

SUMMARY MEETING REPORT

Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee (MAFAC) Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force (CBP Task Force) *Portland, OR – December 3 & 4, 2019*

OVERVIEW

The Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee (MAFAC) Columbia Basin Partnership (CBP) Task Force met at the Davenport Grand Hotel in Spokane, Washington, on December 3 and 4, 2019. 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 28 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:

- Outcomes for Phase 2 of the CBP Task Force
- Purpose and next steps for the Path Forward/Governance Group
- Aligning around scenarios
- Technical Team updates and the use of the slider
- Important points for Phase 2
- Synthesis from Day 1 and Day 2 discussions
- 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 noted that there were several Task Force member absences and some people were planning to join via conference call. He explained that the group has a full meeting agenda, and they will need to make critical progress as the Task Force approaches its final meeting in June 2020.

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 and remote participants:

- Jess Groves, Port of Cascade Locks – present via phone
- Liz Hamilton, Northwest Sport Fishing Industry Association – present via phone
- Debrah Marriott, Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership
- Liza Jane McAlister, 6 Ranch, Inc.
- Jim Yost, State of Idaho
- Glen Spain, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen – present on Day 2
- Joe Lukas, Western Montana Electric Generating and Transmission Cooperative (Western Montana G&T) – present on Day 2

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, providing clarity on Phase 2 outcomes, the purpose and next steps for the Path Forward/Governance Group, a discussion about aligning around scenarios. On Day 2, agenda topics included an update on the Technical Team's work and the use of the slider, a discussion on important points of agreement for Phase 2 outcomes, an opportunity for public input, and synthesis from the discussions on both days.

Deb also mentioned that this phase of collaborative work is challenging because the Task Force is nearing its last meeting, and underlying conflict and dissonance are starting to arise. She reminded the group that they have worked together for several years and have strong connections to one another. She asked that participants remember to check their assumptions, ask questions, and listen to each other to understand differing perspectives. Deb also noted that even though it is a highly political time, Task Force members should try to use this group as a neutral space where they can find common ground. Finally, Deb recognized that there are a lot of other negotiations underway in the basin and she asked participants to focus on discussing topics that are under the purview of this group.

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.

Michael Tehan, NOAA Fisheries, provided an update on the Columbia River Treaty discussions. The eighth round of negotiations took place in British Columbia in September. The discussions

focused on ecosystem issues, and three U.S. tribal members from the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, the Colville Tribes, and the Kootenai Tribes participated as technical advisors. The ninth negotiation session was supposed to take place in Washington, D.C. in November, but it was delayed so that the U.S. could spend more time preparing. Finally, there is a town hall meeting in Richland, Washington on December 16 for the State Department to meet with local interest groups regarding the Columbia River Treaty.

Heidi Lovett, NOAA Fisheries, provided updates about MAFAC. The group met in October and Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries, gave a brief presentation on Phase 2 of the CBP Task Force. Heidi also mentioned that MAFAC is creating a Recreational Electronic Reporting Task Force to develop a roadmap for using apps and data in recreational fishing. She asked Task Force members to distribute the announcement so that MAFAC can get a diverse set of nominations.

Kevin Scribner, Salmon Safe, announced that he attended a Water 2050 Visioning Session in Walla Walla in October. The Washington Department of Ecology and the Walla Walla Management Partnership led the workshop. The Oregon Department of Water Resources and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation participated. Kevin highlighted that the group focused on a future that benefits all people.

Urban Eberhart, Kittitas Reclamation District, noted that Bill Ruckelshaus, the first administrator of the EPA and a strong collaboration advocate, died over Thanksgiving weekend. Bill advocated for collaborative processes and civil discourse and conducted the Situation Assessment along with Oregon Consensus that led to this Task Force. The work of this Task Force embodies his vision.

Jennifer Anders, State of Montana, provided an update on the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (the Council). The Council had decided to use the Task Force's Phase 1 qualitative and quantitative objectives in their amendment process, but they were asked to take a slower approach and seek feedback from people around the region on incorporating these goals. Jennifer also noted that the Council received a report on reintroduction and that Guy Norman, State of Washington, would explain more about it.

Regarding reintroduction, Guy explained that the Council received a report from the Independent Science Advisory Board (ISAB) in November about the Upper Columbia United Tribes Phase 1 Report. The review was largely positive and included some level of caution due to uncertainty about future outcomes. The ISAB noted that they still need a cost assessment of fish passage. The Council's program has overlap between Phase 1 and Phase 2 reintroduction.

Guy also provided an update on the Washington State Orca Task Force. The group delivered the second report to the governor on November 8, 2019. The report summarizes the recommendations for \$1.1 million that was put forth in the budget, provides an update on implementing the group's recommendations, and gives recommendations for a future governance structure. The money was mainly allocated to habitat measures, prey measures, reducing contaminants, and addressing vessel disturbance.

Zach Penney, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC), announced that he, Brent Hall, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, and Paul Ward, Yakama Nation, gave a presentation to their commission about the Task Force. The tribes are still supportive at the Commission level, but Commission members emphasized that the tribal technical staff should devote significant effort to reviewing the technical modeling and inputs. Zach added that the

Commission members provided feedback from the four tribes on reintroduction and hatchery use within the basin.

Scott Hauser, Upper Snake River Tribes (USRT), noted that there are no Phase 1 quantitative goals for the Upper Snake River area. The group agreed to identify goals for this region in Phase 2 and several agencies, entities, and tribes have been meeting since April to continue the discussion to agree on goals for the Upper Snake River. This smaller group met the day before the meeting. Participants included USRT, the Shoshone - Bannock Tribe, the Oregon Governor's Office, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Idaho Office of Species Conservation, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Bureau of Indian Affairs, CRITFC, Nez Perce, Yakama Nation, and Idaho Water Users Association. USRT presented proposed quantitative numbers from their fish management plan, which was finalized by NOAA Fisheries and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. After robust discussion, Oregon and Idaho are going to discuss several items with their legal teams (e.g., Oregon, Idaho, and Idaho Power Settlement and Idaho state statute about reintroduction). The group also needs to discuss the methodology that they will use to identify quantitative goals. Scott mentioned that the small group will meet again, and he reiterated the urgency for the Snake member tribes to have quantitative goals moving forward. Finally, he explained that he will look to NOAA Fisheries for guidance on timing for the quantitative numbers to be included in the Phase 2 report.

Justin Hayes, Idaho Conservation League, provided an update on the Idaho Governor's Salmon Work Group. The Work Group has 20 members and diverse participation from throughout the region. He noted that Katherine Cheney gave a presentation on the Task Force's Phase 1 report in a previous Work Group meeting. Justin also highlighted the group's recently published mission statement: "To develop policy recommendations for Governor Little through a collaborative, consensus-driven, public process to restore abundant, sustainable, and well-distributed populations of salmon and steelhead in Idaho for present and future generations, while recognizing diverse interests throughout the State." Justin highlighted that the Work Group talks about many of the same topics as the Task Force, and they have around one more year of meetings.

Rob Masonis, Trout Unlimited (TU), mentioned that TU had its annual meeting in Arkansas and presented the Conservation Partner Award to Urban Eberhart and the Kittitas Reclamation District.

B.J. Kieffer, Spokane Tribe, welcomed the group to the heart of the Spokane Tribe. He explained that the Spokane Tribe received a thousand salmon eggs in 2015 and they raised the fish using the local school on the reservation. The tribe released 700 juveniles in 2017 at Chamokane Creek. In 2019, they started to see fish coming back up the river. After coordinating with other tribal scientists and fish managers, they identified one fish that made its way all the way back to Chief Joseph Dam. The Spokane Tribe's elders named the fish to mean it came back and traced its way through the water. B.J. noted that he shared this story to tell the group that passage and reintroduction has occurred and will continue to occur. Finally, B.J. mentioned that the Spokane Tribe released 50 more adults into Chamokane and that school children and Tribal Elders all participated in the event.

Heath Heikkila, Coastal Conservation Association, mentioned that his organization was tracking several items in the Congressional budget, including the salmon management account for NOAA Fisheries. He highlighted that he is advocating for money for that account as well as for the Pacific Salmon Treaty.

