

## **Governor's Salmon Workgroup**

**April 28, 2020**

**Virtual Meeting**

### **Roll**

- **Katherine Himes**
  - **Mike Edmondson**
  - **Aaron Lieberman**
  - **Brian Brooks**
  - **Dave Doeringsfeld**
  - **Dan Johnson Senator**
  - **Fred Wood**
  - **Joe Oatman**
  - **Justin Hays**
  - **Kira Finkler**
  - **Will Hart**
  - **Mark Menlove**
  - **Paul Arrington**
  - **Richard Scully**
  - **Roy Akin**
  - **Stacey Satterlee**
  - **Toby Wyatt**
  - **Merrill Beyeler**
  - **Chad Colter**
  - **Jim Yost**
  - **Brett Dumas**
  - **John Simpson**
  - **Scott Hauser**
- 
- **Introductions and Opening -Dr. Katherine Himes, University of Idaho**
  - Welcome
  - *Put up slide of topics that have been covered thus far*
  - Future meeting formats are not decided yet, whether they'll be virtual or in person
    - Will depend on public health scenario
  - This meeting is opportunity for Workgroup to learn about Hatcheries, get updates from subgroups, and get to work on policy recommendations
  - *Salmon Workgroup Members introduce themselves*
  - *Introduce first presentation*

**All presentations will be available on the Office of Species Conservation website on the Governor's Salmon Workgroup Page**

**Hatchery Review and Reform Processes in the Columbia River Basin – Paul Kline Idaho Fish and Game**

**Questions**

- Aaron Lieberman – What did HSRG recommend for Idaho hatcheries, were they implemented and successful?
- Paul Kline – one of the talks later today will talk about it but in summary one of the first orders of business was to identify the importance of each program and which would be segregated and integrated programs.
  - Basically, the recommendation was to determine which was appropriate for each area
- Brian Brooks – through the history of the state science was it discussed as to how long were intended to exist? Perpetuity, decades?
- Paul Kline – Brett can speak to Hells Canyon agreement but we have a few mitigation agreements in place that are intended to be forever to replace fish losses. So at least some are in perpetuity

**Hatchery Review and Reform Processes in the Columbia River Basin Harvest, Conservation and Supplementation - Brian Leth, Staff Biologist, and Matt Campbell, Fisheries Genetics Program Coordinator, IDFG**

**Hatchery and Wild Fish, Genetics, Fitness and Current Research- Ilana Koch Fisheries Geneticist (presenter), Shawn Narum, Lead Geneticist, Maureen Hess, Hatchery Production Coordinator, Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission (CRITFC)**

**Questions**

- Mike Edmondson – Question for Paul Kline. Could you review the list of common concerns with hatcheries and common early practices that lead to those concerns?
- Paul Kline – If you go back to the list that I prepared, some of the main ones were biosecurity such as using tools across different tanks and ponds etc. That was a slow one to come around because it required investment and commitment.
  - Timing of release was another issue that had to be figured out and many factors were important in how the fish respond when released
  - There weren't weirs controlling escapement into spawning habitat
  - Bonneville reports focused mainly on best management practices
- Brett Dumas – to Craig or Diana. Are there opportunities to apply the Snake River successful supplementation or was the success part of the unique area and life cycle of those fish
  - Craig- one thing we've always been focused on is limiting amount of wild fish we take out for brood stock. I hope what I showed today is that we can do this successfully and keep a good TNI

