

SUMMARY MEETING REPORT

Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee (MAFAC) Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force (CBP Task Force) *Boise, ID – February 25 & 26, 2020*

OVERVIEW

The Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee (MAFAC) Columbia Basin Partnership (CBP) Task Force met at the Boise Centre Convention Center in Boise, Idaho, on February 25 and 26, 2020. Barry Thom, Regional Administrator for the West Coast Region, Michael Tehan, Assistant Regional Administrator for the Interior Columbia Basin, and Heidi Lovett, Policy Analyst and MAFAC Assistant Designated Federal Officer, represented NOAA Fisheries leadership at the meeting.

Attendance included 25 CBP Task Force members (see *Appendix A* for list) representing Columbia River Basin (the basin) tribal and state sovereigns (including the states of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington) and stakeholders throughout the basin.

Over the course of the meeting, CBP Task Force members discussed the following topics with each other and NOAA Fisheries staff:

- Updates around the region
- Confirming CBP final products
- CBP Task Force work products
- Developing a framework for SCEE section of Phase 2 report
- Developing CBP Task Force Basin Wide Conclusions, Recommendations, and Key Messages
- Update on Path Forward Team
- Draft Phase 2 report framework
- Next steps for progress

This report summarizes the major meeting discussions, action items, and next steps for the CBP Task Force.

DAY 1 – December 3, 2019

1. Welcome, Introductions, Opening Remarks, and Proposed Agenda

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, and Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, welcomed the group and thanked them for attending the meeting. He acknowledged the amount of work that has gone into the Columbia Basin Partnership process and emphasized the opportunity the group has to shape the future of the Columbia Basin. Additionally, Barry asked that the group strive to maintain a constructive mindset throughout the next two days.

After Barry's opening remarks, Task Force, Project Team, and audience members introduced themselves by name and affiliation.

Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West (K&W), thanked participants for attending and noted the following absences:

- Jess Groves, Port of Cascade Locks
- Heath Heikkila, Coastal Conservation Association, Pacific Northwest Fisheries
- Brent Hall, Umatilla Tribes

Deb walked participants through the proposed agenda and logistics, meeting materials, and asked for clarifying questions. The agenda topics for Day 1 included updates around the region, a discussion on the status of CBP final work products, and developing a framework for the SCEE section of the Phase 2 report. On Day 2, the agenda topics included a discussion around basin wide conclusions, recommendations, and key messages, an opportunity for public input, an update from the Path Forward Team, a conversation around the draft Phase 2 report framework, and synthesis from the discussions on both days.

Deb explained the next two days were an opportunity to distill the hard work that the Task Force has done over the last two years. She noted that the Task Force has an opportunity to build something that has not been built in the basin before and leave a legacy that will impact generations to come.

2. Updates Around the Region

Deb Nudelman, K&W, Task Force Members

Deb Nudelman, K&W, asked Task Force members to share updates that are relevant to the Task Force process.

Steve Manlow, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, announced that the State of Washington has begun the process of updating their recovery strategy. He explained there may be an opportunity for the CBP process to shape the strategy update including providing outcomes.

Ben Enticknap, Oceana, announced that a white paper titled *Southern Resident Killer Whales and Columbia/ Snake River Chinook: A review of the available science*, was published by orca and salmon scientists detailing the science between orcas and lower snake restoration. He stated that he would like to submit it to the full group for consideration.

Glen Spain, Institute for Fisheries Resources, updated the group on a multi-stakeholder letter that was sent out on February 24, 2020. He explained that it contains goals that are similar to the goals established by the Task Force and demonstrates how their work is starting to spread.

Jim McKenna, State of Oregon, stated that the state of Oregon has embarked on a 100-year water vision regarding quality, quantity and infrastructure. The Orca Task Force and Governor Brown of Oregon sent a letter to Governor Inslee of Washington, reiterating Oregon's view that under the Columbia Power System draft EIS there should have been a more thorough analysis of future conditions of the Snake River dams. Jim clarified that it is not a call for immediate removal of the dams, but it is imperative that a large-scale study be done to consider removal.

Urban Eberhart, Kittitas Reclamation District, noted that his group is coordinating with the Oregon Water Committee for communications after the Oregon session and that the regional communication is increasing.

