whether to make the goals statement a specific policy that we would have the Governor consider. If it's submitted to the Governor with the Goals and Mission statement, how would he treat those?
- Sam Eaton
 - To your first question, we haven't necessarily sat down and come up with a plan of attack
 - We're going to get the recommendations in December and then the legislature is going to be in session and be a hectic time
 - I don't know that there'll be a formal response, but I can tell you again that we have relationships with many of you or all of you and can communicate with you
 - First stop will probably be IDFG or OSC but that's not to say we won't reach out to you if there's a recommendation we would like to discuss
 - I see the dialogue continuing and am open to suggestions
 - To your second question, I'm not sure
 - I'm not going to predetermine what the Governor will do with any of the recommendations especially before they're finalized
- Aaron Lieberman
 - You've spoken to not being able to predict the Governor's response or the future which is fair, and you've mentioned reaching out to us for dialogue when needed
 - When this workgroup concludes and the nebulous nature around the 4 states agreement, can you give us any assurance that the work on this issue won't dissolve with the dissolution of this workgroup
- Sam Eaton
 - It won't
 - The momentum is going to be carried forward by you
 - The Governor was serious when he put this group together knowing that the world of salmon recovery is vast and complex
 - Like in a lot of issues he relies on those closest to the ground and that was the spirit of putting this group together
 - It would be disingenuous of us to be sincere on the front end and ignore on the back end

- I'm hesitant to make promises not because it won't be taken forward but don't want to overpromise and need to recognize the realities of the world
- Mark Menlove
 - On the Columbia Basin Collaborative, will there be a role of the congressional representation of the states in that effort?
 - Is there communication going on about that with the different offices?
- Sam Eaton
 - I can answer your second question and may have Mike take the first one
 - I can tell you that I we have a lot of conversations with Simpsons staff and Fulcher's staff
 - Have talked quite a bit to Risch's and Crapo's staff as well.
 - They are keenly aware
 - The congressionals did receive a letter asking them to participate in the regional effort
 - They are actively engaged but have been in the background thus far
 - Mike, anything to add?
- Mike Edmondson
 - A lot of congressional staff participate directly in our meetings
 - It's too early in the process to know how the congressional staff will be involved in the Columbia Basin Collaborative effort
 - Many of them have been focused on election recently
 - New Montana Governor is not a signatory as Sam mentioned
 - Generally, a sentiment that has been shared with me is that the congressional staff has been attentive to our efforts and don't want to get out ahead of us
 - The Collaborative may need some time to develop some more structure, but the congressional members are very attentive to the efforts
- Justin Hayes
 - My questions have mostly been addressed but would like to say thank you for being here
- Sam Eaton
 - I appreciate being here and mean it when I say don't hesitate to reach out to discuss any of these issues
- Brian Brooks
 - Just want to say to Sam and hopefully to the governor that in our conversations people have been thankful that someone has continued to give this issue attention
- Sam Eaton
 - Thanks, I know many of you have sent your appreciation and I pass that along to him

Next Steps

- Katherine Himes
 - *Shared screen showing Timeline and Objectives document*
 - *Gave recap of where we were in October*

- There was Subject Matter Expert (SME) review and feedback given to workgroup in October. That has not happened
- Don't think we've reached out for their review yet
- We also had the report going to graphics editor on the 13th of November
- Our goal is to look what is left on this list and what should happen in the December meeting and what is stuck process wise
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Should we ask Sam while he's here about how we should frame the "shall" or "Idaho should" language?
 - I think that we were on the same page that we at least wanted to make that consistent
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok, there is only a handful that still have that language
- Sam Eaton
 - I agree consistency is important
 - These are recommendations to the governor so whether it's a shall or a must or should
 - Obviously if I was drafting a contract it would have different meaning but in this policy context, I wouldn't overthink the language use
 - Seems like the idea is if the recommendation gets put forth and if the governor adopts it then that would become his policy
 - I think in this context I'm not going to take offense at how the language is written
 - I'd have to look at the specific language to get the tone but because these are recommendations, I don't think I'd get hung up on the specific language
- Katherine Himes
 - Comments or thoughts on the timeline as we have it?
- Senator Johnson
 - December 2nd is a bad day for myself and Representative Wood so you will probably not see us
- Paul Arrington
 - What solutions are we trying to find?
 - We talked at the last meeting is getting the comments and incorporate the report
 - I'm assuming that we accept the changes we made today and send it over
 - Doesn't mean that we are done commenting on it but allows a closer look
 - At the same time that, we have some small groups to finish up some last items and can hopefully get everything back a week before the meeting so we can review it
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok, where does the SME review fit in?
- Paul Arrington
 - I think it fits that it fits whenever they can fit it in. I don't think the recommendations will change much from now so they can look at those and provide comment any time

