

August 24, 2010

TO: Snake River Recovery Planning Coordination Group

FROM: Rick Mogren

SUBJECT: Coordination Group Meeting Notes: 8/4/10

**Introduction:**

The first meeting of the Snake River Recovery Planning Coordination Group (Coordination Group) convened at 10:00 am at the Airport Holiday Inn in Boise, Idaho on Wednesday, August 4<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

Group participants consisted of representatives from five tribes, three states, and five federal agencies. A list of participants and their contact information is provided at Attachment 1. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Northwest Region's Assistant Regional Administrator for Salmon Recovery (Rob Walton) served as convening lead.

NMFS' expectation is that the Coordination Group will serve as a forum of collaboration to inform and assist in the completion of the multi-species Snake River recovery plan. NMFS' goals for roll-up coordination and outreach are that:

- Parties are informed about progress, public review opportunities, and status of the Recovery Plan;
- Interested parties participate and provide technical review;
- A critical mass of relevant parties supports the final recovery plan and subsequent implementation; and
- NMFS will provide a process to discuss issues and guide parties as to how best to address issues and questions.

The Coordination Group's activities and process are not intended to supplant or compete with other salmon and steelhead-related regional processes now underway, such as the FCRPS BiOp, FERC relicensing, US v. Oregon, Upper Snake BiOp, and other processes and programs as may impact the recovery of Snake River salmonid species. Rather, NMFS' intent is that the Snake River recovery plan integrates, as appropriate the findings, and products of these other ongoing regional processes.

**Meeting Objectives:**

The objectives of this meeting were to:

- Provide participants with an overview of NMFS' Columbia Basin recovery planning, the roles of the states and tribes in the planning process, NMFS' expectations for the

As of August 24, 2010

SUBJECT: Coordination Group Meeting Notes: 8/4/10

Coordination Group, and the envisioned schedule for the completion of the Snake River plan.

- Solicit from each participant their goals and expectations of the Coordination Group.
- Provide participants with an overview of the status and substance of each of the three management unit (MU) plans now underway.
- Identify interdependencies and issues that will need to be addressed in order to complete the species-wide plan.
- Determine the next steps toward addressing the identified interdependencies and issues so identified.

### **Meeting Outcomes:**

*Overview of Columbia Basin recovery planning:* See NMFS briefing slides (distributed separately).

*Participant expectations:* Each participant was asked to identify their key expectations for the Snake River recovery planning roll-up process. An outline of the comments made is provided at Attachment 2. The responses consisted both of expectations and issues of concern. Issues are captured in Attachment 3. There appeared to be broad agreement among group member expectations. These broad areas can be characterized as:

- Respect for existing regional processes. There is a general interest in avoiding duplication, maintaining consistency, and incorporating the products of other processes such as US v. Oregon, FERC relicensing, and various biological opinions.
- The importance of developing and sustaining viable partnerships in recovery plan completion and implementation.
- Maintaining open communications and transparency with stakeholders.
- Providing a forum for discussion of “non-H” recovery related issues, such as non-point source toxics and climate change.
- Developing a credible species-wide recovery plan that addresses the biological needs of the fish and sets the stage for subsequent implementation.

*Roll-up and Management Unit Overviews:* See presentation slides, distributed separately.

*Issues and Interdependencies:* Outlines of the issues and interdependencies identified during the course of discussion are provided at Attachments 3 and 4, respectively.

SUBJECT: Coordination Group Meeting Notes: 8/4/10

*Next steps:*

- NMFS will review the interdependencies and issues identified at the meeting and develop a straw-man proposal as to how to proceed. This proposal will be distributed for review and comment to the Coordination Group.
- The proposal will propose a sequencing and process for each.
- Coordination members will be asked to comment on the proposal and indicate in which their agency would like to participate.
- The intent is to get the first team(s) in place by the end of August.
- The next Coordination Group meeting will be scheduled for the end of September / early October.