Joel Kawahara, Coastal Trollers Association, shared that he has been asked to participate in three panel discussions in Washington's Snake River forum process. He noted that he would not speak on

behalf of the Task Force, but he would share information about the Task Force and the Phase 1 and Phase 2 processes.

Guy clarified that the panel is part of the public Snake River forums. There are three meetings in January throughout the region (Clarkston on January 7, Vancouver on January 9, and Tri-Cities on January 13). These meetings will be part of a comprehensive report that includes information from stakeholder interviews with the state, federal, and tribal agencies, as well as interest groups associated with the Snake River dams. It will also include a literature review. The report should be complete in February and delivered to the governor and legislature. The purpose of the forums is to gather comprehensive information related to the Lower Snake River dams. Guy added that the report is associated with the Washington Orca Task Force.

Steve Manlow, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, announced that the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) met recently and allocated funding to restoration projects in Washington. The SRFB devoted \$6 million to support delisting efforts and half of that funding will go towards middle Columbia steelhead. Steve also reported that Washington is evaluating its statewide recovery strategy. The Governor's Salmon Recovery Office is assessing the strategy's successes and fallbacks, and people will have an opportunity to provide feedback.

Patty O'Toole, Northwest Power and Conservation Council, gave an additional update on the Council's amendment process. The 2014 Program is still in place and the draft amendments propose keeping the 2014 Program and adding an addendum. The addendum would include goals, objectives, and indicators. It would also have a focus on implementation and identifying areas from the 2014 Program that should receive emphasis. The Council is considering pausing on the goals, objectives, and indicators to work more with co-managers throughout the region, but they will continue with the implementation portion. The earliest that the implementation part of the addendum would be considered is January 2020.

Michael Tehan mentioned that the ESA requires federal agencies to assess the status of species and threats to reconfirm listings. NOAA Fisheries just began its formal "Status Review" for salmon and steelhead. There is an open data call until the end of March 2020 for fishery managers to submit relevant information to NOAA Fisheries for consideration during the status review.

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, added that the Columbia River System Operations (CRSO) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be released in February by the Army Corps of Engineers, Bonneville Power Association, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

3. Phase 2 Outcomes: Providing Clarity on Where We are Headed

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

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, thanked Task Force members for sharing their updates and noted how impressed he is that the group is integrating the Partnership into their daily work. He explained how imperative it is that the group stick together and keep moving the process forward for the benefit of the entire basin. He reflected on the progress that the group has made over the past two years, and he mentioned how often he hears people speak highly of the Phase 1 Report.

Barry explained that the purpose of this agenda topic is to discuss where there are areas of alignment about the group's desired outcomes by June 2020. He directed the group to the Phase 2 Logic Path, a handout in the meeting packet that demonstrates the progression and outcomes for Phase 2 of the Task Force and reviewed the four outcomes at the bottom of the document.

- **Scenarios:** Barry explained that scenarios are meant to help the group develop potential pathways forward and discuss the tradeoffs of each one. The group will have a discussion about what is possible to achieve by using scenarios, and Task Force members should try not to get bogged down in the nomenclature. Barry pointed the group to the Scenario Question and Answer document in the meeting materials. He explained that scenarios represent different pathways to rebuilding salmon runs and aim to help the region align future management decisions.
- **Revise Provisional Goals (as appropriate):** Barry added that there is the opportunity to tweak or finalize the Phase 1 provisional goals. The scenarios were intended to help provide clarity or refine the goals if needed. The provisional goals still have a placeholder for the Upper Snake River, and the group is still committed to including them in the Phase 2 Report. Regarding the timing of those goals, the Task Force would like to be able to discuss them at the February 2020 meeting.
- **Social, Cultural, Economic, and Ecosystem (SCE&E) Considerations:** Another Phase 2 outcome is related to discussing how the social, cultural, economic, and ecosystem considerations interplay with the biological strategies. The report from the SCE&E activity at the September meeting is available, and all Task Force members should have received it.
- **Governance/Path Forward:** Barry explained that the final Phase 2 outcome is to determine how this process moves forward. NOAA Fisheries is committed to supporting the Task Force through the end of June 2020. NOAA Fisheries cannot lead this group as it starts to discuss the broader policy questions about how to move forward in the basin. There are options as to how the group or something akin to it could exist in the future. The Task Force should think about both short-term and long-term governance structures as they consider what they can achieve by the end of June 2020.

Barry also mentioned that there are a lot of processes underway in the basin (e.g. CRSO EIS, Council amendment process, etc.) and that people often point to the Task Force as the collaborative group that will solve the basin's challenges. Task Force members should consider when and how to integrate the group's work with these other forums. The Phase 1 goals are one outcome that could be shared and incorporated throughout the basin.

Regarding scenarios, Barry explained that he envisions the group having multiple scenarios and each Task Force member's interests should be incorporated into at least one. He reiterated that the Task Force does not have to agree on one scenario at the end of Phase 2. He also noted that while exploring scenarios, the group may discover other salient points that could be useful takeaways to share with the basin in the Phase 2 Report.

One Task Force member asked if the Project Team has decided the shape and form of the Phase 2 Report. He mentioned that scenarios lend themselves to a narrative form and will help convey a clear story and message. Deb replied that the Project Team has not decided on a specific format for the report, and they are open to ideas and suggestions.

Task Force and Project Team members had a discussion regarding Phase 2 outcomes. The main points were as follows.

- It is challenging to tie basin-wide scenarios to on-the-ground actions and impacts. Many strategies and actions would be better developed at a stock scale rather than basin-wide. One Task Force member suggested pursuing a pilot approach to develop a detailed scenario for a specific stock and its subbasin. This approach would allow Task Force members to better assess the biological and SCE&E considerations. Several other Task Force members supported this approach.

- Regarding the scale of scenarios, several Task Force members emphasized the importance of local expertise. One Task Force member suggested that the Path Forward/Governance Group could consider a model that has a large-scale governance group that tracks basin-wide changes. This model would also have subgroups made up of people who have experience in particular regions, and they would track progress for particular stocks. These subgroups would report back to the larger governance group.
- Many of the strategies that have been proposed as part of the scenarios look similar to the CRSO EIS process. One Task Force member asked if there was any connection between the Task Force's outcomes and the EIS process.
 - Barry replied that there is no linkage between the two processes other than the fact that there is a finite list of a strategies and actions to address salmon and steelhead recovery in the basin. As a result, some ideas may be present in both processes.
 - Another Task Force member reiterated that the EIS and Task Force process are different. The EIS focuses on avoiding jeopardy, while the Task Force focuses on a fundamentally different approach of achieving healthy and harvestable stocks in the long-term.
- One Task Force member suggested adding a temporal scale to the low, medium, and high goals to provide more context to an outside audience reading the Phase 2 report.

After hearing these comments, Deb asked Task Force members to share any worries they have about the four Phase 2 outcomes that Barry discussed earlier. Task Force members shared the following comments:

- The Phase 1 natural origin goals for Upper Columbia River sockeye are high. They do not align with the Council goals.
- The Phase 1 hatchery production goals are not in line with the magnitude of the natural Oregon goals. These goals need a formal review through the United States v Oregon Production Advisory Committee.
- The heat maps may be helpful in showing magnitude of influence by factor or subfactor. A histogram would be a good way to display this information.
- It would be useful to be able to look at the Middle Salmon Fork area in the slider tool.
- The Task Force should consider increasing the spring Chinook natural origin goals.
- The slider should demonstrate biological tradeoffs. It is important to know the extent to which changes in one part of the basin affect fish negatively in other parts of the basin.
 - Michael Tehan, NOAA Fisheries, noted that the slider was not intended to achieve this level of granularity.
- The Task Force is solving today's problems rather than thinking about the problems that will face the basin in 25 or 50 years. It is also risky to use today's data for future decisions. Scenarios should provide a structure and benchmarks so that whoever implements them can engage in adaptive management.
- The Task Force should make sure that scenarios respect and honor the commitments that have already been made to address salmon and steelhead recovery. It is also crucial to consider the equitable distribution of the impacts of taking action. Part of honoring those commitments is engaging stakeholders who have already made efforts in future decisions.
- The scenarios do not have a clear overarching vision. They should be focused on different management visions (e.g., weak stock management, stronghold concept, etc.) rather than general ideas like maximizing habitat restoration.
- Just like the natural production goals from Phase 1, the scenarios should allow the basin to be aspirational in its goals for salmon and steelhead recovery and populations.
- One Task Force member suggested that the Project Team and Task Force must test the proposed scenarios to determine how the group should move forward.