- Katherine Himes
 - So, the idea is that the version we have today can go out to SMEs for technical review
- Mike Edmondson
 - Talking for the technical experts, we are committed to get a product turnaround in whatever timeframe we need to
 - We've looked at it and there are some things that are of slight concern with specific wording
 - Other than those things, we just need to all sit down together and get it done
 - If you want it next Friday, I don't think Jim will be able to participate
- Katherine Himes
 - What about the policy recommendations that are out to small groups?
 - When could the language be available for workgroup review and does the workgroup want to review it independently or as a group at the next meeting?
- Paul Arrington
 - If we could have everything by next Friday, then we would have the week to go through everything before we meet next
 - I'll let everyone speak to their ability to do that but that would give us the opportunity to have good discussion at next meeting
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Justin, is next Friday a realistic timeline for your end
- Justin Hayes
 - I have full faith in the people we'll send this to, but some editing may be needed for readability and not intent and it may take a few iterations of review
 - I think creating time for that would facilitate that and I can't give you dates right now but we'll need some time
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Could the recommendations where they stand go to your people and do the first sweep and that the feedback that comes from SMEs and Small groups could get incorporated in second sweep
- Justin Hayes
 - I'm saying that there needs to be enough time for a couple of passes to whatever group will be reviewing this
- Richard Scully
 - I don't know if we need all 4 technical reviewers and if 3 could do it sooner that may help
- Justin Hayes
 - I would support that so that we have time to pass this back and forth
- Mike Edmondson
 - We'll work on details, but I think the answer is that we could do that
- Katherine Himes
 - Ok so we have the 20th for SME feedback and small group final products

- When the SMEs give the technical feedback and if there is a problem, how does the Workgroup make a decision on what to do there?
 - Email or December meeting?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I think that we can do that by email and that if there is no issue raise then the changes are accepted
 - That would be my suggestion
- Katherine Himes
 - The revised material you get from the small groups, how do you want to handle those changes?
- Aaron Liberman
 - It seems that the turnaround needs to be quick to give us time for back and forth
 - I think if possible, we would try to resolve or affirm or not as quickly as possible and if there is general dissent then it would have to go to December meeting
 - For time's sake I think we should try to resolve it before the meeting
- Mike Edmondson
 - If we can get the policy recommendations, Lance and I could get together and start in on them on Monday
- Katherine Himes
 - So, we'll try to do small group review by email, but it may be necessary to bring to December meeting
 - What else do we want to see at December meeting? Agenda group meets tomorrow
- Justin Hayes
 - When we have opportunity for free flow discussion on things, we're struggling with
 - I think we don't put any new things or updates on the agenda and give us large blocks of time to discuss and disagree with each other and try to work through it
- Richard Scully
 - I think we should put together a poll to have a meeting date for around December 10 just in case we need it
 - Hopefully we won't but would be good to have just in case
- Katherine Himes
 - Definitely can do that
 - What date frame are we thinking and how long for that?
 - Other thoughts on this?
- Justin Hayes
 - I think that something during the week of the 14th is helpful and to book more time that we may need
- Aaron Lieberman
 - I agree and what it's worth and looking at the last Agenda notes we wanted to allow for open discussion and discuss the follow through after the process is over
 - Those were things that were left over from last time

- The next steps part was something we wrote down from Workgroup feedback
- Is that something we'd like to keep on
- If no one objects, maybe we can put that down as one of the talking points
- Katherine Himes
 - Alright, I think that is it for this item and we can move to next topic