**Attachments:**

1. Participants and Contact Information
2. Participant Expectations
3. Issues
4. Interdependencies

**ATTACHMENT 1**

**Participants and Contact Information**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Office / Organization</b>
Bagdovitz, Mark	mark_bagdovitz@fws.gov	US Fish & Wildlife Service
Eddy, Bruce	bruce.r.eddy@state.or.us	ODFW
Furfey, Rosemary	rosemary.furfey@noaa.gov	NOAA
Graham, Greg	gregory.s.graham@usace.army.mil	US Army Corps of Engineers
Houslet, Brad	bhouslet@wstribes.com	Warm Springs
Johnson, Dave	davej@nezperce.org	Nez Perce Tribe
Kesling, Jason	jason.kesling@burnspaiute-nsn.gov	Burns Paiute Tribe
Knapp, Sue	suzanne.knapp@state.or.us	Oregon Governor's Office
Mabe, David	david.mabe@noaa.gov	NOAA
Martin, Steve	steve@snakeriverboard.org	Washington Lower Snake Recovery Board
Merkle, Carl	<a href="mailto:carlmerkle@ctuir.com">carlmerkle@ctuir.com</a>	Confederated Umatilla Tribes
Miller, Phil (by phone)	phil.miller@esa.wa.gov	WA Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
Mogren, Rick	rick.mogren@noaa.gov	Columbia River Federal Caucus
Perugini, Carol	perugini.carol@shopai.org	Shoshone Paiute Tribe
Pozzanghera, Steve	steve.pozzanghera@dfw.wa.gov	WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
Ray, Heather	rayh@onid.orst.edu	Upper Snake River Tribes
Schroeder, Gina	gina.schroeder@noaa.gov	Columbia River Federal Caucus
Stahl, Tom	thomas.stahl@state.or.us	ODFW
Stall, Greg	grstall@gmail.com	Idaho Rivers United
Ulmer, Linda	lulmer@fs.fed@us	Forest Service
Walton, Rob	rob.walton@noaa.gov	NOAA
Woodruff, Leigh	woodruff.leigh@epa.gov	Environmental Protection Agency
Yost, Jim	jyost@nwcouncil.org	Idaho Governor's Office

**Attachment 2**  
**Participant Expectations**

Oregon (Knapp):

- Noted previous experience and success with Mid-C and Lower Columbia Plans, hope to achieve same here
- Communication between all parties is key
- Expected outcome: better approach to fish recovery

Idaho (Yost):

- Proceed in proper way to attempt recovery
- Develop recovery plan for local area
- Respect and incorporate existing processes and avoid duplication of other processes and work
- Be mindful of habitat work

Washington (Miller):

- Experiences with similar projects such as the Mid-C recovery plan is encouraging for this plan
- Sets stage for future implementation
- Emphasize respecting other processes
- Follow through on coordination is key
- Keep simple/avoid duplication

Umatilla (Merkle):

- Curious as to how this process will fit together with current and future processes
- Concerned about FERC relicensing above Hells Canyon
- Habitat & hatchery components very important

Nez Perce (Johnson):

- No prescriptive management for proportion of natural vs. hatchery fish.
- Would not like to see a blanket application of mass marking
- Important to manage populations as full populations and not split populations artificially (such as between state boundaries)
- FERC relicensing above Hells canyon
- Consistency throughout plan
- Importance on know what is going on with related processes in other forums
- Some concern with NOAA contractors assigned and their understanding of past and current processes

SUBJECT: Coordination Group Meeting Notes: 8/4/10

Nez Perce (continued):

- HGMP's and tribal resource management plans to be consistent with US v. OR
- Habitat process to be consistent with FCRPS BiOp
- Use same RM&E status and return monitoring process established in 'Skamania Plan'

Warm Springs (Houslet):

- Interaction between Snake and Mid-C, specifically in the Deschutes, very important
- Quality of Deschutes River fisheries and strays
- Enhance communication to bring basins together with common vision
- Understand interconnection between Deschutes and Snake River populations
- Share info on first year of Pelton Round Butte Fish Passage hydro project

Burns-Paiute (Kesling):

- Learning recovery plan development process and incorporating tribal involvement
- Main focus is recovery of fish
- FERC relicensing above Hells Canyon
- How are populations above and below Hells Canyon systems being dealt with?