Barry reiterated the importance of considering what the Task Force can complete by June and how the Task Force can utilize their position as the only basin-wide group to play a key role in helping the region move forward. Though the subregional implementation is critical, the Task Force is not necessarily the right group to pursue it.

Deb thanked the group for their insightful questions and comments. She explained that she sees the four outcomes of Phase 2 as creating a blueprint for the basin. It is challenging to think about both the on-the-ground level and the larger-scale picture, but it is important for the group to do so. Creating resilient outcomes among such a diverse group of stakeholders will make the group's product strong.

4. Purpose and Next Steps for Path Forward/Governance Group

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

Barry explained that discussing the topic of governance is very important to NOAA Fisheries as they have invested seven years in this process and would like to see the benefits of this group continue after NOAA Fisheries is no longer the convening entity. During this discussion, the Task Force will provide guidance and sideboards to the Path Forward/Governance Group so that they can present a preferred governance approach by the February 2020 Task Force meeting. Barry referenced the Path Forward/Governance Group handout in the meeting packet, and he explained that the Project Team wanted feedback on the potential options and alternatives suggested. He also asked Task Force member for other ideas. The alternatives listed on the handout are as follows:

- 1) Ad hoc dispersed alternative: All Task Force members have the opportunity to incorporate Task Force goals and recommendations into their own work. The Task Force effort concludes.
- 2) Voluntary collaboration: A group of non-NOAA Fisheries-sponsored individuals determines how to convene a group like the Task Force that continues to meet and produce recommendations.
- 3) Regulatory: NOAA Fisheries decides to continue, and the Path Forward/Governance Group comes up with a proposal to involve other federal/regulatory agencies in addition to the current Task Force membership.
- 4) Legislative: The Path Forward/Governance Group creates a legislative proposal to stand up a new governance group.

Deb Nudelman, K&W, explained that the Path Forward/Governance group will use Task Force members' feedback and guidance to prepare recommendations for the full group. They will present ideas at the February 2020 Task Force meeting and then refine them for the final Task Force meeting in June 2020. Group members also received an excel spreadsheet with governance examples from throughout the country. The examples may help the group think about what the Task Force can do that complements efforts that are currently underway in the basin. Deb then asked members to provide their thoughts on the governance/path forward topic. Task Force members shared ideas as follows:

- The term governance implies the creation of an additional authority that would impose requirements and approve or reject projects. Many Task Force members noted that there are already ample groups and requirements throughout the basin (e.g. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission projects), and it is unclear where this new governance group would fit in. Given

requirements from the Endangered Species Act, US v Oregon, the Council, and more, what role will this new group play that does not duplicate other work? More specifically, what would the future governance group do that the Power Council does not do already? Thinking about these questions could help the future governance group to fill a necessary gap in the basin.

- Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries, proposed several ideas for the role of the future governance group. One option includes tracking and reporting on the long-term goals that the Task Force created in Phase 1. A second option is to be able to pool and leverage funding from various sources so that groups can rely on different sources (as opposed to a heavy reliance on Bonneville Power Association funding) to achieve salmon and steelhead abundance.
 - Michael Tehan, NOAA Fisheries, noted that the intention of exploring the path forward is not to replace the existing structures in the basin, but rather to think about how the Task Force (or a similar group) can continue without NOAA Fisheries as the convener and add value to other existing forums in the region.
 - Task Forces members who serve on the Council provided additional insight on the role that this future group could play that does not overlap with the Council. The Council only addresses a slice of the problem, while the future governance group would think more holistically. The Power Act and the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program is directly connected to mitigation for development of the federal hydropower system. The Power Council does not address harvest or hatchery. Additionally, the Power Council does not have tribal representation.
- The Path Forward/Governance Group should not select and design scenarios, rather it should help the basin carry out the ideas that the Task Force proposed in Phase 1 and Phase 2.
 - The "Ad hoc dispersed alternative" option provided in the handout is not desirable because it implies that the Task Force's Phase 1 and 2 reports will sit on the shelf. The Path Forward/Governance Group should explore options to create implementation strategies. These strategies should also have some sort of accountability mechanism built into them.
 - The governance model could be two-tiered – one tier should think about the long-term, basin-wide progress, while the other tier will implement on-the-ground projects. Local groups can report back to the basin-wide group to determine the best ways to make progress across the basin.
 - The future group could be a study group that helps collect and analyze information on a basin-wide scale. The Task Force was the first group to successfully put together information on all 24 stocks across the basin, and the future group could do the same for other technical information, including SCE&E-related data. A group that is as diverse as the Task Force may be able to make recommendations that are so widely respected that people will feel compelled to adopt them.
 - The basin-wide perspective has been missing in a lot of recovery planning, and this future governance group has the potential to fill that gap. In addition to providing the basin-wide perspective, the future governance group also has the opportunity to play an advocacy role.
 - The power of this group comes from its diversity. The future governance group can advise on salient issues and provide guidance throughout the basin. It will be incumbent upon governance bodies throughout the region to adopt these recommendations because such a diverse group of interests were able to support it.
 - The Sediment Evaluation Teams provides a good example for the Path Forward/Governance Group to consider. Convened by the Army Corps of Engineers, this group developed a framework and regional teams to align sediment management processes among regulatory bodies throughout the region. The group is not a regulatory body itself, but its recommendations are incorporated into the Army Corps of Engineers' permitting process.
 - The new group should take what the Task Force has created and focus on implementation and public outreach. That could include smaller regional groups that provide input to a larger basin-

wide group. The larger group could include additional entities that are not currently on the Task Force. The future group should also have some technical aspect that would help further flesh out scenarios.

- The Council has struggled for 30 years to determine how to address reporting requirements and implement adaptive management, so it is worthwhile to be cautious about the potential for the future governance group to be able to easily implement these ideas at a basin-wide scale. There is value in a group that gets together every few years to be a barometer to reflect on the work that the basin has done to date.
- It is crucial that any future governance group has tribal representation, which is currently missing from many of the existing governance structures in the basin.

Barry thanked Task Force members for their insightful thoughts. He noted the difference between a group having the authority to exist and the authority to take certain actions. The governance group will need to explore how to receive the authority to exist. Additionally, the benefit of this group is that it is successful in a way that no other group in the basin has been before – the Task Force is a diverse group of stakeholders who successfully provide basin-wide advice and recommendations. Barry also highlighted the following key points from the Task Force’s discussion:

- It is necessary to determine the time frame of the future group – will it address the continuation of the Task Force’s work for a few years or in the long term?
- Most people mentioned the idea of the future governance group helping to provide benchmarks, accountability, and track existing recovery and restoration efforts. It is important to add federal agencies to the future group to be able to pursue these functions.
- One Task Force member asked a question regarding the authority for a group to exist. If the authority comes from an act of Congress, does it mean that the group cannot serve an advocacy function?
 - Barry noted that NOAA Fisheries is prohibited from lobbying Congress.

Deb thanked the group for their comments and provided a few examples of governance structures, including hydrorelicensing processes, the Yuba Salmon Forum, the California Marine Protection Areas process, and the Pacific Fishery Management Council. She noted that NOAA Fisheries has been gracious in convening the group, and it is important for the Task Force to consider who the next convener will be. In addition to thinking about the convening entity, these governance group conversations will include discussions on time frame, governance goals, and more.

