

## **SUMMARY MEETING REPORT**

### **Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee (MAFAC) Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force (CBP Task Force) *Portland, OR – April 23 & 24, 2019***

#### **OVERVIEW**

---

The Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee (MAFAC) Columbia Basin Partnership (CBP) Task Force met at the Marriott Downtown/Waterfront in Portland, Oregon, on April 23 and 24, 2019. Barry Thom, Regional Administrator for the West Coast Region, Michael Tehan, Assistant Regional Administrator for the Interior Columbia Basin, and Jennifer Lukens, Director of the Office of Policy and MAFAC Designated Federal Officer, represented NOAA Fisheries leadership at the meeting.

Attendance included 29 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 from throughout the basin.

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

- Key Questions for Phase 2 of the MAFAC CBP Task Force
- Brainstorming strategies and actions to achieve the goals determined in Phase 1
- Potential analytical tools and approaches for Phase 2
- Guidance for the Integration Team and Technical Team next steps
- Next steps for progress

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

DAY 1 – April 23, 2019

---

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

*Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West, Barry Thom and Jennifer Lukens, NOAA Fisheries*

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, welcomed the group and thanked them for attending. He recognized that the Integration Team, Technical Team, and Project Team had done a lot of work since the last meeting to design a framework for a productive and safe environment to brainstorm strategies and actions to achieve the goals determined in Phase 1. He asked Task Force members to keep their minds open to hearing other's ideas and perspectives. Barry explained that the Project Team designed a process that included both large and small group discussion to ensure that everyone could comfortably share their ideas. He also noted that several Task Force members were missing and asked that members send substitutes when possible.

Jennifer Lukens, NOAA Fisheries, updated the group on the MAFAC process. She noted that MAFAC hosted a webinar in early April so that CBP Task Force members could give an update to members of the MAFAC Ecosystems Subcommittee ahead of the vote to approve the Recommendations Report. Mike Edmondson, Idaho Governor's Office, B.J. Kieffer, Spokane Tribe, Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries, and Ray Beamesderfer, NOAA Fisheries, presented during the webinar. Jennifer noted that MAFAC members were engaged during the webinar. She also commented that she was excited to attend this Task Force meeting and help provide an outside perspective in the brainstorming process.

Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West (K&W), welcomed attendees and thanked them for their participation and efforts. Task Force members then introduced themselves by name and affiliation. Deb walked participants through the proposed agenda and logistics, meeting materials, and asked for clarifying questions. She explained that the audience members would either observe or work with their Task Force member during the brainstorming exercises. She thanked the Integration Team for their guidance in developing the brainstorming framework for the meeting.

Deb noted several absences and alternates:

- Chandra Ferrari, Trout Unlimited, was standing in for Rob Masonis, Trout Unlimited, for Day 1 of the meeting.
- Catherine Corbett, Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership, was standing in for Debrah Marriott, Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership for Day 2 of the meeting.
- Kurt Miller, Northwest RiverPartners, was standing in for Joe Lukas, Western Montana Electric Generating and Transmission Cooperative on Day 2 of the meeting. Joe Lukas could not attend either day of the meeting.

Deb asked for updates from Task Force members. Randy Friedlander, Colville Tribes, mentioned that the Upper Columbia United Tribes (UCUT) published a paper on fish passage and the UCUT commission just approved the report. Liza Jane McAlister, 6 Ranch, Inc., announced that the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board approved over ten million dollars for restoration, technical assistance and monitoring. Liza Jane serves on the board, and she said that they would most likely be investing more money in these efforts going forward. Kevin Scribner, Salmon Safe, told the group that there is a workshop for International Year of the Salmon happening on the week of May 13. He explained that Salmon Safe and Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC) may have a joint station at the workshop. Michael Tehan, NOAA Fisheries, noted that all Task Force members on invitational travel should make sure to follow federal travel regulations and update their

travel profile. Bob Austin, Upper Snake River Tribes, mentioned that representatives from Idaho, Oregon, and some of the tribes met to discuss their interests in the Upper Snake and Hells Canyon areas. Debrah Marriott, Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership, noted that Congresswoman Suzanne Bonamici is introducing legislation about ocean acidification and that the Congresswoman requested that Debrah speak about collaboration during the announcement. Debrah noted that she would be talking about the CBP Task Force.