Columbia Basin Collaborative – Mike Edmondson

- The letter went out and we talked a little bit last week
- It's vague and basically an agreement to agree
- The principal people working on this are Northwest Power Council members from the different states
- We're making good progress
- As we've found out after the election is that Montana's Governor is now republican, and their Power Council representative will change, and we'll have to get them up to speed
- They have been receptive
- Everything else is moving forward
- We have a steering committee that is the four states
- 3 major areas to reach out to,
- Federal agencies, Sovereigns, and stakeholders
- Starting out, we didn't just want to put a letter out to the region and wanted to have a more fleshed out product for people to support
- We need to have other entities at the table
- There are several pitfalls that could happen, so we need a measured approach
- We've reached out to one individual from BPA that has a long history with the tribes and to give us an idea on how to best approach the tribes
- We will be doing structured outreach
- We need to get input from others around the region
- Will put questions to different groups around the region on what they'd like to see and how they'd like to interact
- Likely try to replicate other successful collaborative efforts and likely have the structure laid out in something like an MOU that everyone would sign
- That would lay out how the whole process would work
- The earliest possible time we think we could meet would be possibly March, April is probably more realistic
- Between doing the governing instrument, the charter, talking points etc. all of those things need a lot of work
- I spent the better part of last week working on this
- We're identifying products that need to be created, who needs to be reached out to, and what's the best way to do that
- We're not sure how that looks yet
- Have to look at this process from the perspective of the Governors that agreed to this. Whatever we do it has to be something that they'll agree to participate in

- Needs to be meaningful, impactful, and beneficial to the region and provide a way to discuss and move forward on tough issues
- There're two areas that it focuses on. Supporting CBP goals and providing education and outreach on salmon and steelhead recovery efforts. This is in Statement of Purpose
- Going to be a lot of feedback as this takes shape
- As far as timeline, November we convened a steering committee, figure out outreach process to grow group in productive manner. Outreach efforts on how this thing should look
- End of November/December – should nail down how proposed structure may look by looking at other successful efforts and taking feedback
- December/January – Should get to a place where we figure out how to go about membership
- Groups will designate their members in some fashion
- After structure, need to figure out funding and resource needs
- In February – membership letters would go out and hopefully execute MOU
- March – could have first kickoff meeting
- These are the types of things we're working on
- As we move along and get input from potential participants it will change and evolve as it should
- I have not talked about what it will do and that's because we're not going to predetermine it
- We renamed it the Columbia Basin Collaborative and that will be the name until the group can meet and change it if they want
- Want to create something that everyone can agree to and get this thing moving
- Aaron Lieberman
 - You said the two primary things were advancing CBP goals and education and outreach
 - You said you aren't going to ground exactly what this group may be
 - Could you tell us in what way we should be inspired by that statement and purpose? How is that additive and new?
- Mike Edmondson
 - I have been vague but that's because this is all draft and there's more to come
 - If you like what you saw in the CBP task force the goal is to take the goals from that and do the things the partnership wanted to do
- Aaron Lieberman
 - So, it's to put more teeth behind the goals that the CBP laid out right?
- Mike Edmondson
 - Yeah
 - So like things like resolving the conflicting science. This could be something this group could take on
 - Could take on power and how its produced and distributed or not
 - But group has to determine what they want to look at

- Aaron Lieberman
 - Are you all considering the involvement of congressionals or their staff or is it just on a state to state level?
- Mike Edmondson
 - Started out on a state to state level but we need to engage the congressional staff to see how that may look
 - We want to work within the current structure so when the group comes up with something it would go straight to the decision maker
 - Maybe the group examines the governance of the region and makes suggestions
- Katherine Himes
 - Other questions or comments?
- Richard Scully
 - Did you have a concept on how long this process would last or would it be ongoing?
- Mike Edmondson
 - I believe the letter stated it would be 2 years up and running fully and then we've talked about once it's up and running doing a minimum of 5 years.