5. Aligning Around Scenarios

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

Deb Nudelman, K&W, explained that the group would be discussing scenarios for the afternoon of Day 1. The discussion will focus on the following questions and goals:

- 1) How can we help the proposed scenarios represent a range of ways to achieve the goals?
- 2) How do we ensure that the Task Force members see themselves in one or more of the proposed scenarios?
- 3) Strive to align around a set of scenarios for further development

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, noted that it has been challenging for the Project Team to develop scenarios that help the group understand different ways to achieve the goals as well as the implications of achieving the goals. The Integration Team has provided crucial guidance to the Project Team. Patty Dornbusch, NOAA Fisheries, will present how scenarios have developed since

the last meeting, and then the group will discuss how to tweak these scenarios as well as how they might help the group to move forward.

Patty explained that over the course of her presentation, she will review the work that has been done to date to develop scenarios and then present the working list of four scenario themes. It has been challenging for the Project Team to develop scenarios that resonate with the Task Force because everyone has a different idea about what a scenario is and should be, but hopefully the four themes provide topics and levels of detail that resonate with the Task Force.

Working Scenario Definition

Patty reviewed the working definition of a scenario that the Project Team proposed at the beginning of Phase 2: A combination of one or more biological strategies and sets of assumed future conditions that we can consider relative to the goals. She noted that the group has informally added SCE&E components to this definition. Additionally, the Project Team initially thought there would be multiple pathways to achieve the goals with a focus on different H's (habitat, hydropower, harvest, hatchery), but with preliminary analysis, it appears that you would need to undertake many actions in every category to reach the high goals. There are also multiple ways to create scenarios, and the Project Team has mainly focused on scenarios based on biological strategies. Task Force members are welcome to build scenarios starting with SCE&E components and present them to the group.

Scenario Purpose

Patty reviewed the purpose of scenarios as follows:

- 1) To explore various pathways to achieving the goals.
- 2) To capture a range of options and choices confronting the region on how to achieve the goals.
- 3) To allow for evaluation of tradeoffs among alternative approaches.

All scenarios are intended to achieve the goals. Ideally, they would all achieve the high goals. Some may achieve them sooner than others or have a higher certainty of achieving them.

Nine Potential Scenario Themes and Integration Team Feedback

Patty presented nine scenario themes that the Project Team developed based on the small group activity that Task Force members participated in in the September 2019 meeting. The Project Team sought feedback on these themes at an Integration Team meeting in October 2019. The themes are as follows:

1. Frontload maximum effort
2. Continue existing effort
3. Incremental, increased effort
4. Frontload effort in blocked areas
5. Frontload opportunities for early successes
6. Frontload efforts to secure strongholds
7. Frontload efforts to secure most at-risk populations
8. Innovation
9. Experimental management

These scenarios are all focused on what you would do in the first 25 years. Themes four through seven represent different ways that one could sequence the efforts. Themes eight and nine were based on feedback from the September 2019 Task Force meeting, where group members mentioned the importance of bold and brave actions.

These nine themes were intended to get people thinking about different approaches to achieving the goals as well as the implications of those approaches. The scenario themes are presented in a table that demonstrates the potential components of each scenario including time frames, biological strategies, future conditions/climate change, research, SCE&E considerations, governance, funding, public education/marketing, and infrastructure. The Project Team also incorporated benchmarks, into every scenario. This change was based on suggestions from Task Force members at the September 2019 meeting. People would have to enact additional strategies and actions at specific times if benchmarks are not met.

The Integration Team had diverse feedback on the nine themes. The main ideas are as follows:

- **Wide Ranging:** The scenarios captured the breadth of what the Task Force discussed in previous meetings.
- **Status Quo:** Regarding a status quo scenario, many people noted that there should be a scenario that reflects the current projects and level of effort into the future. Others noted that a status quo does not exist because efforts have been constantly changing over time.
- **Scale:** Integration Team members discussed whether scenarios should be created at a stock or geographic scale versus a basin-wide scale.
- **Starting Point:** Integration Team members discussed starting scenarios with biological strategies versus starting them with SCE&E and governance considerations.
- **Being Bold:** Integration Team members noted that the strategies need to reflect bold, brave, and new ideas.
- **National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Resemblance:** Integration Team members discussed the pros and cons of the scenarios resembling a NEPA analysis.
- **Scenario Components as a Menu:** Some Integration Team members noted that the strategies from all nine scenarios could be used to create a menu that someone could choose from based on what is most appropriate for a specific stock.
- **Prioritization:** Some members were not comfortable with the scenarios based on sequencing efforts on different stocks over time because they prioritize certain stocks over others.
- **Beneficial Hatchery Scenario:** Some members commented that there should be a scenario that incorporates the beneficial uses of hatchery fish.
- **Common Themes:** Integration Team members discussed the possibility of identifying common themes that all Task Force members could agree on as a useful outcome of the scenario process.
- **Connection to Provisional Goals:** Some members thought there needed to be a stronger connection between the scenarios and the Phase 1 provisional goals.
- **Out of the Box Scenarios:** Integration Team members discussed the need for non-traditional scenario approaches.
- **Clout:** There was a discussion about the fact that the way the Task Force develops scenarios may impact the group's clout and determine whether they have a lasting impact.
- **Can't Have it All:** There was a discussion around the fact that the Task Force set ambitious goals, and they have to recognize that there will be resource constraints in implementing scenarios.

Four Condensed Scenarios

Patty explained that the Integration Team advised the Project Team to condense the nine scenarios into four. The goal of the four condensed scenarios is to achieve the high goals, with some achieving them sooner than others. The Project Team fleshed out general biological strategies but has not yet worked on the other components. The Project Team focused on the first 25 years of

implementation, but more long-term strategies could be fleshed out as well. The themes from the original nine scenarios have been integrated as components of strategies to the condensed four scenarios. The scenarios are as follows:

- 1) Stepwise incremental approach – this scenario is based on continuing the existing level of effort and incorporating the benchmark concept.
- 2) Enhanced effort – this scenario focuses on maximizing the habitat effort and engaging in enhanced effort in all of the other H’s.
- 3) Maximum effort – this scenario focuses on maximum effort across all the H’s.
- 4) Climate change contingency – This scenario advocates for early strategic choices that are focused on securing what we can in the face of climate change.

The Project Team hopes that the Task Force can agree on this set of potential scenarios or provide some modifications before the Project Team fleshes out each component. Patty asked Task Force members to think about the following questions:

- 1) Do these scenarios represent a range of alternatives among which it would be useful to evaluate tradeoffs?
- 2) Would they be useful to explore in more detail?
- 3) Do you have other proposed themes?
- 4) What scale should we use for scenarios and is there a role for regional groups?
- 5) How should the scenarios be fleshed out? Who should do it?

Regarding the A La Carte Menu, which is a handout in the meeting packet, Patty explained that it contains a menu of choices for scenarios. Column A to D represents an increasing level of effort. Most of the strategies in the four scenarios are taken from the strategies in the A La Carte Menu.

Deb noted that it has been challenging for the Project Team to use all of the Task Force member feedback since April 2019 and transform it into scenarios. She asked the Task Force to think about how they want the scenarios to be of value to them.

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

- Harvest and hatchery language should be changed to better reflect the real intent of those actions. The language “continue to limit release numbers” does not represent what the Task Force agreed upon in the qualitative goals. If the intent is to indicate that hatchery numbers will be limited after abundance is increased in the future, then there should be greater context around the language. Currently, the language indicates that the Task Force will be seeking additional places to limit hatchery production. Regarding harvest, the term “curtail” in the condensed scenarios is problematic. It could be reworded to “manage fisheries.”
 - Patty responded that all of the strategies in the condensed scenarios and the A La Carte Menu are open to wordsmithing. She also explained that the intent of the hatchery language for each scenario.
 - Scenario One: Continue current level of hatchery reforms to ultimately achieve natural production goals and provide fish for harvest.
 - Scenario Two: Increase hatchery reforms to achieve natural production goals and provide fish for harvest.
 - Scenario Three: Further increase hatchery reforms and enact reductions in release numbers to achieve natural production goals and provide fish for harvest.
 - Ray Beamesderfer, NOAA Fisheries, explained that the documents were created to conceptually demonstrate these scenarios, and the language used in these documents is open for editing.

