

MEETING SUMMARY

MAFAC CBP Task Force Meeting

Conference Call/Webinar: November 15, 2018; 1:00 – 4:00 pm PT

Makeup Conference Call/Webinar: November 16, 2018; 10:00 am – 12:00 pm PT

OVERVIEW

The Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee (MAFAC) Columbia Basin Partnership (CBP) Task Force met by conference call and webinar on November 15, 2018. A make-up webinar was offered and held on November 16, 2018. 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 24 CBP Task Force members (see last page of document 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:

- Review Updates to Quantitative goals and methodology
- Review CBP Task Force Recommendations Report
- Next Steps with MAFAC
- Plan for January MAFAC CBP Task Force Meeting
- Report Release: Discuss ideas for how to roll out the report
- Council Amendment Process
- Next Steps and Summary

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

MEETING AND DISCUSSION SUMMARY

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

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

Barry Thom thanked members for their participation and for their hard work at the October MAFAC CBP Task Force Meeting. He noted that based on those efforts and follow-up work, the team has progressed on numerous fronts, including quantitative goals, methodology description, and the draft CBP Task Force Recommendations Report.

Deb Nudelman reviewed the meeting agenda and materials and reviewed webinar meeting protocols. She noted that the major topics for the day include an update to the quantitative goals and methodology, as well as review of the recommendations report. During the discussion on these topics the intent is to address questions, issues, and concerns for those topics, and then do a once around the virtual table to confirm CBP Task Force support with moving these recommendations forward to MAFAC.

Other topics include review of next steps with MAFAC, planning for the January MAFAC CBP Task Force Meeting, discussion of ideas for how to roll out the CBP Task Force Recommendations Report, and review of the Council Amendment Process.

The meeting also includes an opportunity for public input.

2. Review Updates to Quantitative goals and methodology

Ray Beamesderfer, NOAA Fisheries

Ray Beamesderfer introduced the topic, and directed members to meeting materials that include *Quantitative Goals Worksheets* (3-page stock-by-stock worksheets), methodology description in Chapter 10 of the *Draft CBP Task Force Recommendations Report*, and the *Quantitative Goals Status Summary* that provides a checklist of completion for the stock summaries. At today’s meeting, the project team would like to check in on whether the quantitative goals are adequate to take into the next phase of the CBP process. The goals are not intended to be “final” at this point; in the next phase, the intent is to more fully understand the implications of the goals.

Six main issues were addressed based on feedback from the October Task Force Meeting:

1. *Transparency in documentation* – A number of Task Force members requested additional information on the details for specific numbers identified for each stock. One-page summaries were added for each stock describing the basis for natural production numbers (including current, historical, and low/med/high goals). More detailed documentation can also be found in the stock spreadsheets. We are working to formalize the methods and references for every number in a documentation database that will be available in the final product.
2. *Fishery & Hatchery “goal” characterization* – At the October CBP Task Force meeting, there was a discussion of whether what we had been calling were goals were truly goals or something like expectations or alternatives. To address this concern, future hatchery production

numbers were characterized throughout as “anticipated production.” This distinguishes these numbers from the long-term intent identified in the qualitative goals to reduce reliance on hatchery production. Future fishery numbers (expressed in terms of harvest rates) were characterized as “potential harvest and fishery opportunity.” Whether or not these are actual goals and how they relate to natural production goals will be considered in the next phase of the project.”