## **2. Brainstorming Key Questions for Phase 2**

### ***Deb Nudelman, K&W, and Task Force Members***

Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West, explained that the first portion of the brainstorming would involve going around the table in a plenary discussion and having each person answer the follow question: What are the key questions that you would like answered in Phase 2?

Task Force members provided input as follows. The key questions below are organized by theme.

#### Science & Biology

- How do we optimize production of summer chinook and other salmon populations?
- How can we create more normative natural hydrographs throughout the basin?
- What is the capacity for river ecosystems to adapt? At what scales?
- How do we ensure proportionality between strategies and actions and their impacts on certain sectors and the four H's?

#### Social & Economic Considerations

- Which human-caused factor has the greatest negative impact on salmon and steelhead populations in the Columbia Basin? Which has the least? What are the economic effects?
- What is the economic value of fish?
- In Phase 2, how do we consider the many social and economic factors and align those linkages with the goals?
- How will we account for cultural resources?
- What are the most cost-effective strategies for achieving the quantitative goals? Can we minimize economic and social losses?
- How are we going to pay for it? How can we keep using clean power, like hydropower, which allows us to have clean air, but also help the fish?
- Why has there been inconsistent science management and economic and social concerns in the last 20 years?
- How can we account for the benefits that fish bring beyond their monetary value?

#### Baselines

- What baseline data about salmon populations throughout the basin do we need to improve?
- Do baseline invertebrate biology indicators need to be assessed?
- What is the baseline data? What are we currently doing to achieve the goals and how far from the status quo?

#### Climate Change

- How will we incorporate current changes in climate and projected climate change into our strategies and actions?

- Can we develop future water temperature models to account for climate change?

## Building Upon Existing Efforts

- How do we ensure that any newly proposed strategies, measures and/or actions build upon those within the existing recovery plans? How do we leverage the plans?
- How can we leverage watershed plans, sub-basin plans, and local and state recovery plans?

## Communication & Marketing

- What will communication look like between the Upper Columbia Basin, Lower Columbia Basin, and ocean stakeholders?
- How do you improve communication throughout the basin to prioritize issues?
- How do we change cultural and societal values in favor of salmon? How do we market these values to people in the basin?
- How do we market the importance of the Columbia River system to the rest of the world?
- How can basin residents (current and future) learn about salmon, the river ecosystem, and the interdependent human relationship to galvanize the collective will to achieve our goals?
- How do we change cultural and societal values in favor of salmon? How do we market these values to the rest of the people in the basin?

## Prioritization and Speed

- Which stocks should we prioritize for obtaining our high-end natural production quantitative goals?
- What measures will provide the greatest impact of improving salmon and steelhead returns?
- Can we focus on areas where we can be successful quickly?
- How fast do we act when we identify a scenario, strategy, or action? How can we expedite action?

## Aspirational Nature of the Goals

- Is this process aspirational or will we have a practical and implementable product?
- We developed very aspirational goals – are we still committed to being aspirational in our strategies and objectives for achieving the goals?

## Adaptive Management

- How are we going to balance establishing the quantitative goals with elements of adaptive management?
- How will technology change adaptive management? What will that look like 50 years from now?

## Working with Nature

- How do we get out of the mindset of fighting natural processes? How do we work with those processes to leverage our attempts to reach these goals?
- Can we work with nature?
- How can we design human interactions with the river that promote a natural river system?

## Longevity and Sustained Interest

- What can this group produce that is going to live beyond the group and benefit others?

- What is realistic and achievable over the 100-year time frame? Every basin needs to test the different scenarios to figure out what works best. We should determine if some of the goals are too high or some are too low.
- How will we maintain this level of effort to achieve the goals in the long term?
- How will we sustain our efforts after we reach the goals?
- How do we maintain and broaden support for achieving broad-based goals in the face of “salmon fatigue”?
- Within the 100-year timeframe, how are we going to incorporate changing science and values? Can we predict this in our process?
- How will we maintain federal focus on the Columbia Basin throughout this process when there are so many needs for federal funding?
- How do we change our thought processes to identify and address the different user groups?