- One Task Force member suggested using the language “maintain current release numbers” for Scenario One and Scenario Two to avoid the issues with the word “curtail.”
- Another Task Force member suggested the language “exercise best management practices in hatchery reforms to limit impacts on natural production.” He noted that strategic releases are part of hatchery reform.
- Barry noted that the harvest-related language is largely referring to ESA listed stocks, and that it would be useful to clarify that there is a balance between harvesting abundant non-listed stocks while curtailing harvest of listed stocks.
- One Task Force member suggested that the harvest language should include a mention of non-directed fisheries and directed fisheries so that its meaning is clearer.
- The climate change “contingency” scenario is not a contingency. Strategies that are part of climate change scenario should be integrated into every scenario because climate change is happening and will be worse in the future. There have already been unprecedented changes in the ocean ecosystem.
- Frontload maximum effort in all threats (Scenario Three) is the scenario that represents the most meaningful and significant change in the basin.
- Several Task Force members noted that scenarios should be developed at a stock-scale because each stock has unique needs.
- It is important to remember that habitat is only a piece of the problem. Land use programs, forest management, storm water runoff management, and more are all part of increased effort.
- “Blocked habitat” should be called “currently inaccessible habitat.” Calling it blocked allows people to not address the issue.
- It would be useful to have definitions for each of the impacts.
- Several Task Force members noted that these scenarios seem to prioritize certain outcomes over others (e.g., currently inaccessible areas are not prioritized). The word tradeoff implies that some strategies and actions will be a lower priority.
 - Patty explained that the way that blocked areas are treated in the current scenarios is that the effort to gain access to blocked areas increases with each scenario.
 - Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries, noted that a better term for “tradeoffs” may actually be “implications.” The intent of the future analysis will be to explore the SCE&E implications of different biological strategies.
 - One Task Force member explained he will only feel comfortable moving forward if the language that explains blocked areas in Frontload Maximum Effort in All Threats Scenario (Scenario Three) is included in the other three scenarios as well.
- Regarding hydropower, one Task Force member would like to change the language to incorporate the phrase “consider breaching one or more dams.” Another Task Force member asked for “removal of the Lower Snake River Dams” to be removed and instead include language about large scale changes to the hydrosystem. He noted that removal of the Lower Snake River dams would not benefit all the stocks.
- The hydropower strategies should demonstrate increased efforts to improve juvenile outmigration survival throughout the system in each level of effort.
- The names of the nine scenario themes do not seem like accurate descriptors of the content of scenarios and they should be removed.
- Scenarios should not be focused on specific tweaks to each H, but rather differing management visions for the basin. For example: focusing on areas where natural production potential is very high, focusing on weak stocks, focusing on decreasing hatchery impacts while maintaining fisheries, etc. A scenario that explores these options requires looking at scenarios at a regional or stock scale.

- Barry replied that it is challenging to toggle between the stock level analysis and the basin wide analysis. He explained that it is the Task Force’s challenge to determine how to analyze specific strategies to help the group move forward and learn from the scenario process.

Task Force members also asked the following clarifying questions:

Will the full Task Force review the modified language to the condensed scenarios at the February 2020 meeting or will there be a subgroup that works on that?

Deb replied that the Project Team has not finalized a plan yet, and the Project Team hopes to use this conversation to determine to what extent they need to refine the scenarios.

Should Task Force members provide specific language edits today or in the future?

Deb noted that the Project Team would accept edits today or after the meeting. Barry explained that the Project Team if focused on collecting input from the Task Force to determine where it is necessary to refine language or intent.

Are these four scenarios the final scenarios? Are Task Force members supposed to choose one scenario?

Patty responded that the goal of this conversation is to get consensus on a set of scenarios and that Task Force members are welcome to propose alternative scenarios if they do not approve of the current list. Barry added that every Task Force member should see their interests represented in at least one of the scenarios. The scenarios represent a range of options. Agreeing to move forward with the analysis of the scenario does not mean that you are choosing to implement the scenarios. The Project Team will analyze four scenarios and flesh out the implications of each one.

In Scenario Three, what does “population scale removals to reduce predator impacts” mean?

Ray replied that strategy was focused on in-basin predation, not predators in the high seas. Patty suggested that the strategy read “large scale removals,” not “population scale removals.”

In Scenario Three, why is there a disclaimer that you have to do habitat restoration above the Hells Canyon Complex (HCC) before reintroduction?

Patty answered that it is her understanding that the habitat in Hells Canyon needs to be restored before it can support fish. Since these scenarios are focused on the first 25 years, it makes sense to say they would focus on habitat restoration in Hells Canyon.

How will the Project Team do the SCE&E analysis for the scenarios?

Katherine replied that the analysis would include descriptions of the SCE&E impacts that would result from each of the strategies in the scenarios. These would help qualitatively describe the considerations with more specificity, and there would be no dollar amounts associated with any of them. Task Force members are welcome to provide guidance on how to qualitatively describe the impacts.

Barry thanked Task Force members for their ideas and comments. He noted that he did not hear opposition to the four scenarios, but rather concerns about the specific language within them. He mentioned that he heard Task Force members say that the climate change scenario should be incorporated into the other three scenarios. If the Project Team tweaked the first three scenarios, they could do a basic level of analysis for each stock using the slider, heat map, and professional judgement on what it would take to implement these efforts for each stock. This analysis would allow the Project Team to gain a general understanding of the magnitude of the benefit or impact of each strategy. The output of this analysis could be used for subregional groups to develop strategies

or to implement scenarios more locally. These groups would likely happen after Phase 2 is complete. Additionally, Barry noted that the Task Force has the opportunity to provide basin-wide objectives that subregional groups could implement. These objectives could be articulated in a narrative, quantitative, or time-limited form (e.g., which stocks need to reach which goal by which year). He asked Task Force members to consider if developing objectives would be a useful pursuit.

Task Force members provided the following comments, ideas, and suggestions.

- It might be useful for the Task Force to have regional technical groups that can create scenarios for a set of pilot stocks in each region. The Task Force could provide guidance and sideboards to the groups, and they could propose biological strategies and flesh out SCE&E considerations for each pilot stock. These regional groups could happen after Phase 2 is over.
 - Barry replied that the pilot approach could be useful, but it would be hard to include species interactions and to identify strategies that are useful across stocks. He added that the regional groups could help to do the analysis of running each stock in their area through the three scenarios. He noted that one of the reasons that it is so important to have a basin-wide approach is so that people know the implications of their actions on other parts of the basin.
- It is challenging to narrow the options and to try to fit all of the possible strategies into just three scenarios.
- What does this analysis look like? What is the output? It is important to remember that there is only a small amount of time left in Phase 2 and that the group may need to prioritize the analysis.
 - One Task Force member commented that even if there is limited time, it is important that the group does not lose sight of the SCE&E analysis.
 - Barry answered that it would be a cursory analysis that would mainly be based on the slider and heat map. It is challenging to determine how to do a similar coarse scale analysis for the SCE&E considerations.
- Rather than running each stock through the scenario, it may be easier to provide a menu of options for each scenario and then people can pick the strategy that makes the most sense for a certain stock.
- One Task Force member commented that the reason that the group is having trouble with scenario development is that this attempt is the first effort to do a basin-wide analysis of biological strategies and SCE&E considerations.
- One useful way to think about the best way forward is to consider the gaps, both technical and governance-related in the basin. Once the group identifies those gaps, it will be easier to create scenarios and/or a governance model that complements the work that is already underway.

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

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

Deb thanked Task Force members for their comments and shared a few reflections. She asked the group if they would be comfortable if the Project Team turned the four scenarios into three scenarios, tweaked the language based on Task Force member feedback, and then analyzed them. If they are not comfortable with this approach, she asked what it would take for the scenarios to be representative enough. She mentioned that people seem more aligned around the ideas of benchmarks and timeframes than some other components of scenarios. She asked the group to reflect about how they would like to move forward with scenario development and to come back with suggestions on Day 2. She also asked them to think about which tasks need to be done before Phase 2 ends and which can be done after Phase 2.