Public Comment

- Scott Levy
 - Bluefish.org, I've been hosting it for many years
 - I'll introduce those who are new to bluefish.org
 - The goal is to keep people up to date on fish in Idaho
 - There is a horizontal bar on the Columbia river system operation
 - Provided 60 page comment and the Feds response is pretty funny
 - At the top of the website you'll see a fish with a question mark, and it relates to the Inslee Orca Task Force
 - There's a page with news stories and if it's in bold it's something I thought was a good article
 - Today I posted an article on horn rapids installing solar panels
 - Posted on about experts being perplexed on salmon runs
 - That's kind of the site
 - I see an issue about conflicting science and resolve that and I could help with that so just contact
- Jim Duwitt
 - I don't envy your collective task
 - I hope that everything I'm telling you is a reminder
 - You will play an important role in whether a species will go extinct and vanish forever from Idaho's water
 - Salmon and steelhead are keystone species that support many aspects of the ecosystem

- Their old numbers used to transport vast amounts of nutrients to the region and that is almost gone
- You are charged with deciding the future of the species. A mistake would be devastating
- If you get it wrong the consequences will change Idaho and even the ocean
- As you weigh the costs and benefits please consider the impacts of a region without salmon and steelhead
- You cannot in good conscience support what's already being done
- If you get it wrong, you risk salmon and steelhead extinction and an entire realm of cascading consequences
- Will you be prudent and bear in mind the consequences of getting it wrong
- Again, I do not envy your task
- Gloria Pancrazi
 - Thank you for your work and wanting to protect salmon
 - I have noticed is that you have not mentioned dam breaching
 - It's actually an easy undertaking
 - The dams are in Washington, but it does affect Idaho
 - If you want to seriously talk about recovering salmon, you have to talk about breaching the dams
 - It makes sense socially and economically
 - We have seen the success it can have
 - Just want to share that and hope you take it into consideration and help
- Tess McEnroe
 - Hello and thank you for your hard work
 - After listening all day I'm impressed with the dialog and common goals
 - This is a complicated endeavor
 - I'm a guide in Idaho and without the rivers and fish me and my community do not have a livelihood
 - I will not sit back and watch a species be extinct. I think it is my responsibility to use my voice
 - I'm sure you're aware that sockeye was listed
 - Science is clear that these fish will go extinct if nothing changes
 - The clear thing is to breach the dams
 - They are dead and provide no benefit
 - The solution is to take them out
 - It is impossible to deny that human impact is destroying the environment at an unprecedented rate
 - As a recognition of the tribes' perspective of the fish, the relationship is reciprocal
 - These fish do their part
 - Now it's your turn to do your part
 - This group has the opportunity to prevent their extinction and that of others
 - Start building relationship and save these fish
- Scott Friedman

- Thank you all for taking my comment and your hard work
- I've been fishing the salmon river for 20 years
- Salmon remain in serious decline despite the amount of money spent
- They are a keystone species for social and ecological region
- Hatcheries are clearly not a long term solution
- Genetic diversity is needed for recovery and hatchery fish compete with wild fish
- The only clear path is the removal of the lower snake dams
- All of the impacts to human interests can be addressed
- The many communities and people along the rivers have been on the losing end of the deal for the long time
- Let's not repeat what happened in the Pacific Ocean
- It is in your hands thank you
- Nina Sarmiento
 - It has been my privilege to listen to last two meetings
 - In the October meeting a workgroup member is that dam breaching doesn't need to be discussed because it will be discussed elsewhere
 - Just because it is in the notes does not mean it was discussed
 - A serious discussion of salmon recovery must include a discussion on dam breaching
 - Studies show that dam breaching is most effective way to recover salmon
 - There should be no shying away from this topic
 - The BPA fish and wildlife program is already the most expensive recovery effort in history
 - Idea today was to lobby for more money but how much more money is necessary
 - Have suggestion for supplementation language for hatchery supplementation on genetic diversity
 - It is well known that it has a negative effect on genetic diversity and was meant to provide a Band-Aid for fisherman
 - I recommend that the group talk about dam breaching, revise
 - I do outreach for Dam info and can be reached for further comment
- Sean Downes
 - I live in Washington State and thanks for doing all the hard work to try and save regions' fish
 - During normal times I travel around whole northwest
 - I'm a physicist and we build models for all sorts of things
 - That's just how we think of real complex problems
 - We've developed a tool for addressing complex problems
 - Start with a rough draft and keep increasing detail to improve rough draft
 - The challenge is starting out with correct rough draft model
 - For this issue I worry that excluding the dam breaching is avoiding the correct draft model
 - I worry that any other options are too small to solve the problems before us
 - The problem is a tall ask and you can't do it with small actions