## Achieving the Goals

- How do we achieve the quantitative numbers that we have developed in our regions?
- Can we actually achieve the goals? Can we create a scenario that optimizes the strategies to get the biggest benefit?
- Do we want to drop the term “provisional” and establish a working set of goals that the group agrees on? What can we move forward with right now?

## Other

- What is the willingness and the ability of this group to have difficult, outside of the box conversations about solutions?

Deb, K&W, thanked everyone for their insightful questions and commented that the Integration Team, Technical Team, and Project Team would consider these as they help to define scenarios ahead of the June 2019 CBP Task Force meeting.

### **3. Brainstorming Strategies and Actions**

#### ***Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, Deb Nudelman, K&W, and Task Force Members***

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, introduced the brainstorming strategies and actions portion of the meeting by reiterating the importance of being open to all perspectives. He explained that there are numerous benefits to openly discussing ideas and inquiring about each other’s perspectives. He noted that there may be many ways to achieve the same goal and that each one will have a different cost. As a result, it is useful to consider all pathways and perspectives. Barry stated the importance of thinking in the long-term to help shape what the Columbia River Basin will look like. He also asked that Task Force members assume good intent.

Deb Nudelman, K&W, showed the group where this brainstorming session fits on the Logic Path, a document developed to demonstrate the progression of Phase 2. She explained that the process will get messier before it gets tidier, and there is a lot of value in putting all ideas, no matter how big or small, on the table. She noted that achieving the goals will take a combination of strategies and actions and that every contribution matters. Deb then referenced the handouts in the meeting packets that would guide Task Force members through the brainstorming session. The handout titled “A Curiosity Model for Brainstorming” encourages Task Force members to be curious, interested, and appreciative of one another. Deb also explained that each Task Force member

should be inquisitive about how others came up with their ideas. They should think twice about their own perceptions and assumptions.

Deb reviewed the brainstorming questions listed in the Brainstorming Guidance for Day 1 Handout:

- What are the strategies and actions that contribute to achieving the provisional quantitative goals?
- What are the social, cultural, economic, and ecosystem considerations?
- What do you care about, what do you need and want, and what are you afraid?
- Feel free to think basin-wide, stock-specific, or by geographic region and to suggest biological, socioeconomic, cultural, ecosystem, policy, and/or legal strategies and actions. Feel free to be as general or specific as you want.

She explained that there was a wall with adhesive material on it in the back of the room (henceforth known as the “sticky wall”) and that during this exercise, people should write down their answers to the brainstorming questions on small slips of paper and put them on the wall. Deb encouraged Task Force members to stay patient and take advantage of the unusual opportunity for the group to think together in an open and safe environment.

Ray Beamesderfer, NOAA Fisheries, added that he thought it was important for people to think broadly and not get caught up in the definitions of the terms “strategies” and “actions.” He explained that the goal of the exercise was to capture the universe of all possible options for making progress towards salmon and steelhead recovery, and that Task Force members should not limit their ideas.

Before the group started brainstorming, Deb listed a few examples (e.g., adaptive management and moratorium on floodplain development) to help Task Force members start to think about what they might want to put on the wall. Barry then noted that he wanted to make sure people also focus on cultural, economic, social, and ecosystem considerations in their brainstorming efforts.

For two hours, the group added notes to the sticky wall, read each other’s ideas, and discussed one another’s perspectives. The Project Team identified the following general categories as an initial organizing framework for the ideas: hatchery, hydrosystem, habitat, harvest, predation, salmon stronghold, weak stock management, all H’s, natural production, fish passage and reintroduction, life cycle modeling, ecosystem, future conditions (climate, population, etc.), adaptive management, building on existing efforts, water, energy and renewables, regulation, funding and incentives, overall socioeconomic considerations, cost-benefit analyses, timing and time frames, big picture thinking, governance, branding and communication, and equity/diverse perspectives.

Transcriptions of the individual sticky notes are included in *Appendix B*.