Barry added that the Project Team has heard Task Force members' feedback about changing the language in the scenarios and A La Carte Matrix so that it provides more context and is more carefully worded. He also noted that it is important to acknowledge that inaccessible habitat exists throughout the basin (not just in the Upper Columbia River and Upper Snake River) and that other dams are being considered for removal besides the Lower Snake River dams.

Deb asked Task Force members to reflect on alternative solutions if the scenario approach is not working well for them. She thanked them for their hard work on Day 1.

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

DAY 2 – December 4, 2019

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 reviewed the agenda, which included a presentation about updates to the slider analysis tool, reflections on the scenario discussion from Day 1, an opportunity for public input, synthesis of all of the topics that the Task Force has discussed during the meeting, and a discussion about next steps.

2. Technical Team Updates and Use of the Slider

Ray Beamesderfer, NOAA Fisheries

Ray Beamesderfer, NOAA Fisheries, thanked the group and noted that the Project Team views the biological analysis as an important supporting element of the scenario process, but not necessarily as the core element. Ray explained that he would be talking about the products of the biological analysis and the progress that the Project Team has made on those products thus far.

Gap Analysis

The Task Force identified the gap between the current abundance and abundance goals in Phase 1.

Factor Analysis

The factor analysis quantifies the effects of all potentially manageable factors. This information will help the Task Force think about the relative size of the impacts and accordingly consider the best strategies and actions to achieve the goals. The Project Team has worked with regional experts throughout the basin to quantify the factors. The heat map, which is a document in the meeting packet, displays the relative impact of each limiting factor.

Salmon Slider

The salmon slider tool helps to explore the implications of different changes to limiting factors on each stock. It uses a common currency of adult abundance to compare the impacts of different limiting factors.

General Analysis

The Project Team plans to conduct a general, sensitivity analysis to draw broad conclusions about how changes to limiting factors across the basin affect abundance. After the analysis is complete, the Project Team will document the results and share it with the group. This step will also help the Task Force to develop some general conclusions that it can provide to the region about the best path forward for salmon and steelhead restoration (e.g., no one solution will achieve the goals – all possible strategies must be employed in combination).

Scenario Analysis

One potential Phase 2 technical product is a scenario analysis that uses the slider to quantitatively evaluate the scenarios. It would be necessary to use expert judgement to determine how far to move each slider bar based on a suite of strategies or actions that are documented in each scenario. The

Task Force should decide if they would like to move forward with using the slider for this type of analysis.

Documentation

The final product is documentation of the slider model and the general analysis for each limiting factor. These documents provide a summary of what the Project Team knows about each limiting factor and the sources of that information.

Progress to Date

The gap analysis, salmon slider, literature review of the impacts, documentation of the impacts, and technical workshops have all been completed. Ray mentioned that the Project Team vetted the salmon slider in workshops throughout the region and people understand what the slider can and cannot do. The draft documentation will be distributed soon for Technical Team feedback. Technical Team members should provide any additional feedback before Christmas. Regarding the general sensitivity analysis, the Project Team will conduct the analysis and present it at the February 2020 Task Force meeting. Finally, regarding the scenario analysis, it is an open question as to if or how Task Force members would like to pursue it.

Heat Map

Ray also provided additional context about the heat map document. The heat map contains quantitative estimates of the impacts on each stock for the following categories: habitat, estuary, mainstem, latent, blocked areas, predation, fishery, and hatchery. The impacts are color coded based on their relative size. The document provides a snapshot of the largest limiting factors for different stocks and in different regions.

Task Force members provided the following comments and questions.

It is concerning that hydrosystem impacts are split into so many different categories – latent mortality, mainstem, and blocked areas.

A Task Force member noted that if the hydro impacts were more accurately represented, it would show up as a bigger impact on the heat map. The Project Team should not make an overarching statement about habitat as the biggest limiting factor.

Ray replied that there are a lot of different ways to categorize impacts. The Project Team chose to categorize them as they did to be explicit about the assumptions they are making for each one.

There is a danger in making the slider accessible to people who will draw the conclusions that they see fit from the model. They may draw conclusions that are not appropriate given the limitations of the data.

Ray noted that the model documentation explicitly explains the assumptions and limitations. It also includes supporting information about the derivation of the model and how it relates to life cycle approaches. Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries, added that the Slider FAQ documentation articulates the purpose and limitations of the model. The Project Team plans to include this information as a cover sheet to be transparent about the limitations in the final product.

The slider looks at the current and past impacts, but the Task Force should be looking at what we can do in the future regardless of the historic or current impacts to change the trajectory.

It is important to remember that something that has a low impact in the heat map could make a big difference when done in combination with other things.

There is an asterisk on the heat map that indicates that the map includes draft values. Are the numbers close to being finalized?

Ray noted that some numbers are closer to final than others (e.g., fishery impacts are close to final). As ballpark representations, they are very close to final.

Are there other existing models that could validate the slider and heat map? Will there be outside peer review?

Ray replied that there are life cycle models and factor-specific models that would support a finer scale analysis. The Project Team is currently calibrating the inputs into the slider based on these other models and all available information. If Task Force members would like to use the slider for more detailed, action-specific purposes, it should be supported with finer scale modeling. Regarding peer review, the Technical Team is providing feedback on the documentation and all inputs to the slider. The same documentation has also been sent to the NOAA Science Center for their review and comment. There is no formal referee journal review.

Which impact category contains elevated river temperatures?

Ray answered that the elevated river temperatures as they affect adult and juvenile migration through the mainstem would fall in the mainstem category. Elevated temperatures as they affect rearing conditions in freshwater spawning and rearing areas would fall into the habitat impact. Future changes in temperature relative to the current situation would fall into the climate change slider bar.

One Task Force member noted that it is important to be explicit about what falls into each category so that the model can be used more effectively in the future.

If habitat has such a large impact in Idaho, why aren't there more hatchery fish there?

Ray explained that the Idaho stocks have a low smolt adult survival rate outside of the basin. Even though this rate is low, increasing the habitat would increase the number of fish. The coarse analysis demonstrates that a combination of habitat effects and out of basin effects compound in Idaho.

Does the slider take into account the synergies among the different factors?

Ray noted that the slider treats the factors independently. If someone intends to use the slider in a more applied way, it is important for them to think about the context for each factor and the interactions between them.

It is concerning that the Project Team is relying on Jim Chandler's work for the Snake River numbers because he did not recognize that there were already blockages in the basin at the time that the Hells Canyon Complex was constructed.

Ray replied that the Project Team looked at the best available information that they could find, including recovery plans, Chandler's work, and more. The Project Team is looking to Task Force members to provide additional sources of information, and they are currently reviewing the Snake River sources that were provided.

One Task Force member noted that he is interested in using the slider as an adaptive tool that can continue to be adjusted as people provide additional sources of information.

Deb thanked Task Force members for their comments and questions. She noted that it has been a tremendous amount of work to conduct the technical biological analysis, and she asked Task Force members to contemplate if the slider is currently good enough for its uses in the CBP process. She encouraged Task Force members to talk with their technical staff to ensure that they think the analysis is credible enough for its purposes in this process.

3. Synthesis and Reflections on Day 1 Discussion

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

Deb Nudelman, K&W, highlighted that the discussion will focus on how to make the Phase 2 work products useful and move the region towards achieving the aspirational goals. The group will discuss the following three topics:

- 1) What does it mean to refine the scenarios so that they are good enough for the purpose of Phase 2? The scenario conversations have already been useful for the group in helping them to have complex conversations about controversial topics. Deb proposed the idea of using the language from the A La Carte Menu in the scenario document since many Task Force members were more comfortable with that language.
- 2) When is the slider good enough from a technical standpoint to move forward?
- 3) Are there any salient points that the Task Force can agree on to put forth as basin-wide recommendations?

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, added that the Project Team intends to make the adjustments to the language in the A La Carte Menu and the scenarios that Task Force members requested yesterday. He asked group members if they are in agreement on editing the language and moving forward with analysis of these scenarios. He added that the slider was only developed to be a potential tool to help the group understand the current state of salmon and steelhead in the basin and think about potential solutions. It should not be used beyond the Task Force, and the Project Team does not aim to publish it.