Liz Hamilton, Northwest Sportfishing Industry Association, apologized for missing the last meeting and wanted to celebrate that the spill standard had been raised to 125%.

Zach Penney, Columbia Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC), announced that the Nez Perce tribe held their five-year symposium. Regionally, steelhead population levels have caused concern and they are expecting another slow chinook run.

Joel Kawahara, Coastal Trollers Association, noted that he participated in panel discussions for the State of Washington Governor's stakeholder process on Lower Snake River dam removal approval. There were indications that there was a willingness to go forward with salmon recovery and examine the need to implement mitigation efforts if dams were removed.

Randy Friedlander, Colville Tribes, told the group that this last year one of the main goals of the Colville Tribes was to reconnect salmon with their historic habitat and reconnect the people with the salmon. Randy was at the Kettle Falls site where they had people return the fish to the river, which was really powerful. Preliminary results showed that only two of the native fish fell back as they apparently went through the turbine and up the Okanogan River.

Paul Arrington, Idaho Water Users Association, gave an update that there have been six meetings of the Idaho Governor's Salmon Work Group. A majority of the meetings have been spent finding common ground, and the conversations are promising. The group has been tasked to create recommendations by the end of the year and they still have a few meetings to address this task and discuss impacts to species. The next meetings will occur in Lewiston, Idaho and Riggins, Idaho.

Mike Edmonson, State of Idaho, thanked NOAA Fisheries for their support with the Idaho Governor's Salmon Work Group, as well as Katherine Cheney, Guy Norman, and Bob Lessard for their help. He encouraged Task Force members to attend future meetings.

Joe Lukas, Western Montana Electric Generating and Transmission Cooperative, noted that the draft EIS will be released February 27, 2020 and hopes this letter is viewed as a call to action from energy leaders to elected officials.

Rob Masonis, Trout Unlimited, explained that one of the risks for the region is that when the draft EIS comes out that people become positional. The overarching message from the letter, which discussed the relationship between the Lower Snake River dams and salmon recovery, is

acknowledgement that this is a complex issue and that there are a lot of people who want to work in good faith. He expressed hope that this group can prevent the risk of polarization from materializing, build momentum, and engage electeds to find comprehensive solutions. Offices in Washington, D.C. are looking for the stakeholders in the region to help them find a path forward.

David Doeringsfeld, Port of Lewiston, stated that with the last EIS in 2002, there was a lot of discussion and then when the EIS came out everything stopped. There is too much momentum in the basin right now, and the theme of the letter is to keep that moving forward. The EIS alone cannot do that.

Guy Norman, Northwest Power and Conservation Council from Washington, was encouraged by the stakeholder letter. He stated that he had not seen this kind of collaborative momentum before. The draft report about the Lower Snake River dam stakeholder process was released to the public in mid-December, followed by three public workshops. Collectively, over 400 people participated. The panels did a great job of representing their values but also the diversity of the group. Guy was encouraged by the side conversations people were having, and people felt like their interests were being covered. The rest of the schedule includes the public comment period that just ended at the end of January with a final report due to the Washington Governor in early March.

Gary James, Umatilla Tribes, gave an update on the recent floods in northeast Oregon. There has been some damage but there are some areas that have remained in good condition. He stated that the Task Force effort has amazed him, and the group should work to get a path forward/recommendations out to those who work in the basin.

Liza Jane McAlister, 6 Ranch Inc., thanked everyone for including a cattle rancher in the group. She noted that agriculture is a struggling industry. She noted the importance of agriculture and that the majority of the salmon and steelhead populations occur on private land, and that is also where restoration needs to occur.

Michael Tehan, NOAA, noted that the draft EIS has been mentioned multiple times. He explained that the draft EIS will kick off a new process with stakeholders and legislators and acknowledged that the next five months will be difficult. He provided another update that the State Department announced that they are going to do a ninth round of negotiations with Canada on the Columbia River Treaty.

3. Updated on CBP Final Work Products Status

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, and Deb Nudelman, K&W

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, directed the group to the CBP Products Diagram. He explained that the diagram presents the final products of the Task Force, and acts as an outline of the Phase 2 Report. The top section includes the conclusions and recommendations the Task Force will make to the region. The second section consists of the main components of products moving forward which include goals, biological analysis, scenarios, and SCEE. Barry noted that some sections are more fluid than others, specifically the governance aspect.