#### **4. Small Group Discussions on Brainstormed Ideas**

##### ***Deb Nudelman, K&W, and Task Force Members***

Deb Nudelman, K&W, explained that much of the afternoon would entail small, facilitated group discussions to continue brainstorming, talk about the overarching themes of the brainstormed ideas on the wall, and think about suggestions for how to organize the ideas. She also noted that representatives from NOAA Fisheries and/or Kearns & West would help facilitate the discussions and that one Task Force member from each group would be tasked with reporting back to the full group. The discussions centered around the following two questions:

- What are the overarching themes of the brainstormed ideas?
- What are some suggestions for how to organize these ideas?

For two hours, Task Force members talked with one another in their small groups. See Section 5 below to learn about the content of each group’s discussion.

## **5. Report Out from Small Group to Large Group**

*Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, Deb Nudelman, K&W, and Task Force Members*

Each group’s representative had a maximum of 15 minutes to recount what they discussed in their small group. Please see below for summaries of the major themes discussed in each group.

Joel Kawahara, Coastal Trollers Association, represented Group A. The main themes his group discussed are as follows:

- All H’s (hydrosystem, habitat, hatchery, and harvest) and determining limiting factors
- Helping to support and nourish the culture of salmon in the basin
- Cross-region prioritization in which you maximize the geographic distribution of adult fish
- Restoring and learning from natural processes – work with nature rather than fighting against it
- Landscape-scale prioritization – focus efforts on areas where you can make a large impact and preserve the areas that are still in good condition

Urban Eberhart, Kittitas Reclamation District, represented Group B. He noted that Group B discussed the following themes:

- All H’s (hydrosystem, habitat, hatchery, and harvest) and predation
- Equity and inclusion of others
- Education and marketing – the importance of having a cohesive and compelling message about recovery efforts and why they are important
- Flexible funding model and changes to funding processes
- Changing to regulatory processes
- New model of governance
- A compelling and durable vision

Urban also mentioned that for each of these themes, the Task Force should consider focusing on different geographic areas, keeping costs at a reasonable level, and exploring the feasibility of strategies and actions.

David Doeringsfeld, Port of Lewiston, represented group C. His group discussed the following themes:

- All H’s (hydrosystem, habitat, hatchery, harvest) and predation
- Geographic areas – basin-wide and sub-basin
- Water – water rights, regulation, flow, and water quality issues
- Innovation – new technologies and incentives
- Governance – collaboration, changing rules and regulations, and communication
- Adaptive management – monitoring, prioritizing largest biological benefit, and cost effectiveness
- Branding – a cohesive message to bring to Congress

Jim McKenna, State of Oregon, and Glen Spain, Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman, represented group D. Jim and Glen described the following themes and ideas discussed by their group:

- Water – quantity and quality
- Cultural significance of salmon in the basin
- Technology
- Governance
- Communication and marketing – telling a complex interconnected story about recovery efforts and the role of residents of the basin
- All H's (hydrosystem, habitat, hatchery, and harvest) and predation
- Timelines and timeliness – act quickly and efficiently
- Equity – adopt salmon-based economics in which cost-benefit analyses consider all the costs and benefits. It is necessary to internalize the externalities.

Several other Task Force members commented on equity following the presentations. One Task Force member explained that she was using the term equity to refer to the fact that the true costs of many actions are not measured due to externalities. Another stated her definition of equity focused more on incorporating diverse and disadvantaged groups into basin-wide decision-making processes.

After the groups finished presenting, Deb Nudelman, K&W, thanked everyone for their thoughtful discussions and explained that the group would be able to continue the conversation the next morning. Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, noted that it is impressive to see both the similarities and the diversity of ideas across groups.

## 6. Next Steps and Summary

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

Deb Nudelman, K&W, reminded Task Force members about meal payments, parking payments, and other logistics. Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, thanked the group for their efforts.

DAY 2 – April 24, 2019

---

**7. 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 Deb Nudelman, K&W, asked the group for introductions. Task Force and audience members introduced themselves by name and affiliation.

Deb thanked everyone for their work and reviewed the agenda, which included a short reflection on brainstorming from the prior day, a discussion of analytical tools and approaches, and guidance for the Integration and Technical Teams. She then asked for updates.