- It's two different species and the sub species component are not experiencing the same amount of mortality
- Not saying you can't do it but there are definitely things to consider when applying elsewhere.
- I do think there are opportunities to expand such programs. We are dealing with poor ocean conditions and would like to see improvements there and in the hydro system before we try to expand.
- There is promise
- Dave Doeringsfeld – Question for Ilana Koch. Are the results you're finding consistent with other areas like Alaska or others.
  - Ilana Koch – I am not familiar with those studies if someone else would like to comment
  - Dave Doeringsfeld -I'm just curious, I would think you would see consistent results
- Richard Scully – Question for Matt Campbell – Is there some domestication that occurs in the hatcheries where multiple generations of fish result in more docile fish and if so are there any genetic or physical factors to explain it?
  - Matt Campbell – definitely evidence that hatchery fish can become somewhat domesticated and become more so the longer they are there
  - I think the answer would be to start an integrated program to bring in those wild fish and have the natural environment combat the domestication
- Aaron Lieberman – Question for Ilana Koch – To what extent can the variable reproduction capacity in Johnson creek be extrapolated to other stocks in Idaho.
  - Ilana Koch – those programs are pretty unique in that they are using 100% wild fish brood stock. Other studies from places with less natural origin brood stock show different results
  - These studies that we've shown are pretty unique and other studies show different results because of that difference
- Aaron Lieberman – Question for Lance Hebdon – Do you have any sense of what the cost of what is spent on the 6 Idaho hatchery programs is? Can you describe the cost associated with logistics of each program, like transportation?
  - Lance Hebdon -we could calculate those costs but I don't have that on hand
  - Most chinook are released on site, but some programs do have some complicated transportation logistics
- Justin Hayes – I think we heard Ilana say that her studies were unique from other programs in Idaho that don't have 100% natural origins but heard from others that there wasn't
  - Ilana Koch – I think that was a fair statement
- Justin Hayes – I think we heard that supplementation is viable when you have excess habitat so how does that work with the focus on creating habitat. Seems like we have excess habitat and should focus on supplementation?
  - Mike Edmondson, I don't think I got the same message

- Lance Hebdon – I’d like to address first question that Ilana answered. There is an optimal program with 100% natural origin brood stock but there is the factor of managing the landscape and don’t focus on the genetic piece only
- If you can prevent fish from going to spawning ground with a weir then you can eliminate the risk.
- Joe Oatman – How does the info we’ve seen today connect with the Mission Statement that the Workgroup adopted? So Lance, has there any thought as to what size or scale would be necessary to provide a viable fishery
- Lane Hebdon -We do have a goal of 90,000 hatchery fish at Lower Granite and have hit that a couple times
  - We have not looked at what the upper level of the capacity of that fishery could be but 90,000 has provided a pretty good sport fishery
- Joe Oatman- If 90,000 is what we want on an annual basis how much do we need to change to get there?
- Lance- There’s two pieces 1) is smolt survival and one is smolt production
  - We’ve hit that a couple times indicating that if we hit above average on those metrics, we could get there
  - So there would likely need to be millions of additional smolts produced on an annual basis to reach that
- Dave Doeringsfeld – The Dworshak and Clearwater hatcheries, do you see similar SARs between these two hatcheries?
  - Lance Hebdon – Part of the challenge of that question is that they aren’t released in the same location.
  - Bill Young – it does depend on the release site because the different sites affect them differently
- Kira Finkler
  - Statement was made that after 4 years we’ve never met mitigation needs for the lower snake complex. Could you elaborate on that?
  - Lance Hebdon– that area had very specific return goals for above the project area. If you just take the production of returning Chinook salmon, it has never hit that target
    - We have been working on some numbers to figure out what it may take to bridge that gap and Gary may speak on that later today

## **Current Hatchery Implementation and Reform in Idaho**

### **Water Supply from Dworshak Dam- Gary Byrne, Assistant Chief of Fisheries, IDFG**

#### **Questions**

- Dave Doeringsfeld – Not having any idea on the cost of a hatchery – for like \$50 million could you bulldoze the current hatcheries and put something more modern in rather than put in the pipe proposed in your presentation

- Gary Byrne - Depends on efficiencies. If you are not running off of gravity then you are paying pumping cost. I don't think you could build new facilities that were more efficient
- Dave Doeringsfeld – if you took out two and put in one newer more efficient one would the water supply be sufficient? I think this is something that should be looked at to see what would be most cost effective and it very well may be the pipeline addition.
  - Dworshak does have some obsolete equipment but clearwater does not have that same problem
  - Facilities built in the more recent years have been incredibly expensive and expensive to operate.
- Richard Scully – I think that this could have a lot of benefit for the fishery so perhaps we could discuss this further at a future meeting to get more details