- Aaron Baxter
 - Appreciate everyone who has served on this group and appreciate that you're on it for the same reason
 - I live in the Pacific Northwest and seen a lot of money thrown at various rivers
 - Fishing it has been tough to catch any fish
 - Those runs have pretty much collapsed from 20-30 years ago
 - Seems like the money is being squandered
 - Hatcheries are not working, and the dams are a hinderance and obsolete
 - Dams are not making money or producing power and its time that it be dealt with
 - Failure to address that is failure to serve properly
 - Salmon are keystone species
 - I've read in Canada about bribes to keep quite on talking about dam breaching
 - BPA needs to stop subsidizing the dams and people need to get together and solve the issue and allow nature to do its things
 - Please do not omit that from your conversations and please include that aspect in your recommendations
- Liam Doucet
 - For decades salmon populations have been low
 - Salmon have been keystone species for millions of years and in just 50 years they have almost gone extinct
 - Reason for that is that the dams and they were built on a lie
 - BPA have spent billions of dollars to keep them running for no reason
 - BPA has attempted to bribe Native Americans to shut up about their culture from dying
 - investment hasn't help
 - Fish have died from turbines, warm waters, and little to no spill
 - Orcas have suffered from these impacts and for 40 years they have watched their loved ones starve to death
 - Their food is dying because of the dams
 - The science is irrefutable now that the only way to bring life back to the rivers is to breach those 4 dams
 - Engineers knew those dams were a bad idea before BPA even existed
 - I hope that this group can come to reason and help bring those dams down and bring life back to the region
- Owen Begley Collier
 - I'm here to talk to you about the starving orcas and failing communities
 - We need to save the salmon to save the Orcas
 - The army corps has the authority to breach the dams on their own
 - This is low hanging fruit
 - We need these dams breached as soon as possible
 - Incremental change and genetically tainted hatchery fish won't cut it
- Casey Langely
 - I've been in Idaho for over a year and before that was in Eastern Washington

- Have fished whole Columbia River and in Idaho it is a completely different situation
- I have caught wild salmon below Lower Goose
- They don't swim up the Snake like they do the Columbia
- I'm not advocating for dam breaching but there needs to be collaboration with the Army Corps and Oregon and Washington to get fish up here
- Everyone needs to form a plan to get fish up the river
- I think that is the most important thing for everyone to work together
- Needs to be more in depth with more people involved
- Thank you for trying to make situation better
- Julian Sullivan - Trudel
 - Would like to say that you are all very lucky to have opportunity to save salmon
 - You're also lucky that the solution is right in front of you
 - Science shows that breaching the snake river dams is the solution
 - I would like you to capitalize on your luck and recommend these actions
- Kris Nystrom
 - This subject has been talked about since late 90s and I would like to say that the runs get smaller every year
 - There has been tons of money thrown at the problem
 - Breaching the lower snake river dams is really the only way to get to salmon recovery
 - It's easy and its cost effective
 - We're subsidizing those dams for no reason, plenty of other power on the grid
 - There's no reason for the navigable water to ship grain and don't need the dredging
 - There are rail lines right there that could be used for the same thing and it's a big lie that has been supported for years
 - Only way to bring them back is to breach the dams and it would be easy
 - Keep it going and breach the dams
 - Also, sport fish and recreation dollars would eclipse any of the money lost by grain, transport, or any other dollars form the dams
- Rusty West
 - I've been promoting climate recovery for a couple decades
 - Everyone needs to listen closely to these youngsters; they'll be here long after we're gone
 - It is critical to respect mother earth and return to the indigenous ways
 - Need to breach the lower snake river dam
 - Joined car caravan last year to make plea to NOAA to take care of our mother earth
 - Don't have a lot of evidence myself but should listen to experts like Jim Waddell
 - Has said that the most logical thing to do to recover salmon is to breach the dams
 - Thank you
- Ned Fowkes