3. *Upper Columbia River Goals* – There were a number of lingering questions in natural production goals for healthy stocks in currently-accessible areas and blocked areas above Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee Dam. The Upper Columbia River Technical Team met to resolve these questions. For healthy stocks, goals were standardized as viable at the low range, current optimum for mid-range, and a reasonable potential for high range. We also recognized and documented that the viable low range number was not intended to be a low bar to be managed down to for these healthy stocks. For the blocked areas, numbers were identified to address the upper Columbia River tribes’ goal of restoring meaningful anadromous fishery opportunities in the area upstream from Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee Dams. Numbers are referenced to historical production but are much less than was historically present. The goals do not attempt to apportion numbers into specific populations and make no assumptions regarding Canadian production. Language was added to Chapter 10 in the CBP document with further explanation for these goals (pg. 59).
4. *Snake River Goals* – The Snake River Partners had a series of discussions on how to address historically accessible but now blocked areas upstream from Hells Canyon. This group ultimately decided to address this area with an explanation in the CBP report (p. 58-59) recognizing a desire for restoration by some parties and anticipating further discussion about potential goals among state and tribal co-managers in the future. The group did not identify specific numerical goals for the area above Hells Canyon. The Snake River worksheets therefore are focused on the currently-accessible areas. There has also been a discussion of the high-end goals for Spring Chinook and Steelhead within the accessible area relative to ecological goals identified by the Nez Perce Tribe. The Nez Perce Tribe ecological goals were acknowledged in the goal worksheets in a column as a point of reference under historical numbers and explanatory language was added to recognize that provisional goals identified by the CBP do not diminish the long-term desire and intent of some Fish and Wildlife managers to achieve higher levels of abundance.
5. *Consistency with Recovery Plans* – The team received a number of questions about how this process and these quantitative goals relate to ESA recovery plans (i.e., are they consistent, do they conflict, do they supersede?). The CBP is by design intended to be consistent with the recovery plans. The low range natural production goals are the recovery goals. These goals are stepping stones on the way to achieving higher levels that the partnership has identified as the ultimate aspiration. Many recovery plans discuss or identify broad sense recovery goals – these are incorporated into the quantitative goals where available. Language is included in the CBP report in Chapter 10 explaining the distinction between recovery and broad sense goals. Further, the recovery plans identify limiting factors and measures designed to achieve goals.
6. *Level of completion* – The team is seeking CBP Task Force concurrence that these provisional quantitative goals are ready to take to the next phase of this process. The meeting materials today include a detailed description of the status of the quantitative goals (*Quantitative Goals*

Status Summary). The provisional natural production goals are complete (low, medium, and high goals) for every population. Current and anticipated hatchery production is also documented for all stocks. Where there is information, adult return goals and actual adult returns are identified; but that information does not exist for all stocks. Fishery potentials are identified as harvest rates for natural-origin fish. Harvest rates for hatchery fish and total harvests are documented where available but these numbers are not currently available in every case. (Additional work is required to make the calculations.) Average run sizes are identified by species and run type to specific regions and to the Columbia River mouth. Stock-specific numbers to the Columbia River mouth are identified where available but only approximate numbers are available for some stocks.

Group Discussion: November 15 Webinar

Deb asked for questions, feedback, and concerns.

Overall, participants said that they appreciate the hard work that went into developing the Quantitative Goals and Methodology, and that the product responds to the comments brought up at the October CBP Task Force Meeting. Several members provided their support for the quantitative goals as sufficient to move into Phase 2.

The following clarifying questions were asked:

- Question about how the historical abundance figure of 671,000 Chinook was developed.
- Question about the origin of the “key limiting factors” list that accompanies some stocks; they do not seem complete and there seems to be more of an all-H issue for some of the stocks.
- Question about the relationship between the Snake River 21,000 steelhead low end goal and the ESA recovery goal.

Group Discussion: November 16 Webinar

Deb asked for questions, feedback, and concerns.

Overall, participants said that they appreciate the hard work and collaboration of experts. Some participants noted their appreciation for the word change “hatchery goals” to “current and anticipated hatchery production.”

The following additional comments were added:

- A comment that the tribes are feeling more comfortable moving into the next phase because there has been discussion to develop satisfactory numbers for Upper Columbia River and Snake River. The Yakima Nation has provided a letter expressing their support, with a few caveats.
- A comment that not all stocks can be protected at the same level with mixed-stock fisheries. Toning down expectations and removing the word “goals” from fisheries is more realistic and acceptable.
- A comment of support for the changes made for harvest, fisheries expectations, and hatcheries.

3. Review CBP Task Force Recommendations Report

Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries and Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Katherine Cheney introduced Version 2 of the CBP Task Force Recommendations Report and related materials. She thanked the Drafting Team for their hard work in helping to produce Version 2.

Version 2 consists of two main pieces: (1) context for the goals and Task Force process; and (2) the Task Force products including qualitative goals, quantitative goals methodology (Ch. 10) and the 2-page goal summary sheets (currently in a separate document). The context portion of Version 2 has been reworked and reorganized to better reflect the work of the Task Force and provide better cohesion. For transparency, there are several documents that help show how CBP Task Force member comments were integrated and turned into Version 2. This includes a crosswalk to understand how content from Version 1 was incorporated into Version 2; a table that tracks incoming comments and edits; and a Word version of Version 1 of the report with all comments in comment bubbles, as well as who they are attributed to.