### **Letter to Governors - Dave Doeringsfeld, Workgroup member**

- There was a letter on Feb 24<sup>th</sup> written to 4 governors of Pacific Northwest from about 16 different organizations
- Pretty diverse groups
  - Public utility districts, environmental groups, Port of Lewiston
- Everyone in that group recognized that the EIS that came out won't solve our fish recovery issues
- However, the EIS does create the opportunity to create a regional plan and hopefully they can help direct investment
- Four goals in the letter
  - Abundant and harvestable runs
  - Enhancement of the regional economy
  - Honor Tribal Responsibilities
  - Reliable and affordable decarbonized electrical system
- Probably similar to CBP
- Tribal interests helped put letter together but did not sign
- We must respect our diverse interest and direct the energy towards identifying strategic investments
- They have met about 4 or 5 times and are trying to outline a path forward
- I think they are still trying to figure out how they are going to move forward
- I do believe that group is committed to moving forward

### **Questions –**

- Mark Menlove – I think this recommendation that the congressional delegations from the states meet with the tribes is a positive step and I think this group should encourage Governor Little to do that. I think getting the four states together is critical
- Aaron Lieberman – Wanted to agree with Mark and thank Dave for being a part of that effort to encourage leaders to find solutions

- Joe Oatman – I think from my perspective whatever develops there, our interest is to ensure our treaty rights are fulfilled and the responsibilities the tribes have as resource managers are taken into account. I do have some interest in how that effort will turn out
- Richard Scully – Thanks Dave. Is there any update on that you can give us from the people it was sent to?
  - Dave Doeringsfeld- I think that the main focus of the Governors right now is on Covid and not this issue and will likely be the priority for the foreseeable future
  - That group has talked on how they can maintain communications and move forward right now so we don't have to just sit until this passes
- Brian Brooks – Appreciate this Dave and I think that your sentiments have been echoed by other communities. I agree with Mark that it may make a good recommendation to the governor

### **Public Comment**

Amy Rawn

- Thank for your participation and your commitment for returning abundant runs in Idaho
- Fish are important to me and many Idahoans
- Although I am a resident of Wood River Valley I work in Alaska
- College studied decline of salmon
- Spending time in Alaska is a stark reminder of what we've lost in this state but also of what we could gain
- I want my children to be able to experience all the beauties of salmon
- We are at a turning point to decide what kind of future we walk towards
- This will require bold action
- I believe it is possible to make large scale policy change
- I am counting on the workgroup to lead Idaho towards this future

Jeff Bitton

- President of IOGA
- Most of you have had time to read through and understand the EIS
- The preferred alternative will not accomplish recovery or abundance
- This leaves it to you to identify viable solutions
- Please consider all actions
- For all those outfitters that are depending on your decisions I urge you to continue your work to continue to make sure recovery happens

Nic Nelson

- I applaud your dedication to this process especially in these trying times
- I did want to bring to attention that some of Idaho's policy has been shaped by Governors little comments on the hydro system being a blessing for power and irrigation
- He did mention the Salmon Workgroup in that letter

- I think that we have done a disservice to Idahoans by not having recommendations to the Governor before commenting on the EIS
- We don't have much time to save these fish and have other deadlines to meet that the Governor will need guidance on to save the fish and I look forward to working with you

Lauren McCullugh

- I am a resident of Idaho and local river guide and I encourage the Governor's workgroup to take bold action to save salmon and steelhead
- Large changes to the hydro system are necessary and this workgroup could help with that and keep farmers whole
- I moved from Midwest because of the outdoors and communities
- We want clean healthy river systems and thriving rural communities
- This group gives me hope that we can get there