Upper Snake River Tribes (Perugini):

- Still learning and understanding process and their role
- How FERC will deal with reintroduction above Hells Canyon

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (Pozzeghera):

- Bring science to the table
- WA will be coordinating through Salmon Recovery Board
- Partnerships amongst all participating groups is extremely important

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (Stahl & Eddy):

- Importance on 'stitching' together the 3 management unit plans
- Utilize coordination group to work out consistency issues, common terminology and interdependencies
- Would like this to be 'last' recovery process

WA Salmon Recovery Board (Martin):

- Re-emphasize importance of 'stitching' together the MU plans
- Making sure ESU Roll Up is based on biology
- Looking for actions/policies to span MU boundaries

SUBJECT: Coordination Group Meeting Notes: 8/4/10

WA Salmon Recovery Board (continued):

- Establishing durable partnerships is key

US Forest Service / Bureau of Land Management / National Resources Conservation Service (Ulmer):

- Supports local involvement
- This plan involves 3 regional foresters for FS and 2 land managers for BLM
- Note how FS status and trend monitoring (PIBO) can inform this process
- Landscape assessments for climate change should be included
- Habitat piece is very important but only part of equation

US Fish and Wildlife Service (Bagdovitz):

- Good job to NOAA on local strategy
- This plan should be dependent solely on what the species needs
- Keep in mind that this plan also provides context for regulatory actions and decisions
- The needs of the species should be explained in an understandable means to everyone

US Army Corps of Engineers (Graham):

- Noted Corps obligations under FCRPS BiOp for hydro and habitat actions
- Consistency with existing processes is key
- The Corps has authorities in assisting with recovery ecosystem improvements and restorations

Environmental Protection Agency (Woodruff):

- Would like to make sure the Columbia River Basin toxics issues are considered in this process
- Engage in further outreach to ID on toxics issues

National Marine Fisheries Service (Furfey):

- Ensuring that this coordination group works together is critical to completing this plan

National Marine Fisheries Service (Walton):

- Incorporate developing pieces such as toxics and climate change

### ATTACHMENT 3

#### Issues

##### Non-federal dams:

- How to address?
- Include in hydro module?
- Note Upper Snake BiOp provisions on flow.
- Review UC and MC planning approach.
- Roll-up or MU plan issue?
- Scope and scale?

##### Integration of Hells Canyon FERC process into recovery plan:

- How to address issues of passage and reintroduction?
- How much latitude do recovery planners have to address this topic?
- Is it better deferred to FERC team?

##### Reintroduction above blocked areas:

- Which species?
- How to address?
- Roll-up species issue or MU issue?
- Affects ID and OR.
- Include as “broad sense” goals?

##### Recovery criteria:

- “What does it take”? Across Hs? Across species?
- BiOps avoid jeopardy; RP should define recovery needs.

##### Fall chinook delisting criteria:

- How many populations needed?
- How determined?

##### Development of hatchery strategies:

- Role / degree of marking
- Proportion of hatchery to wild fish

##### Water quality and quantity:

- How to address toxics and temperature?

##### Dispute resolution:

- Criteria?
- Decision mechanism?

## ATTACHMENT 4

### MU Plan Interdependencies

“Plan interdependencies” means those aspects of the MU plans which are not separable from or independent of other MU plans. They are the plan elements common to all MU plans for which a species-wide perspective is needed in order to produce a coherent species-wide recovery plan. The list which follows identifies the interdependencies as identified at the meeting:

- Treatment / strategies for lower Grande Ronde and Joseph Creek steelhead
- Treatment / strategies for Wenaha spring/summer chinook.
- Fall chinook
- Sockeye
- Research, monitoring, and evaluation (RME)
- Treatment of out-of-MU effects:
  - Hydropower system effects
  - Estuary
  - Out of MU harvest and hatchery effects
    - Straying
  - Climate and ocean condition effects
- Water quality and quantity
  - Toxics (localized vs. system wide)
  - Mainstem temperature in lower Snake River
- Implementation framework and schedule of actions (vice specific projects)
- Approach to recovery scenarios
- Threats criteria
- Approach to adaptive management
- Reintroduction (above HC; above Owyhee)