She noted that the *Quantitative Goals Worksheets* will be incorporated into the final version of the report.

A first draft on an executive summary has also been developed.

Katherine then provided a section-by-section review of Version 2, including:

- Section 2 “Context around Shared Goals for Columbia Basin Salmon” includes much of what was in the Version 1 Introduction, History and Current Landscape piece. Version 2 also includes two new important pieces: 1) the intended use of the long-term goals, and 2) narrative around the sense of urgency.
- Section 3 “Building a Regional Partnership” highlights the formation and process to establish the Task Force. It explains the rationale in taking an interest-based collaborative approach, and highlights members’ hopes and expectations.
- Section 4 “The First People of the Columbia Basin: A Tribal Perspective on Developing Shared Goals” was drafted by Zach, BJ, Randy and Bob, and we thank them for the contribution.
- Section 5 “Creating a Common Foundation” reviews the Task Force process and importance of members’ getting to know each other, understanding the Hs, and understanding the value and many uses of the river. It also includes the economic values of the salmon fisheries, both commercial and recreational. The project team is working with a graphic artist to see if we can convey this information in an infographic. There is also a description of indirect economic benefit of salmon, and description of the relationship of the partnership process to Southern Resident Killer Whales. The section also mentions how important it was to engage in cross-sector education pieces around the Hs, the workshops we held, and the conversations we had around specific salmon management areas.
- Section 6 “Fostering a Collaborative Approach” introduces the Partnership work products, and the following sections include those work products (*Guiding Principles, Vision Statement, and Qualitative Goals*).
- Section 10 “Quantitative Goals” reviews the quantitative goals methodology. Areas of new language are highlighted for transparency.

- Section 11 “Continuing the Work of the CBP Task Force” discusses the continuing work of the CBP Task Force and intentionally leaves space for refinement.

Group Discussion: November 15 Webinar

Deb asked members for clarifying questions, concerns, or comments on the Recommendations Report. They provided the following questions:

- Members clarified that the aggregate quantitative goals charts in Chapter 10 reflect the same information that Ray walked through.

Group Discussion: November 16 Webinar

Deb asked members for clarifying questions, concerns, or comments on the Recommendations Report. They provided the following questions:

- Members expressed comfort with the Recommendations Report and appreciation for the hard work put into its development.
- Members expressed feeling that Version 2 is more cohesive, concise, and readable than Version 1.
- Members commented that the Recommendations Report is reflective of the Partnership’s journey.
- A member asked where the Definitions will be housed, and Katherine responded that Task Force members are split on whether to include the definitions at the front or end of the report. There will be additional discussion and ultimately the Drafting Team will decide.
- Another member expressed that three out of four tribes do have a concern around one specific piece of data (the ISAB number). There will be continued discussion to address this concern.

Next Steps for the CBP Recommendations Report

ACTION ITEM: Katherine directed members to the *Proposed Recommendations Report Workplan and Protocols for Report Review* and explained that **comments on Version 2 of the Recommendations Report are due on Wednesday, November 21**. The project team will then consolidate all comments and edits, and review those on a call with the Drafting Team and editor Barbara Taylor. The Drafting Team will then review Version 3. The plan is to share and review Version 3 with the Drafting Team, rather than the entire Task Force.

The Report would go into layout on December 15, to fix tables and figures, incorporate graphics, include member testimonials, and finalize formatting. After December 15, it will be difficult to make wholesale changes. Version 3 will be complete by mid-January, and will then go to Task Force members for review and discussion at the January 2019 CBP Task Force meeting.

Members are encouraged to provide photos to include in the report, as well as credit for the source. If any Task Force members have comments or concerns, they should notify Katherine. Katherine will work with members to address any arising issues. If the issue is significant, we will make sure there is time with the Task Force before December 15 to work through that issue. If needed, it is possible to schedule another Task Force conference call to take care of remaining issues.

Confirmation of Support

Group Discussion: November 15 Webinar

Deb asked members (1) are you in support of the Recommendations Report as you see it; (2) are you on board with the Recommendations Report moving forward, meaning that you will not block it; (3) did we address all of the issues that came up at the October Task Force meeting; and, (4) are there any new issues?

Many members expressed appreciation for the hard work, overall support for the Recommendations report, excitement for the next phase, and agreement to respond to the above questions by Wednesday, November 21.