Deb Nudelman, K&W, discussed viewing the diagram through two lenses: a substantive lens and a process lens. She encouraged Task Force members to think about the next two days as the building blocks for an agreement in principle on the final products.

One Task Force member noted that they believed the CBP diagram did a great job of encapsulating the work that has been done and that it will allow the group to identify a range of possible options moving forward.

4. CBP Task Force Work Products

Ray Beamesderfer, NOAA Fisheries, Pat Frazier, NOAA, Scott Hauser, Snake River Tribes Foundation, Patty Dornbusch, NOAA Fisheries, Zach Penney, CRITFC, and Deb Nudelman, K&W

Goals

Scott Hauser, Upper Snake River Tribes Foundation, gave an update on the conversation around blocked area goals. He mentioned that in Phase 1 there was a group that was interested in having qualitative goals for the blocked areas and that there was an agreement that the State of Idaho, Idaho Water Users, and State of Oregon would revisit the blocked area goals in Phase 2. Scott referenced a document in the meeting packet, a list of proposed USRT quantitative goals, which were also shared in Phase 1.

Scott continued, noting that during the December Task Force meeting, questions arose regarding the Hells Canyon relicensing settlement agreement between Idaho, Oregon, and the Idaho Power Company. Since the December Task Force meeting, there have been many conversations around how Oregon and Idaho can move forward on blocked area goals. Scott explained that the group met prior to the February Task Force meeting to discuss how to move forward to incorporate the quantitative goals. While they made progress during the meeting, there is still additional work to do, including Oregon reviewing USRT's quantitative goals. Scott complimented the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes for moving the work forward.

Mike Edmondson, Idaho Governor's Office of Species Conservation, explained more about the blocked area goals from Idaho's perspective. The governor has established a work group to discuss salmon and steelhead policies. There was an agreement during past meetings that the group does not want ESA-listed fish above Hells Canyon. He also noted that Idaho has a statute that requires both legislative and executive branch concurrence for introduction and reintroduction of species.

Mike continued, stating that one of the next steps is to comply with the settlement agreement for the Hells Canyon Complex. Mike noted that the Idaho Governor's Office had recently developed a policy statement regarding blocked areas, he provided the policy to the NOAA Fisheries Project Team to be distributed to the Task Force. He finished by noting that entities have to recover fish, and that they can't add an ESA burden to an area with diminished resources.

Jim McKenna, State of Oregon, gave an update from State of Oregon. He thanked Scott, Mike, and the USRT tribes for pushing the process forward and noted that he felt confident that they would reach their goal. He noted that Oregon does have to abide by the Hells Canyon Complex settlement agreement, so they are trying to find a middle ground.

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, stated that he attended the working dinner as an observer and noted the progress the groups have been making.

Task Force members shared the following reflections, comments, and questions on the proposal.

- There is concern about an ESA nexus and this policy helps.
 - It was clarified that an “ESA nexus” refers to when an ESA listed species is present, and as a result there are additional requirements due to ESA regulations.
- A member supported the idea of aspirational goals while not forgetting about the upper Columbia and focusing on the lower Columbia.

Biological Analysis

Ray Beamesderfer, NOAA Fisheries, presented an update on the biological analysis work being done at NOAA Fisheries. Ray noted that the information will be put in the context of the goals and that the work is almost finished. Summary level information and documentation will be distributed to the Task Force, who will then have an opportunity to review and comment on the goals, heat map, and documentation. Ray then described and discussed the individual categories of the analysis:

- **Habitat** – This includes freshwater habitat, spawning and rearing areas.
- **Estuary** – The numbers were updated after meeting with estuary representatives, and the draft documentation will be circulated. The impacts are estimates of the mortality rate of each stock going through the estuary.
 - A Task Force member asked how adult mortality in passage over the mainstem is captured. Ray responded that the mainstem factor includes adult mortality taking out the pinnipeds, the dams, the juvenile and adult mortality going down stream. Inundation is also present.
- **Latent Mortality** – Latent mortality was pulled out from mainstem in order to analyze it separately. There are no direct estimates of delayed mortality and there are a variety of inferences including estimates of total mortality of juveniles that are correlated with dam passage conditions. There is a range of assumptions.
 - A Task Force member advocated for lumping together latent and mainstem categories to get a complete picture of damage done by the hydro system. Ray responded that to get the complete picture one could add up the two individual components.
 - Another Task Force member suggested that it makes sense to lump together latent and mainstem for certain scenarios and not others.
- **Predation** – This includes sea lions, birds, fish, and other predator impacts that we are able to quantify.
- **Hatchery** – This includes assumptions on the level of fitness of the hatcheries and the impacts on the natural fish.
 - One Task Force member stated that there is a lot of agreement around hatcheries and the science is evolving, yet there is a lack of good data on key impacts. They encouraged good experimental design to get to the bottom of these ecological questions to avoid large data gaps.

Ray continued, noting that the team spent a lot of time in the regional meetings talking about habitat impacts. He then provided examples of different combinations of improvements that might be necessary to achieve the goals.

Ray concluded by announcing that the biological analysis is nearing completion, noting that there will still need to be caveats and directions for what it should be used for. He explained that the project team distribute a write-up describing the biological analysis to Task Force members. The goal is to finalize the explanations and analysis, specifically the fatal errors and issues.

Task Force members shared the following reflections, comments, and questions on the biological analysis.

- One member suggested including language to clarify what the slider should and should not be used for.
- The slider does not address which actions should be focused on for different stocks in different areas. It also does not cover the magnitude of potential improvement and the temporal frame where that could happen.
- A member emphasized the importance of presenting the information in an accessible way.

Scenarios

Patty Dornbusch, NOAA Fisheries, updated the Task Force on what has happened with scenarios since the December Task Force meeting. She explained that the purpose of scenarios is to explore alternative pathways to achieve the goals and evaluate the implications of different approaches to achieving the goals.

Patty announced that in January, the NOAA Fisheries Project Team held a series of regional meetings in the Upper Columbia, Snake, Middle Columbia, Lower Columbia, and Willamette regions. One of the main purposes of the meetings was to discuss the project team “level of effort” scenarios and receive feedback from people on the ground about what those scenarios might look like in each region. The meetings were well attended, with a good mix of those with a more technical background and Task Force members. As a result of the meetings, the Project Team made minor modifications to the themes, clarifying that the first scenario is what will happen if we continue the same level of effort. The second scenario includes making moderate efforts across the board and the third scenario stayed the same. Patty noted the meeting handout that was a draft condensed summary of the three “level of effort” scenarios and the regional meeting input. While the input from the meetings was hard to summarize, one takeaway was that people universally agreed that the low hanging fruit projects are gone and that the next projects will be more complex and expensive. Patty noted that detailed meeting notes from each regional meeting had been distributed to Task Force members.

Patty mentioned that there was a discussion around the possibility of other Task Force members developing additional scenarios, one of which Zach will present later in the day.

Task Force members shared the following reflections, comments, and questions on the scenarios.

- One Task Force member asked for clarification on what was meant by “low hanging fruit projects were gone.”
 - Patty noted that the discussion came up in the Snake and Upper and Middle Columbia River meetings and referred to the experts’ comments that most straightforward restoration projects have already been completed.
- A Task Force member asked how the scenarios will be presented in the report.

- Patty answered that the Task Force will not be choosing a single scenario but will lay out the multiple options and talk generally about the implications of each.
- Another Task Force member advocated for getting rid of the status quo scenario, noting that fixes need to be proportional to what is broken and include a linkage between the limiting factors and the actions.
- Another Task Force member commented that effort does not equal success. It is important to figure out what strategy will work and then use resources to that point.

Salmon First Presentation

Zach Penney, CRITFC, presented on a scenario he created to represent tribal interests, with input from treaty tribes and technical and policy level staff. He noted that the document is a draft and that it has not been endorsed.

Zach reported that, so far, the primary feedback on the scenario has come from the treaty tribes, who saw two specific challenges: the geopolitical and regional differences on how to use these strategies. The overarching theme was to avoid normalizing the status quo. The intent of the scenario is to add more fish to the rivers sooner rather than later as well as list the philosophies. Zach tried to incorporate climate realities and the tribes' related concerns.