Shiva Rajbhandari

- Thanks for hearing comment
- Freshman at Boise Junior High
- Does the government hate kids?
- Fish populations are a legacy
- We do not inherit the earth we borrow it from our kids
- To approve the DEIS really shows that they don't care about kids
- Youth will soon be paying off the massive debt
- These dams provide no real benefit to Idaho
- The power is sold at a loss, no flood control,
- Someone needs to be an adult in the room and make the decision to take the dams down
- Thank you

Emma Palmer

- 8<sup>th</sup> grade at north junior high in Boise
- For thousands of years anadromous fish have returned to Idaho to spawn and die bringing much nutrients
- Also important to tribal interests and could bring billions in revenue
- Also of great sentimental value to Idaho
- Idaho's outdoors is something we can be proud of
- Please take bold action to have the CRSO reject the EIS and take bold action to save the fish

Closing

- Mike Edmondson –
  - *Discussed tomorrow's agenda*

**Meeting Adjourned**

## **Governor's Salmon Workgroup Meeting**

**April 29, 2020**

**Virtual Meeting**

### **Roll**

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

**Intro – Dr. Katherine Himes**

**Mission Statement Subgroup Update – Brian Brooks**

- Brian Brooks
  - If you have the document, you could pull it up
  - This statement was batted around by the subgroup for a while now and the language was carefully selected to try and incorporate everyone's thoughts and try not to step on other's toes
  - If the WG adopts it, it basically adopts the CBP goals as adopted by IDFG
  - *Quoted some of the language*
  - First paragraph recognizes some of the work done in the region



- Second paragraph covers adopting the goals of CBP as adopted by IDFG and recognizes that those don't cover blocked areas
- Last paragraph recognizes that these efforts will be ongoing in order to achieve abundance goals
  - Wanted to recognize that action is required now while also keeping a realistic view that the efforts will be ongoing
- Subgroup had much discussion on this language
- Recognizes that adaptive management will be necessary in order to achieve success
- Paul Arrington
  - Thanks Brian, I think that accurately portrayed it
  - Want to say that the only thing different here from our last meeting is that last paragraph
  - Our effort was to really thread a needle to capture what we thought people would want to capture in this document
  - We did struggle quite a bit with the last language
  - One of the lingering things in the back of my mind is the use of the “significant language” in the last sentence
    - We attempted to avoid words that could have different meanings to different people, and I think that that language does
    - I don't know if I'll lose sleep over it but just a lingering concern I'd like to bring up
- Aaron Lieberman
  - I think it looks good for what it's worth
  - From last time it looks like you addressed what we discussed
- Mark Menlove
  - I'll second that and is there action that we need to take on this right now?
- Mike Edmondson
  - I don't know if we have an action
  - One way to move forward is lack of objection
  - Katherine?
- Katherine Himes
  - I think this can go forward unless there is absolutely a point that someone thinks need to change
  - Could also do an affirmative vote as well
  - Important question for the workgroup to decide on how they want to handle process because there will be many future issues to vote upon
- John Simpson
  - The only question I have is the last paragraph.
  - Looking at the action words I appreciate that it recognizes that each stock will require different action
  - In the last sentence where we say adaptive measures *will* be necessary, I think that *may* be necessary would be more appropriate