Some members expressed that they are not ready to answer all of the above questions because they have not had a chance to thoroughly review the documents yet, and need to check with constituents.

One member asked, in regards to the Southern Resident Killer Whales (orcas), is there any conversation about river hatcheries where fish have a better chance of escaping into ocean than some of the Upper River salmon? Michael Tehan responded that there are conversations about hatchery projects to support orca populations happening in Washington and throughout the region. However, hatchery production numbers for orcas specifically are not captured in the Recommendations Report at this time.

Group Discussion: November 16 Webinar

Deb asked members (1) are you in support of the Recommendations Report as you see it; (2) are you on board with the Recommendations Report moving forward, meaning that you will not block it; (3) did we address all of the issues that came up at the October Task Force meeting; and, (4) are there any new issues?

Many members expressed overall support for the Recommendations Report and excitement for the next phase.

One member commented that Yakama Nation has written a letter of support. Umatilla Tribe, Warm Springs Tribe, and Nez Perce Tribe are writing similar letters, which will signify additional tribal support.

4. Next Steps with MAFAC

Heidi Lovett, NOAA Fisheries and Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Heidi Lovett presented next steps with MAFAC. Following the January CBP Task Force meeting, the Recommendations Report will be submitted to MAFAC. MAFAC’s meeting is tentatively scheduled for some time between late March and early April. A set of CBP Task Force Members should present the Recommendations Report at that meeting. Once MAFAC has received the report, Heidi does not envision any concerns and expects approval. The Recommendations Report will then be reviewed by Chris Oliver, Administrator of NOAA Fisheries, and the full NOAA Fisheries Leadership Team.

The project team may schedule a webinar with MAFAC prior to the March/April MAFAC meeting to walk MAFAC members through the quantitative goals in more detail.

Group Discussion: November 15 Webinar

Deb asked for questions, feedback, and concerns.

One member asked what will happen after the NOAA Fisheries Leadership Team receives the report? Heidi responded that there will be some correspondence with the Partnership to thank them for their work, and then NOAA Fisheries will officially deliver the Recommendations Report to the region. MAFAC has already approved extending the work of the Task Force for two years, and there is no reason to expect that Chris Oliver would not approve the Recommendations Report.

Another member asked if the Recommendations Report would be available to Congress, or have some further journey? Heidi responded that this topic is discussed in the next agenda item.

Group Discussion: November 16 Webinar

Deb asked for questions, feedback, and concerns.

One member asked where the April meeting will be held? Heidi responded that it will likely be held somewhere other than Portland, Oregon, and possibly will be held in Portland, Maine.

5. Plan for January MAFAC CBP Task Force Meeting

Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries and Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

The next CBP Task Force Meeting will be held at the end of January 2019, possibly January 29, 30, and/or 31 in Boise, Idaho. The meeting will include a half-day session and dinner on Day 1 and a full day session on Day 2 (9:00 am – 3:00 pm).

The main purpose of Day 1 is to conduct a final review of the Recommendations Report and move it forward to the MAFAC review process. A dinner will follow, including a celebration with the Task Force.

The main purpose of Day 2 is to discuss Phase 2 and continuing work.

A block of rooms is being held at the Riverside Hotel. The project team will get out a notice in early December to help members reserve their hotel rooms.

6. CBP Task Force Report Release

Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries

Katherine noted that some Task Force members have expressed interest in releasing the Report to a wider audience beyond MAFAC, as well as to keep the Congressional Delegation informed. Some have suggested drafting a joint op-ed, holding a joint press conference, a regional meeting, presenting to the Northwest Power and Conservation Council, and other ideas. She invited ideas on

how to further socialize the Recommendations Report. This will also be discussed at the January Task Force meeting.

Group Discussion: November 15 Webinar

Barry suggested that the celebration timing depends on what stage the group wants to celebrate: the Task Force’s submission of the Report to MAFAC or MAFAC’s final adoption of the Report.

Members suggested a number of opportunities for further socialization, including:

- Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund’s event where a contingent of states meet with their Congressional delegation to express appreciation
- Task Force members could present the Recommendations Report to the Federal Caucus, which would help to engage other federal agencies
- Presentation to the Northwest Power and Conservation Council
- Presentation to the members of the Columbia River Treaty effort, including Canadian counterparts
- Coordination with the Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership
- Discussion at the “Future Of Our Salmon” series

There will be more chance to discuss this topic and the pathways at the January meeting. There is also a possibility that the members draft language for a joint press release, and then add specific language to it.