Zach then walked through the document and gave an opportunity for questions and comments from Task Force Members, who shared the following reflections, comments, and questions:

- One Task Force member noted their appreciation that the scenario took a basin wide approach.
- Another Task Force member explained that they like the scenario because it did not use terms with negative connotations and focused on how to move things forward.
- A Task Force member asked: What can we do as stakeholders or as entities that have an impact on salmon? What will force us to think outside the box and make this something unique and push us outside what we typically think about?

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, asked that if members cannot see themselves in any of the existing scenarios, are they willing to create a scenario they do see themselves in. Additionally, Barry noted that the purpose was not intended to generate one master scenario. Barry reminded everyone that scenarios should achieve the high goals.

5. Reflection, Wrap Up, and Prepare for Day 2

Deb Nudelman, K&W

Deb thanked Task Force members for their comments and requested that, if they are able, they read what is remaining in their packets, including the Salmon First scenario. She noted that it would be helpful for members to get through the SCEE framework and key messages that will be reviewed on Day 2.

Task Force members thanked the Project Team for their tremendous effort in developing the scenarios and the accompanying documentation.

DAY 2 – February 26, 2020

1. Welcome and Introductions, Reflection on Day 1 and Review Agenda for Day 2

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, and Deb Nudelman, K&W

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, welcomed the group and thanked them for participating in the meeting.

Deb Nudelman, K&W, thanked everyone for their hard work and efforts on Day 1. She noted that the agenda had been rearranged and that the Path Forward topic would be discussed first to give the Task Force an opportunity to hear what the group has accomplished to date and options for how to move forward. That conversation will be followed by a conversation on SCEE.

2. Path Forward Update

Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries, Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West, Zach Penney, CRITFC, and various members of the Path Forward Team

Path Forward Team

Jim McKenna, State of Oregon, updated the Task Force on work of the Path Forward team. He noted that the team met twice in December, where it was decided to shift the title of the group from Governance Team to Path Forward Team, as there were many perspectives on what governance meant. Most felt that whatever the model is, that it should not be a new, top-down authority in the region. The team had a conversation around the future of the CBP, starting the book ends which included discussing what if we had no CBP at all or what if we were a decision body. The team wanted to find a place in between those book ends. At the Task Force meeting, the team wants to discuss the roles and functions of what that entity might be moving forward. The Path Forward team sees a future where the CBP is a hub of coordination, information sharing, and a dialogue with stakeholders. It can also work to track implementation efforts and function as a place to discuss opportunities, challenges, and lessons learned as well as advocate for funding. Jim mentions that the second page of the handout has a diagram that lays it out.

Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West, suggested the group could discuss pros and cons of different structures.

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, asked the group to think about the partnership moving forward, what would the charge of that group be? What are the key tasks that the group would accomplish in the next two-five years?

Task Force members shared the following reflections, comments, and questions on the Path Forward team and the structure of the group:

- The Task Force has become the grease to relieve the friction between interests.
- Going forward, it is really about trying to build the fortitude to make some of the tough decisions and fully integrate salmon needs. It is about figuring out how we generate the willingness to put salmon at the forefront in the day to day decisions.

- This group could function like a nonprofit or FACA committee to help resolve issues, identify monitoring needs, and coordinate efforts to advocate for funds.
- One Task Force member mentioned that they believed focusing on funding would be beyond the scope and would dilute the group. They also suggested thinking about how to engage the federal partners that are not at the table.
- This group should not be regulatory and should not be telling others what to do or not to do.
- Another Task Force member suggested the group could help market, support, and advocate for projects.
- In past successful efforts the key was relationship building and coming together. Continued communication and understanding. When you have disparate groups come together, it is extremely helpful.
- A Task Force member suggested that the group review, prioritize, and advocate for projects. The member also noted that action agencies should be included in the future.
- How does this group make sure that the resources are brought to bear in a fair way across the region? And how do we provide the grease to the skids to make some of these things happen?
- Another Task Force member suggested the group could be an information sharing entity, focusing on education and addressing urgency issues. They offered the idea of having an executive committee and sub committees, one could be on urgency, one could be on monitoring, etc. Finally, they noted that they would also like to see a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to formalize it.
- There are issues with people coming together under a spotlight, it is not conducive to work through problems without positioning for your own interests.