Rob Masonis, Trout Unlimited, noted that he was in Boise the prior day for a conference about salmon and energy. He explained that there was a diverse group of people who attended the meeting and that Congressman Simpson made impactful remarks about the need for healthy, abundant, and harvestable salmon populations in Idaho.

**8. Reflection and Making Meaning of Yesterday’s Brainstorming**

***Deb Nudelman, K&W, Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, and Task Force members***

Deb Nudelman, K&W, explained that the Project Team made a first effort to organize the strategies and actions on the sticky wall into different categories. She noted that Task Force members should feel welcome to move the ideas around and add categories as they saw fit.

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, thanked the Project Team for categorizing the ideas on the sticky wall and stated that it was interesting to see how much the theme of governance came up in people’s conversations. He also noted that education, outreach, and cultural awareness were themes that seemed common across many groups. Barry assured the group that an all H approach would be reflected in the scenarios and noted that he hopes the group can find ways to incorporate these other common themes and ideas into the scenario development as well.

Deb asked the group if they had any reflections on the wall and the categorization. Steve Fick, Fishhawk Fisheries, asked if NOAA Fisheries could collect data on the cost of hatchery production in the basin and the fisheries supported by those hatcheries. Kevin Scribner, Salmon Safe, reiterated the importance of the economic and equity conversation from the previous day and explained the importance of having some qualitative metric for the basin to reflect the value of the activities, functions, and interdependencies in the region.

Kurt Miller, Northwest RiverPartners, asked the group if they were hoping to get support from the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) or to reach beyond BPA and ask Congress for more funds. Several members of the Task Force and the Project Team affirmed that the group is thinking about federal funding, but that they also hope to be creative and find other sources of funding as well.

Randy Friedlander, Colville Tribes, noted that the ideas on the wall impressed him and that he was eager to move towards a discussion about the implementation of these strategies and actions in different areas. Ben Enticknap, Oceana, stated it was interesting that ideas on the wall ranged from very specific projects to abstract ideas. He wanted to know how the scenario planning process will take all these ideas into consideration. Deb, K&W, explained that Ray Beamesderfer’s upcoming

presentation would help clarify and that the group would be able to provide advice to the Integration Team in the afternoon on exactly that topic.

## 9. Potential Analytical Tools and Approaches

### *Michael Tehan and Ray Beamesderfer, NOAA Fisheries*

Michael Tehan, NOAA Fisheries, explained that Ray Beamesderfer, NOAA Fisheries, would be presenting on potential methods that the Technical Team might use to analyze the strategies and actions on the wall. Michael noted that the more traditional analyses will include an all H approach and that the Technical Team will aim to put together different combinations of strategies and actions that will achieve the provisional goals. He also commented that the Technical Team will start conducting some of these analyses while the Integration Team begins to determine how to incorporate the more non-traditional ideas from the sticky wall into a scenario development plan.

Ray started his presentation by stating that there are three components of the Phase 2 process: 1) big picture thinking, 2) social, cultural, and economic questions and analyses, and 3) biological analyses and questions. The Technical Team has come up with some ideas for how to tackle the third component.

Ray noted that the most important outcomes of testing the provisional quantitative goals are:

1. Determining if the goals are reasonable and understanding the implications of the goals.
2. Identifying multiple sets of strategies to reach the goals.

He explained that a Technical Work Group will be brainstorming about the analytical tools and conducting the necessary analysis for the CBP Task Force. The group met prior to the Task Force meeting and discussed the following ideas for consideration during analysis:

- *Structured decision process:* How can we use the biological information to help structure the decision-making process?
- *Scientific foundation:* It is critical to have a scientific foundation for all the goals and work that the Task Force does.
- *Biological sideboards:* The Technical Team can help provide a range of options so that the Task Force is not overwhelmed with data.
- *All the H's:* The biological analysis must include all H's.
- *Coarse and fine-scale analysis:* The Technical Team will begin with coarse higher-level analyses and refine them after Task Force review.
- *Integrate existing tools and plans:* It is crucial not to spend time reinventing the wheel. The Technical Team will gather all the available information and distill it into a useful framework for the Task Force.

Ray then stated the five important questions the Technical Team will explore as they conduct their analyses:

1. How much improvement is needed to achieve the goals?
2. What are the limiting factors?
3. What combinations of improvements across one or more limiting factors close the gap?
4. What actions produce the desired improvement?
5. How do we reconcile strategies across species, stocks, and regions?