- Joe Oatman
  - I'm a member of the subgroup that worked on this
  - I'm largely supportive of what is specified here
  - I recognize there is some questions regarding some of the language, in particular the last paragraph
  - From my perspective the phrasing of significant action and adaptive measures are necessary to make sure the goals are met
  - From the direction the workgroup has received thus far all the way back to the first meeting on what factors has affected the salmon's declined. Given that information the WG has developed a slide that covers the policy ideas that covers each "H". As we are contemplating here, I think the adaptive measures we reference in this document are a reference to the ideas that this WG may develop
  - I ultimately think that minimum or minor actions won't fit our need or the need the fish have to meet recovery
  - We do have the Mission Statement and that this language would accompany that
- Will Hart
  - I'll go back to Paul's comment. I agree that the definition of significant is in the eye of the beholder
  - Believe it could potentially lead us to things that won't lead us towards consensus
  - I've been not overly supportive of this additional language to back up the mission statement
  - From my perspective if we're going to leave the Significant Action language in there and that there is such significant difference in stocks, I agree with John that perhaps we should change it to "may" instead of "shall"
- Brett Dumas
  - I think that this is really well crafted
  - As far as the discussion around the last sentence I agree that the actions required depend on the stocks and changing "will" to "may" in the last sentence
  - Would like to see where we can get with consensus
  - I don't think voting is a mechanism to reach consensus but it can be helpful on finding out where we are. Not running this like a democracy, we're looking for consensus
- Brian Brooks
  - I have a clarifying point
  - This isn't really a second mission statement to back up the first
  - We were trying to think of whether the subgroup should pivot to developing goals and whether we should do it to help inform the recommendations
  - Adopting the CBP goals is kind of what we came up with
  - More of a statement to the public to demonstrate what we are aiming for
  - We're shooting for healthy and harvestable
  - Think it's important for the public to know that we're shooting for this.
- Dave Doeringsfeld
  - Brian, you explained that well.

- I think that you are correct that this does not replace the Mission Statement and that the original will still stand
- Think it's important for that Mission Statement to be succinct
- On the last paragraph, we wrestled with that quite a bit so that we didn't provide ourselves with an out
  - We went around quite a bit
- I like the idea of John to replace "will" with "may" in last sentence
- I think its important to recognize that the stocks will be different and may require different actions
- Roy Akins
  - Overall, I support the statement
  - The "will" to "may" change is fine with me
  - I think it's important to let the people know what we're accomplishing and that this could help that
- Chad Colter
  - Appreciate all the hard work on this and I think it may help us down the road come to a draft policy statement that could work for all of us
  - One concern I have is where the SAR is measured
  - From what I understand is that the 2-6% range in the Columbia range is tough to know where to measure to get that number
  - A 2% at Lower Granite does not get us 2% for Middle Fork
  - That 2% also won't get us to recovery for Sockeye. Would need more like 6% measured at the gravels
  - What we're viewing here is really dependent on where it is measured
  - Just want to point out that concern
- Richard Scully
  - Want to comment on 2-6% with average of 4%
  - I think the 4% is important and seemed to be important when it was adopted by NWPC and IDFG and Fish Passage Center
  - If you just have SARs that hover around a 2% average, then you won't get recovery and the 4% ensures that we'll get to recover
  - Other documents usually include the 4%, and I don't know why ours should be different
- Merrill Beyeler
  - I have one comment but agree with most things that have been discussed and changing "will" to "may"
  - What I may suggest is may be add another word after significant is add "Significant and/or meaningful action"
- Aaron Lieberman
  - We've all talked enough that you know I appreciate language
  - I hope that we don't get too mired in the small parts of the language like "will" and "may"

- If we spend our time debating “wills” and “mays” then we will lose sight of our purpose and the people that this situation is really affecting
- I hope that we can go forward with a focus on our mission and goal without getting mired in language.
- Mark Menlove
  - I would propose that if we can handle this on this call, I would prefer that and I think we could get that done
- Brett Dumas
  - I agree with Mark. I think it’s important to resolve among us
  - I appreciate what Aaron said but many of us live in a regulatory environment and those words have important meanings for us
- Aaron Lieberman
  - Brett, I do appreciate the differences in language and have had to work on that in legislation. So I get it
  - To the extent that I diminish it has to do that this document is not really a regulatory document that could be held against us
  - As far as the language goes with significant and such is that there is enough wiggle room that it wouldn’t be overly restrictive
- Mike Edmondson
  - There is a good paper to share later about the SARs
  - I think we need to move on, but I think that we can solve this with a quick call
  - I don’t know that we can spend more time on this now and keep to our schedule
- Brian Brooks
  - My final comment is that we are here to suggest significant changes
  - Things that we’ve done so far hasn’t worked and people are hurting
  - I know that language is important in the regulatory world, but I want to remind everybody why we’re here
  - I think we are here to have tough conversations and make significant changes
  - Things that we can agree on but don’t affect recovery aren’t significant to me
  - I get this sense of dread when the conversation shies away from sensitive things.
  - Let’s remember that people are watching
- Scott Hauser
  - I agree with Brian
  - I support the use of significant and I think the onus is on those with concern about the word to provide explanation to change
  - I do think that if we do kick this down the road, we can do it sooner rather than later
  - Been working on it for a long time
  - Don’t disagree that we should probably move on
- Kira Finkler
  - I’ve tried hard to listen to workgroup members over past months and it seems we all agree that our goal is not just to get to ESA delisting
  - If our goals are beyond that then to me our goals are significant actions