Barry reflected on the Path Forward conversation and stated that the group needs to maintain their ambition and noted that the partnership will carry a lot of weight with stakeholder and action agencies. He emphasized the need to have some form of accountability and benchmarks to ensure the group is staying on track while recognizing two large remaining questions; what is the funding structure the group will need to address moving forward, and how do we move it forward after NOAA Fisheries is no longer the convener?

Deb noted that the Path Forward group is scheduled to meet on March 10th and can use this conversation to help move the process forward.

Funding

Joe Lukas, Western Montana Electric Generating and Transmission Cooperative, updated the group on possible funding options for salmon recovery, including:

- Create a “Salmon Tax” to establish a more equitable funding source from all residents of the Columbia River Basin. One example would be a tax on each kilowatt hour sold by a utility in the region, dedicated to salmon and steelhead recovery funding.
- Establish a mechanism requiring mitigation for development of salmon habitat. This type of mechanism would allow for any negative externality to be offset up front.
- Develop various incentive programs that rewards residents to spend money or purchase goods to support salmon and steelhead populations. One example of such a program is the federal Duck Stamp and Oregon’s salmon license plates.

Task Force members shared the following reflections, comments, and questions on the proposed funding options:

- One member asked for clarification on the inherent limitations of the current BPA funding.
 - Another member responded, saying that the council has limited ability to effectuate Bonneville rates, they can make recommendations but usually do not make budgetary decisions.
- A Task Force member emphasized finding a funding stream outside of Bonneville as Bonneville is constrained by its authorities and does not have much flexibility.
- Another Task Force member suggested the group could be a place where model code policies could reside that would have the buy-in from this group so that when local jurisdictions are considering changes, they could see how that lines up with other recovery efforts.
- A member stated that it is not just about making people aware of the issue but also making them care.

Youth Engagement

Zach Penney, CRITFC, and Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries, presented a proposal to send a survey to college aged students in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana to receive their input on the work being done by the Task Force.

Zach stated that a general sentiment from younger students is that they are concerned that problems are happening faster than they can be solved. He noted that the younger generation can be used not just to tell us what to do from their perspective but could also be a gut check for the partnership.

Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries, announced that she has secured support from the NOAA Fisheries education and outreach staff to develop a list of university programs covering fisheries, agriculture and natural resources in all four states, as well tribal colleges and summer programs. Katherine and Zach presented questions that could be organized into a survey and then sent to the list of professors for distribution to their students. The team would summarize the survey input for the Task Force consideration and inclusion in the Phase 2 Report.

Task Force members shared an overall enthusiasm for the proposal and listed potential academic groups that the group could reach out to for input.

3. Continuation of Day 1 Scenario Discussion

Michael Tehan, NOAA Fisheries and Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Michael Tehan, NOAA Fisheries, announced next steps for the scenarios process that had been discussed on Day 1. Michael noted that what he heard on Day 1 was that the current path does not represent a scenario to achieve the goals and that that needs to be recharacterized in the report. Finally, Michael reissued the offer from Barry on Day 1 for any interested individuals to create new scenarios that better reflect both their interests and the interests of the collective group.

Den Nudelman, Kearns & West, encouraged the group to stay the course, take a week or two to pull together scenarios and share them in April. She noted that Integration Team is scheduled to meet on April 2nd and could act as a focus group for new scenarios that are created.

4. Public Input

Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Deb asked audience members if anyone would like to share public comments. Tom Stuart, Save Wild Salmon, shared the following thoughts. He noted that he appreciates the partnership and that he was happy with the Phase 1 abundance goals. Tom emphasized the need for bold action and stated that he wants to go beyond establishing the goals for abundance. Salmon are on an extinction path in the Snake River Basin. He stated that the Snake River Basin is down to about 1% of the historic abundance.