**Question 1: How much improvement is needed to achieve the goals?**

Ray explained that the Task Force answered this question when it defined the high, medium, and low goals. He provided an example of the Lower Columbia River Coho and noted that you would need to more than double the current abundance to reach the low goal. To reach the high goal, you would need to increase the current abundance six-fold. Ray also provided a graphic of several stocks and how much they would each need to improve to reach the high, medium, and low goals. The image demonstrates that some stocks (e.g. Snake River spring Chinook) need much more improvement than others (e.g. Upper Columbia River Sockeye).

**Question 2: What are the limiting factors?**

Ray noted that “factors” include harvest, hatchery, tributary habitat, hydrosystems, estuary habitat, future conditions, and predation. All these factors affect abundance. Ray explained that the goal of this portion of the analysis would be to determine which factors have a large impact and which have a small impact. Impact is defined as the percent reduction in recruitment or survival rate affecting abundance. Some impacts may be simple to calculate (e.g., fishery and/or hydro mortality rates), but there are other more complicated impacts that the Technical Team can estimate as well. Consider hatchery-related reduction in fitness – it is hard to estimate an exact change in abundance, but by estimating reductions in natural-origin fitness or productivity as a result of hatchery-origin spawners, we can estimate how abundance of natural-origin adult spawners might be affected for a particular stock.

Ray also commented that it is important to note that each one of these limiting factors has many components that contribute to the final calculation. For example, the hydro mortality rate consists of impacts from juvenile passage, adult passage, latent mortality, and reservoir mortality.

Once the Technical Team has the information about the impacts of all the factors, they can start looking at the potential scopes for improvement within each one. In this step of analysis, it is also important to consider the uncertainty in these estimates. The Technical Team will comb through existing research to bring together the best data and estimate the impacts and uncertainty for each factor and stock.

**Question 3: What combinations of improvements close the gap?**

Ray explained that the next step is to conduct a coarse-scale analysis. One can think of this step as a dial-turning exercise. A tool known as the slider can help demonstrate how abundance changes as the impacts of different limiting factors vary. This exercise will help to demonstrate the necessary magnitude of change in each limiting factor to achieve the goals. Ray also showed a slide that explained the method and formula that the slider uses to estimate the effects of change in impacts on adult abundance. Finally, he noted that this method of analysis builds off all the other tools that people have been using in the basin to measure impacts.

**Question 4: What actions produce the desired improvement?**

Ray commented that the next step is to conduct a finer-scale analysis in which the Technical Team will refine the coarse-scale scenarios developed in the prior step. This analysis will start to incorporate specific actions and strategies into the process. Some important questions to consider during this refinement are:

- What actions are consistent with each strategy?

- How much of a reduction in impact is reasonable?
- What are the benefits of specific actions?
- How much improvement can we expect from actions that have already been implemented?
- How much more is needed to reach the goals?
- How quickly will improvements occur?
- What are the economic and other implications of different strategies?

## **Question 5: How do we reconcile strategies across species, stocks, and regions?**

Ray referred to this step as “reconciliation and aggregation.” He explained that it is important to look at the stocks comprehensively to determine if changes to limiting factors affect multiple stocks in the same or different ways. He noted that this step will help determine the tradeoffs between focusing on one species over another. He also noted that it could help determine which strategies and actions have positive effects across a large swath of stocks.

In conclusion, Ray stated that the Technical Team hopes to act as a bridge between the complex science and the Task Force to help the group efficiently and productively make thorough and comprehensive decisions. He then asked if any Task Force members had questions and comments.

### Questions about the model:

*Which portion of the model takes ocean impacts into consideration?*

The ocean impacts will be reflected in the future conditions category.

*Which portion of the analysis incorporates timescales?*

The Technical Team will not include a temporal aspect in the coarse-scale analysis, but the fine-scale analyses may incorporate options with different timelines for implementation and effects of implementation.

*Is the model a linear regression model?*

The algebraic formula used in the slider reflects a linear relationship between impacts and adult abundance, but statistically this is not a linear regression model. However, the simple linear equation is very robust.