7. Council Amendment Process

Katherine Cheney, NOAA Fisheries

Katherine noted that the Council is going through its Amendment Process and accepting comments through December 13. A number of sovereign and tribal entities are planning to submit comments. She asked if any Task Force members are planning to submit comments that include or address work of the Task Force. If so, she suggests getting together on a conference call to coordinate how we are providing those comments and to potentially coordinate messaging.

Group Discussion: November 15 Webinar

One Task force member commented that December 13 is the deadline to submit recommendations to amend the Fish and Wildlife Program. Immediately upon receiving those recommendations, the Fish and Wildlife Program makes the recommendation available for public comment until early February. The Task Force may want to consider that if it is not ready to submit the final report in December, a placeholder could be recommended for comment and review. Michael agreed that it makes sense to defer to the final report.

8. Opportunity for Public Input

Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Deb called for an opportunity for public input. No members of the public made comments at either webinar.

9. Next Steps and Summary

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

Barry provided closing remarks. He expressed appreciation for the progress made by the group as the Partnership moves towards the finish line on Phase 1 and builds momentum for Phase 2. The progress is a remarkable accomplishment.

Katherine reminded members to provide comments on Version 2 of the Recommendations Report by Wednesday, November 21.

The project team agreed to provide a summary of the webinar calls for group review and agreed to send an update on progress to the Task Force members by Saturday, December 15.

MEETING PARTICIPANTS: November 15, 2018 MAFAC CBP Task Force Webinar

MAFAC CBP Task Force Members		
First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Jennifer	Anders	State of Montana
Bob	Austin	Upper Snake River Tribes (USRT)
Bert	Bowler	Idaho Salmon Group
Urban	Eberhart	Kittitas Reclamation District
Ben	Enticknap	Oceana
Randy	Friedlander	Colville Tribes
Jess	Groves	Port of Cascade Locks
Heath	Heikkila	Coastal Conservation Association
Joel	Kawahara	Coastal Trollers Association
BJ	Kieffer	Spokane Tribe
Debrah	Marriott	Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership
Steve	Martin	Snake River Salmon Recovery Board
Rob	Masonis	Trout Unlimited
Jim	McKenna	State of Oregon
Kevin	Scribner	Salmon Safe
Norm	Semanko	Idaho Water Coalition
Glen	Spain	Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations
Jim	Yost	State of Idaho
MAFAC CBP Team Members		
First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Tony	Grover	Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NWPCC)
Tucker	Jones	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife – Fish Division
Nancy	Leonard	Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NWPCC)
Mike	Okoniewski	Pacific Seafood
MAFAC CBP Project Team		

M A F A C C B P T A S K F O R C E

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Ray	Beamesderfer	NOAA Fisheries
Katherine	Cheney	NOAA Fisheries
Pat	Frazier	NOAA Fisheries
Heidi	Lovett	NOAA Fisheries
Barbara	Taylor	NOAA Fisheries
Michael	Tehan	NOAA Fisheries
Barry	Thom	NOAA Fisheries
Sylvia	Ciborowski	Kearns & West
Deb	Nudelman	Kearns & West

MEETING PARTICIPANTS: November 16, 2018 MAFAC CBP Task Force Webinar

MAFAC CBP Task Force Members		
First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Jeff	Grizzel	Grant County Public Utility District
Liz	Hamilton	Northwest Sport Fishing Industry Association (NSIA)
Liza Jane	McAlister	6 Ranch, Inc.
Kristin	Meira	Pacific Northwest Waterways Association
Zachary	Penney	Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC)
Jim	Yost	State of Idaho
MAFAC CBP Team Members		
First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Paul	Arrington	Idaho Water Users Association
Kurt	Fesenmyer	Trout Unlimited
Paul	Kline	Idaho Department of Fish and Game
Dan	Rawding	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
MAFAC CBP Project Team		
First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Ray	Beamesderfer	NOAA Fisheries
Katherine	Cheney	NOAA Fisheries
Pat	Frazier	NOAA Fisheries
Heidi	Lovett	NOAA Fisheries
Barry	Thom	NOAA Fisheries
Sylvia	Ciborowski	Kearns & West
Deb	Nudelman	Kearns & West