- I understand some of your concerns about the significant language being loose, but we will still be able to discuss our actual recommendations

### **Agenda Subgroup Update**

- Katherine Himes
  - Two technical topics for May
    - Marine derived Nutrients
    - 5 year reviews
  - Rest of time for May would be for Workgroup to discuss policy recommendations
  - July meeting will hopefully be in Riggins.
    - Technical topic is comprehensive look at full basin
    - Rest of time is for Workgroup to focus on recommendations
  - Schedule for August and Beyond have not been set but subgroup meets May 7<sup>th</sup> and will discuss
- Mike Edmondson
  - A couple of meetings ago, Brett came up with a question which was can we take a good look at supplementation and where it may be beneficial to supplement it.
  - We had a good look yesterday but what we lack is having all of that info in one paper to analyze and talk about
- Brett Dumas
  - Mike, I think you captured that well
  - After yesterdays presentation and the opportunity for supplementation to help with harvestable fish
  - The question was how can we rethink this and give some of these runs a shot in the arm
  - Looking for opportunities to keep genetics whole and improve the numbers that we're getting
  - Recognize there are some runs we should not touch but should explore the opportunities
- Mike Edmondson
  - We could put this in July and will run it through the Agenda Subgroup to discuss
- Mark Menlove
  - Another item that I want to bring up is that for the May meeting would be a good opportunity to check in to see how the Spill program is doing
- Katherine Himes
  - Wrote it down and Mike things it can be something we can share
- Richard Scully
  - I think that this consensus exercise gave everyone a chance to think hard about what will work to recover Idaho salmon and I think we could use that to move forward and have each Workgroup member put together a vision of how we get to recovery from where we are
  - It would be nice that if all documents were shared for transparency to see what everyone's thoughts are on recovery and their vision towards recovery

- Not sure how to word that but that's what's on my mind
- Brett Dumas
  - I agree it would be nice to hear how spill is doing
  - Also, with the closure of fishing on the Columbia river I would be interested in seeing what our Idaho returns are and how they compare to what we expected
- Joe Oatman
  - Comment on earlier idea about hatchery supplementation and how we could look at that those opportunities
  - I would offer to provide assistance or info
- Richard Scully
  - Yesterday we had a talk on Dworshak and Clearwater hatchery and water supply issue
  - Clearwater has all the water they need and Dworshak doesn't
  - Can seasonally get Clearwater supply when conditions are right
  - Would like to have more discussion on that
  - There is a document out there that discusses the issue
  - Improving the water at Dworshak may not recover fish but could increase runs and is something that can be done and could have good support
  - Although it's not the big picture, I think it is something that would be extremely valuable for Idaho fisherman
  - I'd like to discuss that at a future meeting