### General Questions

*How will we incorporate economic factors into this analysis? Can we put a number on the value per fish of salmon and steelhead in the region?*

In this portion of the analysis, the Technical Team aims to determine if the goals are biologically possible. The next step will include an analysis of the costs or other forms of socioeconomic impacts of the strategies and actions that would allow us to reach the goals. In addition to this biological analysis, there will also be a parallel process to identify and reach out to socioeconomic experts to determine tools for measuring the social, cultural, economic, and ecosystem impacts of the strategies and actions. The Integration Team will be a part of the process of vetting socioeconomic experts and tools.

*How do you define the word “reasonable”? (e.g., Are the goals reasonable?)*

Everyone has their own interpretation of what reasonable means, so the Technical Team will provide information on what types of impact reductions would be needed to achieve the goals and,

potentially, on what actions would achieve those impact reductions. Task Force members will decide as a group what they think is reasonable.

*How do we make sure that stakeholders on the ground are involved in this process?*

The Logic Flow and Workplan for Phase 2 of the CBP Task Force include iterative processes in which the analyses are refined over time based on Task Force feedback. The goal is that each Task Force member will take the information from the meetings back to their constituents and return to the next Task Force meeting with that feedback in hand.

#### Other Comments

- Importance of being transparent about the assumptions and predictions that go into the models
- Importance of focusing on the political will and not solely thinking about biological feasibility
- Importance of quantifying spatial distribution and diversity

After the discussion, Deb thanked everyone for their participation. She explained that there would be an opportunity for public input after lunch and that the day would finish with a discussion about advice for the Integration and Technical Teams.

#### **10. Public Input**

***Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West***

Deb asked audience members if anyone would like to share public comments. No one opted to comment.

#### **11. Continue Morning Discussions and Provide Guidance for Integration Team/Technical Team**

***Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, Deb Nudelman, K&W, and Task Force members***

Deb Nudelman, K&W, noted that the afternoon discussion would be about giving guidance to the Integration Team and Technical Team on how to effectively incorporate the brainstormed ideas into the Phase 2 analyses and products.

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, explained that the Project Team is hoping to gain insight on three topics in this discussion:

- 1) Guidance for the Integration and Technical Teams to move forward between now and the June CBP Task Force meeting
- 2) A discussion on the technical analysis of the actions and strategies on the wall
- 3) A discussion about governance – should the CBP Task Force have a Governance Subgroup that would brainstorm and consider options for successful long-term governance structures?

Deb noted that the Integration Team will, at minimum, take the information that is on the sticky wall and help figure out how to organize and coalesce it on behalf of the Task Force. The Project Team will then help incorporate the results of that process into the Workplan. She noted that the Technical Team will also meet to determine next steps for the analysis.

Next, Barry posed the following two questions to the Task Force:

- Should the Task Force consider exploring a series of short-term actions that the group can agree on?
- Should the Task Force create a Governance Subgroup?

Deb asked that each Task Force member share their thoughts on these questions. Their ideas are summarized as follows:

## Short-Term Actions

- Some Task Force members immediately supported the idea of coming up with a list of short-term actions and they shared examples that they believe should be on the list (e.g., creating cold water refuges).
- Several Task Force members notes that taking short-term actions may help build the credibility of the CBP Task Force in the basin.
- Other Task Force members supported the concept of creating a list of actions that could be implemented in the short-term but had doubts about how the group would come to consensus on which actions belong on the list. They explained that the discussion about short-term actions could derail the more important discussions about the long-term vision for salmon in the basin.
- Some Task Force members expressed that they would be interested in taking short-term actions, but that they did not think the actions should be identified from any individual organization or agency's lists. These members explained that if the group is going to recommend actions, they need to reflect the uniqueness of the Task Force: the actions need to be original and system-wide in order to add value to the basin.
- A couple Project Team members noted that it is important to remember the Task Force does not have authority or funding to implement specific actions, but rather to make recommendations.