Regarding scenario analysis, Barry noted that the Project Team originally had the vision of doing a coarse scale analysis of the scenarios using the slider, but he recognizes that Task Force members want to do an evaluation at a subregional level to better understand the landscape. Barry highlighted that it is complicated and time consuming to do a regional stock-specific analysis, and he asked the group if it would be possible to conduct a subregional analysis in a narrative form to demonstrate what scenarios would mean for each stock. It is important to think about what is achievable in the time remaining in Phase 2.

Task Force member provided the following comments, suggestions, and questions.

Scenarios

- Many Task Force members recognized the Project Team's hard work and effort in creating the scenarios.
- It is challenging to support a particular scenario because Task Force members agree with different components of each scenario. Could the group use the A La Carte Menu as a work product instead of creating scenarios?
 - Barry replied that it is not the intention that Task Force members select a scenario but rather approve a range of scenarios for analysis.
- One Task Force member suggested an iterative process. The Task Force would begin with the slider to provide a coarse scale analysis, and they would also create a coarse SCE&E analysis. Based on this process, Task Force members could pursue finer-level analyses at stock or ESU scales based on what makes the most sense for each locality. This finer focus should also include the impacts on people in each ESU or watershed. The future governance group could provide the linkage between the groups that do the finer resolution analysis and basin-wide strategies and funding. This iterative process could begin during Phase 2, but it would not be complete before Phase 2 is over.

- Barry responded that the Project Team could do a general analysis of the three scenarios and regional technical members could meet to determine how much each slider bar can move for each region. They could also provide input on the SCE&E considerations.
- Another Task Force member agreed with the iterative process and proposed a pilot stock approach as a trial.
- It is important for Task Force members to go back to their organizations and agencies and think about if the products are sufficient for the purpose of Phase 2.
- Having three potential scenario options with biological and SCE&E analysis in addition to an outline of a governance model that a diverse group of stakeholders have agreed on would be a very powerful outcome for the Phase 2. There are other people who should be in charge of the implementation of strategies and actions, and it is not the Task Force's role to think about implementation details.
- Climate change should be incorporated into all of the scenarios, not just one of them.
- The scenarios provide useful bookends. Scenario One is critical because it demonstrates what will happen if the current path continues. Scenario Three demonstrates what the region could look like if people dedicate significantly more effort to all of the H's.
- It is important for the group to prioritize strategies because there will be finite resources to implement them.
- Several Task Force members reiterated that there is no spatial component to the scenarios and that it would be useful to consider scenarios at more local levels. One person mentioned that implementing different scenarios in different places could serve as a large experiment in the basin. In one location, you could do an intense all-H approach for three generations of fish, and in another area, you could continue with the incremental approach. Several Task Force members agreed that studying how the fish respond to these changes would provide critically valuable information.
 - Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries, mentioned that the scenario table has a placeholder for innovation and experimental management, and that spot would be a great place to include ideas like the one suggested above.
- One Task Force member disagreed with the concept that the scenarios that are more likely to reach the goals quickly will be able to do so based on a greater level of effort. Achieving the goals will depend on choosing strategies that have the most potential.
- Scenarios should include some time component so that decision makers and others will understand how quickly these strategies and actions will help the region reach the high goals.
- Many Task Force members expressed concern that the scenarios are too general and that they will not provide any useful takeaways as a result. Task Force members would like to see more specificity in the strategies.
- It is crucial to add temporal components to the scenarios because time is of the essence.
- It is important that the group has clear messaging around the goals and intended uses of scenarios.
- Regarding the SCE&E analysis, one Task Force member noted that using the analysis to discuss tradeoffs may lend itself to prioritizing one strategy over another.
 - Barry replied that the SCE&E analysis will include the benefits as well as the impacts.
- The treaty tribes may offer an additional scenario that better reflects their vision and interests.
- One Task Force member expressed concern that the A La Carte Menu proposes starting reintroduction in blocked areas with resident fish substitution rather than anadromous fish. The ceremonial fisheries are of key importance to the tribes.

The Slider

- The slider demonstrates that the region is currently not devoting enough effort to improving salmon and steelhead habitat.

- Task Force members reiterated the concern that the hydrosystem impacts are broken up into several slider bars.
- One Task Force member suggested that decision-makers could potentially use the slider and heat map in the future to support funding decisions.
- The slider has helped the group elucidate that there is no silver bullet. It has also demonstrated that certain combinations of strategies among limiting factors can make a big difference.
- Several Task Force members expressed concern about the slider being used outside of the CBP process.

Governance

- It is crucial to develop a governance model that addresses the gaps in the basin before Phase 2 ends. Addressing this topic will allow the Task Force to continue to be bold and innovative. The governance gaps should be articulated in the Phase 2 Report.
- There are already a lot of governance processes in the basin, so it is critical that the future governance group fills a gap and does not duplicate other work.
- In order to not overlap with other processes in the basin, the future governance group could serve as an entity that creates and promotes a common basin-wide vision. Members of this group could share this vision in their own forums.
- It is important that the future governance group utilize different levels/scales of governance so that both basin-wide and regional groups can coordinate among themselves and with each other. Federal agencies, sovereign tribes, and other stakeholders should be involved.
- It is crucial that the future governance structure respect the treaty tribes' current harvest rates and status as co-managers.
- The future governance group could serve as an adaptation team that changes management recommendations based on events that take place in the future that we cannot predict.
- The future governance group should be a durable institution that is capable of being an advocate, collecting funding, and conducting adaptive management.

Miscellaneous

- One Task Force member noted that it is crucial to have the federal action agencies at the table to make sure that they are on board with the strategies that the Task Force is proposing.
- One Task Force member brought up several topics that the group has not yet addressed. These include clipping all hatchery fish, addressing heavy impact fisheries, focusing on the ocean and estuary improvements, and enforcing the laws that are already on the books (e.g., thermal pollution laws).
- Several Task Force members mentioned that building on small successes will be an important part of any implementation strategy. There may be things that the Task Force can agree on now that could have a big impact (e.g., addressing predation).
- Given that there are other concurrent processes underway in the basin, it is important to think about how the Task Force can be a space where group members work together and are cognizant of each other's needs and interests.
- People believe that they will have to make sacrifices so that salmon and steelhead recovery can move forward in the basin. So long as they believe that, they will stymie progress. Therefore, it is crucial to start having a social and political discussion about these topics.
- One Task Force member proposed the idea of extending Phase 2 beyond June and asked other Task Force members to comment on this possibility. Several other Task Force members agreed and expressed significant concern about completing the necessary analysis and work products before June 2020.

- The Task Force is helping to create a template to approach salmon and steelhead recovery that is consistent, comprehensive, and durable. As part of this template, it is important to look at all costs and benefits, including the cost of doing nothing.
- It is important that the governance group consider equity in cost so that some groups do not have an unfair burden.

Barry thanked Task Force members for their comments and he recognized that many of them want to continue beyond June 2020. He noted that he would talk about NOAA Fisheries' constraints in doing so in the afternoon.

4. Public Input

Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Deb asked audience members if anyone would like to share public comments. Bob Lessard of CRITFC shared the following thoughts. He explained that he has a long history of creating complex models, and he is impressed with the work that the Project Team has completed. He explained that he has faith in the technical approach, and he wanted to share his reasoning for having faith with the Task Force. An ideal model has precision, accuracy, and utility, but in most cases, it is only possible for a model to have two of those three characteristics. The slider model is precise, but it comes at the expense of accuracy. It is also quite useful and robust. The model helps explore different pathways forward, and it can serve as an objective measure of progress in the future. It will also be important to consider the timescale as the group moves forward with different strategies. Additionally, the slider does not tell the user how they can achieve changes in limiting factors. Bob also offered a few changes to the model as well as comments on specific limiting factors:

- A distinction or separation of stocks in the Snake River (e.g., the Middle Fork should be separate)
- There is no difference between the effect of degraded habitat and the effect of blocked areas in the model. That science behind this is not clear.
- Hydropower is broken up into multiple slider bars (mainstem and latent mortality), and it needs to be clear that changes to the hydrosystem affect both of those.