### **Homework Summary -Dr. Katherine Himes**

- *Dr. Himes gave two presentations on Homework assignment*
- **Presentations are available on the OSC website on the Governor's Salmon Workgroup Page**
- **Questions**
- Richard Scully
  - So, to understand the last slide
  - The one that said breach, there were 3 people so does that mean that there are 3 people that think the group could reach consensus on that?
- Katherine Himes
  - So, it has how many people responded and the average response
  - So, on breach it had a score of 3 on consensus, so not high
  - The purpose of this was just to let the group see how the group is thinking
- Joe Oatman
  - Thank you for walking us through that process
  - I appreciate the steps of trying to combine these
  - Will this Power Point be provided to Workgroup members?
  - One of the initial slides illustrated how certain Workgroup members ranking systems

- On the final slide the utility was not ranked, was there going to be any further work to capture that here?
- Katherine Himes
  - Yes, it will be shared this week
  - Only a couple of people scored utility or something similar so there wasn't really enough info to do an analysis across the group
  - It is important to note that some people are thinking in those terms and maybe you can consider
  - Could pop up in a future exercise but was not incorporated here
- Brett Dumas
  - Could you explain the threshold for non-consensus? Seems like the breach one is really low, and I want to understand why it wouldn't fall into that category
  - And all the issues in white mean they didn't reach any of the criteria?
- Katherine Himes
  - *Went back and explained the "How We Synthesized" slide*
  - Correct that the white categories met none of the categories.
- Richard Scully
  - As a follow up to this exercise we could do another one where we ask for a list of items that would actually recover Idaho salmon rather than the ones that we can just agree upon
  - We also keep hearing the \$17 billion dollar number and a lot of that is hatchery and it would be interesting to see a list where people think we can get from where we are today to recovery

### **Homework Workshop/Path Forward Discussion -Dr. Katherine Himes**

- *Dr. Himes presented on second homework exercise on drafting policy recommendations*
- **Presentations are available on the OSC website on the Governor's Salmon Workgroup Page**

### **Discussion**

- Mike Edmondson
  - Roy Akins had to leave, and Toby Wyatt is now on in his place
  - Welcome Toby
- Kira Finkler
  - When you're asking us to volunteer for small groups, what are the titles for the small groups or categories?
  - I think the important thing is that there are diverse views in each small group
- Katherine Himes
  - This exercise is challenging over video and could have been easier to do in person
  - Between now and May we would hope that people would select issues to discuss and then between now and the next meeting you do a heavy analysis on that issue

and on different areas and come back with your idea in May to share with the full Workgroup to discuss

- Mike Edmondson
  - In some of the side chat I'm seeing that some more time with the slides is necessary and some more structure around the groups would be helpful
  - Slides will be available, but I think we need to move forward in somewhat developing our groups
- Katherine Himes
  - This will be sort of a moving target depending on who volunteers for what because we'll have to figure out to get people to cover every topic and could be on multiple groups
  - Groups may not be perpetual. Could end and then others will form.
- Joe Oatman
  - From my perspective its going to be difficult to try and figure out what everyone is interested in volunteering for.
  - Maybe we could develop a list of potential topics so people can better figure out where they may fit.
  - Relatedly, how will we do that even with a concise list? I think it may be difficult. Would OSC staff or would it just be the group? I think its important to consider the process/procedure aspect
- Katherine Himes
  - These groups will be working on their own because we may have many groups working at one time
  - Will be responsible to self-organize and put together language
- Brett Dumas
  - I agree with Joe
  - I think it will be really difficult to commit to something today
  - I would like to see a matrix of some of these measures to see whether we think we can reach consensus and gauge our interest in each topic
  - Then you can look at those responses and use it to develop balanced groups
  - I trust that you could put a diverse group together based on the info we provide
  - I would suggest that we do something like that
  - I think that we could respond in short order
  - I would be more comfortable with that then trying to commit to something today
- Mark Menlove
  - It seems to me that we have a convergence of what these groups need to be formed around
  - Some of the categories seem to be sorted broadly
  - If we could come up with those topics and then assign small groups kind of like Brett said, it could help make groups diverse
  - Could start more broadly and go more narrow
  - May be more helpful then everyone choosing specific issues
- Aaron Lieberman