## Governance Subgroup

- Most Task Force members expressed support for creating a Governance Subgroup that would explore and/or develop a long-term governance model. Some referenced that the Governance Subgroup could provide a way for the Task Force to have sustained influence beyond Phase 2.
- Other Task Force members supported the idea of a Governance Subgroup but noted that they want it to occur in parallel with the Task Force and not have it take up time during Task Force meetings.
- One Task Force member noted that he is cautious about developing a governance structure because he is worried that not all stakeholders will be represented.
- Another Task Force member noted that he is worried that creating another governing body will make implementation processes slower than they already are.

After hearing these thoughts from Task Force members, Barry thanked them for sharing their ideas. He reminded the group that the CBP Task Force can only make recommendations, not make decisions or contribute funding. He explained that the priority product of the group is developing scenarios that will achieve the goals. If this analysis happens to result in a suite of short-term actions that are comprehensive and/or consistent across all the scenarios, the group could consider adopting them as recommendations.

Barry also thanked everyone for their comments about the Governance Subgroup and noted that he believes there is a need to explore how to keep this diverse group of stakeholders around the table in the long-term. He believes that the Governance Subgroup would help achieve that.

## 12. Next Steps and Wrap Up

*Deb Nudelman, K&W, Katherine Cheney and Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries*

Deb Nudelman, K&W, stated that it is a pleasure to work with this group and that she appreciates their ability to think on a high level and be comfortable and respectful when they disagree with one another. Deb thanked the group for their willingness to participate in the brainstorming exercises and noted that she is hopeful people will continue to think about the brainstormed ideas and discussions over the next few months. Deb asked if there were any additional comments.

One Task Force member stated that that he was feeling frustrated about discrepancies between some agencies' willingness to collaborate during Task Force meetings versus their willingness to collaborate outside of the meeting. Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, explained that he understood the frustration and that the only purview of the Task Force is to provide comprehensive recommendations on long-term salmon recovery in the basin. As of now, agencies are not changing their mandates to reach the goals that the group has recommended, so each agency must continue implementing its current mandate. Barry recognized that these discrepancies may be frustrating, but he believes that with continued effort and collaboration in the Task Force, the status quo discussions will change. Another Task Force member noted that the group has worked hard to create strong relationships with one another. He explained that given the strong relationships and the intent of the group to bring healthy and harvestable salmon stocks to the basin, he thinks that Task Force members have good intentions and everyone's best interests in mind.

Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries, reminded the group that B.J. Kieffer, Spokane Tribe, Marla Harrison, Port of Portland, and Mike Edmondson, Idaho Governor's Office, would be presenting to the MAFAC on Tuesday, April 30, 2019 in Portland, Maine. She noted that the Project Team would email the Task Force the slides, talking points, and conference call and webinar information in case they would like to attend virtually. Jennifer Lukens, NOAA Fisheries, added that the MAFAC would be voting on whether to approve the CBP Task Force's recommendations and that she thought it would go smoothly. She explained that after MAFAC approves the report, it will go to Chris Oliver, the NOAA Administrator.

Deb reviewed next steps, which include:

- The Project Team will send out the MAFAC meeting information to Task Force members.
- The Project Team will transcribe the sticky wall and send it out to the Task Force in case they would like to add any other ideas.
- The Project Team will add the word "economic" to the box of the Logic Path in the top row so that it reads: "Brainstorm social, economic, cultural, and ecosystem considerations."
- The next in-person Task Force meeting will be held on June 26 and 27, 2019 in Spokane, Washington.
- There are two upcoming Integration Team meetings.
  - An all-day in-person meeting on May 23, 2019
  - A conference call on June 3, 2019
- There is at least one upcoming Technical Team meeting, the date of which will be determined soon.
- The Project Team will send a draft meeting summary to the Task Force in the next few weeks and will request feedback.

Barry thanked everyone for their discussions throughout the meeting and their thoughtful input. He recognized that the Integration, Technical, and Project Teams will need to do a lot of work to coalesce and make sense of the sticky wall ideas prior to the CBP Task Force meeting in June. He stated that he looks forward to seeing everyone then. The meeting was adjourned around 3:00 pm.

Upcoming Meeting Dates	Location
June 26 and 27, 2019	Spokane, WA
September 25 and 26, 2019	Portland, OR
December 3 and 4, 2019	Spokane, WA

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