Tom provided a graphic to help characterize the salmon slider methodology that Ray described on Day 1. He stated that he worries that people will look at that slider as a quantitative tool instead of a qualitative tool and make management decisions not intended by the Task Force. Tom notes that the graph really shows how you might prioritize these decisions. For every 100 juvenile salmon that go out you have to have about 2 adults come back just to maintain the population. The Power Council and other bodies have established a 2-6% goal. Anything less than 2% and stocks will be lost.

Tom concluded by urging the group to not be timid, be firm, and encourage other agencies to be firm.

5. Developing a Framework for the SCEE Section of the Phase 2 Report

Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries, and Task Force members

Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries, introduced the framework of the proposed SCEE section of the Phase 2 Report. She noted that the SCEE section is complementary to the scenarios as the scenarios are focused on the biology, with the SCEE being about people. This section is designed to reflect the Task Force diversity and memorialize the viewpoints of its members.

Katherine went on to describe a proposed approach. The proposal included Task Force members themselves writing SCEE sections from their perspective that covers certain questions and topics. The template asks Task Force members to describe their interest or where they sit in the basin, key characteristics and key values. The template also asks Task Force members to describe their connections to fish and water and why those connections are important and describe the implications of the scenarios to their SCEE interests and the collective interests of the basin. Katherine empathized that the SCEE sections present an opportunity to lay out big, bold ideas

There was general support from Task Force members with some committing to create a SCEE section.

6. Developing CBP Task Force Basin Wide Conclusions, Recommendations, and Key Messages

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, and Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, began the discussion of key messages and recommendations that will be produced by the partnership. He noted that the idea of key messages and recommendations has come forward from several Task Force members since the beginning. Barry referenced a handout in the meeting packet that compiled potential key messages and recommendations that from past conversations of the Task Force. He stated multiple questions for members to think about as they reviewed the list:

- Are there consensus recommendations that this group wants to make?
- Do people like the overall idea of having key recommendations?
- Do the bigger categories resonate?
- Are there specific points?

Barry stated that these need to be consensus recommendations and that he would rather have fewer recommendations and a short list that is more impactful than pages of less impactful recommendations.

Task Force members shared the following reflections, comments, and questions on the list of proposed key messages and recommendations:

- One Task Force member suggested that some of the recommendations should be bolder.
- Another Task Force member expressed their support for the key messages section and noted that it was vital to the report.
- A Task Force member suggested adding a bullet about coordinated efforts for various and diverse stakeholders.
- A Task Force member suggested that each bullet should have a small explanation paragraph.

Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West, invited the members to read through the proposed list of key messages and recommendations and provide more detailed feedback in the next couple of weeks.

7. Task Force Draft Phase 2 Report Framework

Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries

Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries, began a discussion on a framework for the Phase 2 report. Katherine mentioned that a significant portion of the report will be SCEE considerations, and because of that there will not be a need for a full drafting committee. The other sections, such as background and purpose, are short and can be pulled from Phase 1. The key messages and recommendations will be a group effort. There are other sections that are either finished or being worked on by the project team. Katherine noted that the hope is to start getting sections to the Integration Team in early April and then to everyone in mid-April. Finally, the Project Team will take the feedback and try to get to a working draft by June.

Task Force members shared the following reflections, comments, and questions on the proposed draft Phase 2 report framework:

- One Task Force member asked if the Phase 2 report will be a standalone report where it contains all the information from Phase 1 and 2, or if it will contain just the incremental progress from Phase 2?
 - Katherine mentioned that she thinks the Phase 2 report would stand on its own, but for some items readers may want to reference Phase 1 for additional detail.
- Another Task Force member noted think there is value in referencing Phase 1 and that they like to have their reference material at least footnoted or readily available.

8. Next Steps and Wrap Up

Deb Nudelman, K&W, and Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries

Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West, thanked the group for all of their hard work and how impressed she was with the progress that had been made over the last two days.

Barry Thom thanked Task Force members for their participation and effort. He noted that the group came into this meeting with a lot of uncertainty and that many of those issues were resolved. He finished by recognizing that there will be a lot of work to do between now and June.

The meeting was adjourned around 3:30pm.

Upcoming Meeting Dates	Location
June 2 and 3, 2020	Portland, OR

Meeting Materials
The meeting materials can be found on the NOAA Fisheries CBP Task Force website here: https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/west-coast/partners/columbia-basin-partnership-task-force