- After going through the first round of responses we kind of have laid out areas that we can expect agreement
- There was talk about assigning a utility value
- In the interest of allocating resources efficiently I'm interested in hearing what Workgroup members think about first identifying what we think will have the greatest utility to meet our purpose and then focus on those for purposes of forming our small groups
- Mike Edmondson
  - I'm sensing we need a higher level of organization than going at the specific recommendation level
  - I'm hearing that Katherine and I could do some more homework on this to categorize it some more
  - I think the concern here is that we need to streamline this so it can get running
  - Some feedback has been that they are comfortable with us putting together groups and getting feedback on that
- Katherine Himes
  - I'm fine with any way we want to go
  - I think that it is important to remember that whatever these small groups do, they will bring it to the whole workgroup and everyone will get their input on it.
- Richard Scully
  - Regarding Aarons comment made me think
  - If we could go through the lists that you had and had a way for us to rank them on what we think their ability to contribute to recovery is, then we could use that info to trim down the list.
  - Remove the lowest scoring and focus on the ones that have the higher probability of contributing towards our goal
- Katherine Himes
  - One thing to remember is that it is April
  - As Mike and I work on these next steps we need to think about the calendar and the fact that everyone is going to want to review the draft report and the final report
  - Be sure to think about balancing the importance of the time we have left and the value of the exercises
  - It may feel like we're moving faster but it may be necessary
- Aaron Lieberman
  - Mike and Katherine, you have been incredibly helpful, thank you
  - To build upon my earlier comment
  - I think that the consensus exercise was helpful to show what we could agree upon and I think the Utility one would be helpful to show what we think would be effective in our goals and that will give us valuable information to work from in selecting what to prioritize
  - The task to me will be where we disagree and the potential utility is high that we focus our energy there

- I think that we have the tough conversations where we disagree to provide our recommendations and let experts work out the minute details of how to implement
- Katherine Himes
  - If the group is ok, I think moving forward we will get these slides in your hands to analyze and then for Mike and I to discuss the best way to get the WG into the first round of small groups and get back to you
  - I think a third piece is to really to consider doing virtual breakouts in our next meeting to have small groups work through topics
  - The other thing I would like to do in the May meeting is bring in some people who have worked a lot on collaborative issues and how to work through tough conversations
  - I will reiterate that the small groups will have the opportunity to work with SMEs to aid their policy recommendations
- Scott Hauser
  - Question for Katherine
  - You mentioned bringing in people from the Owyhee Initiative, who is Lue Lunte
  - Chairman Ted Howard was heavily involved in the Initiative and I would suggest that it may be good to get a tribal perspective on the Owyhee Initiative
- Brett Dumas
  - I feel like we're in a place right now where I'm pretty confused about where we're headed
  - I think we really need to get a clear picture on how we'll develop policy and move forward
  - I don't know that Owyhee Initiative people will be all that helpful to me or the group. I think we've all been involved in stuff like this and that we know what we're up against
  - I think that our time may be better spent on focusing on how we'll move forward
- Katherine Himes
  - Ok we will send out these slides and Mike and I will work on coming up with concrete next steps
  - Do people agree with that?
- Mike Edmondson
  - What I'm taking away from Brett is that we have an experienced mature group and can save the time and not have Owyhee Initiative people come in
- Katherine Himes
  - I think I have enough information and Mike and I can move forward
  - Are there any last minute questions or comments?
- Richard Scully
  - Dan just had a meeting with the Governor, did you talk about this group
- Dan Johnson
  - We pretty much just talked about re-opening the economy and the Covid situation

- Although I did come away from that meeting feeling comfortable that we will begin the recovery plan Friday and there's a high chance that we could meet in person in May
- I think it's beneficial to meet in person and I'm hopeful it could happen
- Mike Edmondson
  - We've reached the end of our time
- Katherine Himes
  - Thank you everybody for participating and actively engaging
  - I know virtual meetings can be exhausting
  - Look for info coming your way and presentations being posted to the website

**Adjourned**