- I am a retired Forest Service employee and worked on river restoration in Payette Forest
- Did watershed restoration and did habitat restoration up and down Payette
- Taxpayers spent a lot of money on fish barrier culverts and removing those barriers
- I've been on site when many of these barriers have been removed and once it's removed, they instantly know what to do and fish go back up to where they were not before
- If it's appropriate to occur in watersheds, then we need to look at the major bottleneck on the system
- We talk about mother earth, everyone here owes our life to our mother
- We are demonstrably part of the earth
- We do owe our life to our mother earth
- We have decided that since we can, we will make decisions on who lives and who dies
- I think we have a significant amount of ignorance on the interaction between species
- An amount of greed has informed that, and we feel entitled to survive beyond others
- Crystina Stucker-Gassi
 - I work for the northwest alternative to pesticides
 - We have successfully won through the courts that EPA should re-examine the effects of pesticides on salmon
 - The reason I'm here is because I'm reminded about learning about salmon recovery in third grade
 - Everyone except one person today talked about dam breaching and I wonder why we didn't learn about that in 3rd grade
 - Thank you
- Maradel Gale
 - Here to echo people's statements on the need to breach the dams
 - I live in Western Washington where we've had dams removed and it's amazing how the fish come back
 - There are others on the river but the lower 4 are low hanging fruit and we can solve for the transportation issues
 - I've worked with young people on this
 - I've been working on these issues for over 60 years and would like to see some movement on this issue
 - It has been sad to see the way the salmon and orcas have gone and would like to see some reversal
- David Conn
 - Not a scientist or fisherman. Just a guy that in my life have kind of seen how things are going

- Seems like some people have great thoughts on how we're part of the life experience
- If you look at every indigenous person on the globe, the stories are almost the same in that humans don't own the planet and that we are a small grain of sand, but we have the biggest footprint
- The footprint is not a good one
- I really implore the legislators and other to stop thinking about today or yesterday and think of tomorrow and think of where we're putting our planet for our children and grandchildren
- First step is to try to get things back to normal
- These dams do not provide substantial benefit and it seems the best way to get back is to remove them
- Thank you
- Elaine French
 - I just wanted to ask the Workgroup to think big and think boldly
 - We've spent a lot of time and billions of dollars trying to solve this problem
 - Would like the workgroup to examine a new power system and make sure that those impacted by that action can continue to prosper thank you
- Carolyn Coiner
 - Thank you for your hard work on working towards collaboration
 - So much money, time and effort has been put into healing habitat
 - Habitat is ready and is just waiting for the fish
 - Scientists have said that the way to get the fish there is to remove the lower snake dams
 - I would encourage the group to examine that and figure out how to make people whole and not discuss whether to make that decision
 - I think that that is really a forgone decision
 - Thank you for the opportunity to comment
- Mike Edmondson
 - As of now, no other members of the public have signed up
 - For the Workgroup, did we cover blocked area policy? If not, we need to send to agenda sub committee
- Scott Hauser
 - We did not
- Katherine Himes
 - We did miss one policy recommendation review earlier and I think we can knock it out quickly here
 - Blocked areas Fishery
 - *Put recommended change on screen*
 - Any concerns?
- Aaron Lieberman
 - Whoever added those, could you explain the language
- Katherine Himes

- Important to clarify whether the Nez Perce Fisheries were involved or not
- Paul Arrington
 - That is correct and just wanted to make clear that that was the case
- Katherine Himes
 - Any concerns?
- Mike Edmondson
 - Seeing no objections
 - No one else has volunteered to comment
- Katherine Himes
 - Thank you everyone for giving public comment
 - Can also provide written comment
 - Thank you for the workgroup for getting through a lot today
 - Know that it is not easy on Zoom
 - I think we've set out a good path forward

Adjourn: 5:31pm