Bob concluded by adding that he is excited that the Task Force has reached this point and that he is confident that the slider will help the group remain objective and measure progress as they start working on scenarios.

Task Force members provided the following reflections, comments, and questions based on Bob's input.

- One Task Force member cautioned against breaking out the Middle Fork area because it is not in pristine condition.
- One Task Force member asked why the blocked habitat is separate from the currently accessible habitat in the slider.
 - Barry responded that it is useful to break out the currently inaccessible habitat because it demonstrates how much potential there is in certain places for specific stocks.
- One Task Force member asked if the heat map could be displayed such that the factors are rows and the stocks are columns.
 - Ray answered that it would be possible. There are many different ways of presenting the data.

5. Synthesis and Reflections Continued

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, and Task Force members

Barry Thom, NOAA Fisheries, shared additional information about the potential to extend the Task Force's timeline. He noted that MAFAC has given the group permission to go beyond June of 2020, but the decision to extend the process depends more on funding, scope of work, and the ability for NOAA Fisheries to continue. Regardless of the need to find additional funds, the contract vehicle for funding the facilitation cannot renew after June 2020. If the group needs additional time to complete the scope of work that was agreed upon in Phase 2, another entity would have to come forward with a new funding mechanism. If the reason to continue Phase 2 is to do more work on implementation, it is beyond the scope of NOAA Fisheries. Federal action agencies would need to be at the table to make implementation decisions.

One Task Force member clarified that he asked for an extension to complete the current scope, not to expand the scope. Another Task Force member proposed having more time in between meetings so that the resource expenditure would stay the same.

A group member expressed concern about completing the Upper Snake River quantitative goals for the blocked areas by February 2020, and he indicated that it would be helpful to have more time. Another Task Force member reminded the group that the Task Force agreed to develop the Upper Snake River blocked area goals in Phase 2 and that the current timeline is achievable. Both Task Force members agreed to work as quickly as possible to develop the goals.

Deb noted another document in the meeting packet called High Level Ideas, which is a rough draft of an attempt to model ideas that the Task Force can agree on that could become basin-wide recommendations that would help people move forward collectively. One Task Force member commented that no group this diverse has ever agreed upon statements like these before, and it would be a powerful part of the report. Deb added that having discussions about ideas that a group can agree on is a useful approach. Having the conversations in and of itself helps to create glue and alignment.

6. Next Steps and Wrap Up

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

Deb Nudelman, K&W, reviewed a list of topics that the Project Team and Task Force members need to work on between December 2019 and June 2020. She mentioned that there will be another Task Force meeting in February 2020 in Boise. The topics, action items, and relevant discussion points are below.

Slider and Regional Meetings

- Wrap up the core of the slider exercise: finalize estimates of impacts and complete the generalized sensitivity analysis.
- Consider the following questions: What happens when we consider different strategies throughout the basin? What forward-looking synergies occur?
- Finalize heat maps, any other representations, and related documentation.
- January: Regional groups finalize the detailed information that Ray and Pat have collected. Task Force members and Technical Team members can join these meetings.
- Finalize slider documentation.

- Update and further refine the slider FAQ document.

Task Force members shared the following thoughts about the slider:

- Several Task Force members commented that the slider should have a temporal component.
- Barry noted that the original intent of the slider was to help the Task Force consider different options and the fact that it does not have a temporal component is okay for the purposes of this analysis. Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries, added that that scenarios will have time components built into them.

Scenarios and A La Carte Menu

- Refine language and columns in the A La Carte Menu
 - Action: Task Force to submit additions, comments, and edits to A La Carte Menu by December 20, 2019.
- Use the language from strategies in the A La Carte Menu to fill in 3 scenarios.
- Submit additional scenarios within a couple of weeks (treaty tribes)

Task Force members shared the following thoughts about the A La Carte Menu:

- The first three columns include a lot of strategies that are already underway, so there are not many options to choose from in terms of making improvements. It is unclear what the A La Carte Menu adds beyond the fourth column.
 - Deb noted that Task Force members should propose alternate strategies and solutions and the Project Team would be happy to incorporate them.

Scenarios and Regional Meetings

- Conduct regional meetings in January throughout the basin with the following goals:
 - Wrap up the inputs to the slider and reach alignment
 - Flesh out three scenarios with revised A La Carte Menu language using one pilot stock from each region
 - Begin fleshing out the SCE&E considerations specific to that stock. Ensure that they describe the benefits as well as the costs.

Integration Team/ SCE&E Development

- Review and add to initial input from regional work groups on SCE&E considerations (benefits and costs)
- Opportunity to provide high level guidance on regional meeting outputs
- Schedule meeting to discuss above topics in early February

Path Forward/Governance Group

- Best option from doodle polls is Tuesday, December 10 from 1pm to 3pm PT. However, this date does not work for enough Path Forward/Governance Group members
- Project Team to keep looking for a date to meet in December
- Schedule half day conference calls in January, February, March, April, and May

Phase 2 Report Framework Document

- Articulate pre-June and post-June components of work
- Katherine and Project Team to outline the framework document

High Level Ideas

- Looking for Task Force members’ high-level ideas that they can agree on. These could be included in the report
- Invite students or other young people to share their perspectives on the topic and the work of the group
- Continue to develop high-level ideas that can be added to a document for consideration at the February meeting

Status of Final Quantitative Goals

- Need to finalize quantitative goals
- Ray to clean up goals based on input
- Ongoing discussion about blocked areas in the Snake River – report out at February meeting

February Meeting Topics

- Report out on slider outcomes
- Status of scenarios, including SCE&E components
- Framework document for Phase 2 Report
- Path Forward/Governance group report out on progress
- Report out on Snake River blocked areas discussion
- Discuss and refine high level ideas, striving for alignment

Deb thanked the group for discussing all of the next steps and action items and for sharing their hopes and expectations. She noted that the group has made huge leaps forward at this meeting.

One Task Force member requested that the maps that NOAA Fisheries provide to Task Force members should include Nevada, given that some of the tribes are in that area. Another Task Force member asked if the group could have a student attend the next meeting to share thoughts from the younger generations about salmon and steelhead restoration. Katherine noted that she would work with both Task Force members on those requests.

Barry thanked Task Force members for their participation and effort. He reiterated how complex the issue is and expressed his appreciation for Task Force members’ willingness to have tough conversations.

The meeting was adjourned around 3:30pm.

Upcoming Meeting Dates	Location
February 25 and 26, 2020	Boise, ID
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

Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee (MAFAC)
 Columbia Basin Partnership (CBP) Task Force
 December 3 and 4, 2019
Appendix A

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
MAFAC CBP Task Force Members		
Jennifer	Anders	State of Montana
Paul	Arrington	Idaho Water Coalition
David	Doeringsfeld	Port of Lewiston
Tom	Dresser	Grant County Public Utility District
Urban	Eberhart	Kittitas Reclamation District
Mike	Edmondson	Idaho Governor's Office
Ben	Enticknap	Oceana
Steve	Fick	Fishhawk Fisheries
Randy	Friedlander	Colville Tribes
Jess	Groves*	Port of Cascade Locks
Brent	Hall	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
Marla	Harrison	Port of Portland
Scott	Hauser	Upper Snake River Tribes (USRT)
Justin	Hayes	Idaho Conservation League
Heath	Heikkila	Coastal Conservation Association (CCA)
Joel	Kawahara	Coastal Trollers Association
B.J.	Kieffer	Spokane Tribe
Joe	Lukas	Western Montana G&T
Steve	Manlow	Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board
Rob	Masonis	Trout Unlimited
Jim	McKenna	State of Oregon
Guy	Norman	State of Washington
Patty	O'Toole	Northwest Power and Conservation Council
Zachary	Penney	Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC)
Kevin	Scribner	Salmon Safe
Glen	Spain	Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations
Paul	Ward	Yakama Nation
Jim	Yost	State of Idaho
* = remote participant		