

RESOLVE

Results Through Consensus

MEMORANDUM

TO: Columbia River Fisheries Working Group Members, Staff, and Advisors
FROM: Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE
SUBJECT: Action Items from the October 15, 2008 Meeting – FINAL
DATE: Friday, November 7, 2008

This memo includes upcoming meeting dates, action items agreed to during the meeting, and a brief summary of deliberations for your information. Please review the action item list for tasks assigned to you and contact me if you have any questions.

Upcoming Meetings	When	Suggested Agenda Items
Columbia River Fisheries Working Group <i>Meeting</i>	Monday, November 17 <i>[9:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.]</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and discuss agency progress on potential allocation approaches Initial exploration of Phase II

I. ACTION ITEMS

Action Items Memo	Who	Completed by
1. Distribute draft Action Items memo for review	RESOLVE	COMPLETED
2. Provide edits/comments on Action Items memo to RESOLVE	Working Group members, advisors, and staff	COMPLETED
3. Finalize Action Items memo	RESOLVE	COMPLETED

Building on Allocation Approaches	Who	Completed by
4. Develop and distribute Options Analysis (e.g., objective; hindcast; etc.) to full group	ODFW and WDFW staff	COMPLETED
5. Share comments, questions, and reactions to Options Analysis – send to Paul [pdemorgan@resolv.org]	Working Group Advisors	COMPLETED

6. Distribute materials for November 17 meeting to advisors and via website	ODFW and WDFW staff	COMPLETED
---	---------------------	-----------

Phase I and II Communications	Who	Completed by
7. Discuss OFWC decision to “fish Will. River but not Lower Columbia” and propose approach to clarify situation for public	Curt M., Guy N., and Axel S.	Friday, Nov. 14
8. Develop joint ODFW and WDFW ‘brochure’ to communicate allocation decision efforts	ODFW and WDFW staff	Friday, Dec. 5

Miscellaneous	Who	Completed by
9. Post meeting materials (i.e., information distributed at meetings and on upcoming meetings) to websites	ODFW and WDFW staff	Ongoing/ASAP

II. INTRODUCTIONS AND UPDATES

Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE, welcomed participants, described the meeting materials, and presented the agenda. For a list of Columbia River Fisheries Working Group members, staff, and advisors in attendance, see attachment A below. Flipchart notes taken during the meeting can be found in attachment B.

III. OVERVIEW OF INFORMATION OBTAINED

Oregon Commissioner Dan Edge acknowledged the advisor comments received by the Commissioners since the September 15 meeting (Carmen Macdonald, Ed Wickersham) and described key points the Commissioners took away from the comments. Washington Commissioner Jerry Gutzwiler also thanked the advisors for their comments and added some additional thoughts.

Steve Williams, ODFW, then explained through the answers laid out in the “Questions from the September 15, 2008 Columbia River Allocation Work Group Meeting” meeting document shared prior to the meeting. It was noted that this, and other documents distributed at the meeting, would be available at the WDFW website [<http://wdfw.wa.gov/fish/regions/reg5/stakeholder/>].

IV. OVERVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED ALLOCATION APPROACHES

Guy Norman, WDFW, described a series of graphs and tables related to escapement and expected season durations in response to other information requests coming out of the first meeting. He then reintroduced the Matrix approach and described three different allocation scenarios based on upriver and Willamette run sizes.

Curt Melcher, ODFW, walked the group through the Conceptual Management Framework approach revised building on the conversations at the last meeting. He focused on sections 5-7, which described objectives for the commercial and sport fisheries as well as a proposed short term solution. Phil Anderson, WDFW, then presented another approach to sections 4-7 that WDFW developed after the last meeting.

After hearing the two different presentations, the group discussed expectations of what this effort should be focused on – specifically, the time frame for Phase I as opposed to Phase II. In general, the advisors indicated support for the long-term planning efforts to take place in Phase II and for Phase I to cover the “transition” (i.e., one to two years). Given this direction, there was a sentiment that ideas such as revisiting SAFE areas and the role they play should be set aside for now, especially given the reality that funding would be such a big part of any such deliberations.

When asked about the different approaches, most commercial advisors expressed a preference for the Matrix approach (though some did note concerns with the fact that it would be driven by Willamette numbers). They indicated they did not understand the rationale behind the Conceptual Management approach as it appears to reduce their take from the start. They also felt the buffer allows the sport fishery a ‘second chance’ that they would not be getting. One advisor indicated his disappointment in the limited availability for “public” fish early in the season as early opportunity creates a buzz for the commercial side as well and later commercial involvement in the fishery results in more impacts and lower quality fish.

Sport advisors did not express support for one approach over another, but rather indicated they support higher percentages for their industry – especially when it can allow for more consistency for the middle-level angler. One advisor suggested the Commissioners consider other ways to achieve the consistency (e.g., 4 days/week). Sport advisors reiterated the tough times for the sport industry and stressed that the Commissioners needed to consider what they are ‘selling’ them with this decision and how they can encourage their support.

Allocation Options

After lunch, the agencies laid out an overview of the two allocation options (presented in the ODFW and WDFW Conceptual Management Framework documents – section 7, Short Term Solution) building on the questions and discussion of the morning. They first suggested that the matrix is not so much an option as a tool that could be utilized by one of the options. They indicated each option included the following main components: a buffer; early season opportunity; and allocation. Then, with the assistance of the group, they sketched the specifics of each option using an example:

Option 1 (laid out in the ODFW Conceptual Management Framework document)

* 40% buffer off the top no matter the run size

- 75/25 sport/commercial – early (pre update)
- 50/50 sport/commercial – late (post update)

=> goal of 65/35 sport/commercial but actual numbers will depend on actual run size

Note:

* Decision(s) based on early and late objectives

Option 2 (laid out in the WDFW Conceptual Management Framework document)

- 60/40 – allocation for year [based on the matrix or could be set as a fixed proportion]
- Early (pre update):
 - 75% of 60 -> sport
 - 50% of 40 -> commercial
 - ⇒ 35% buffer
- Late (post update)
 - Manage to achieve 60/40 sport/commercial
- Notes:
 - Can use ‘static’ number or matrix on allocation;
 - Because of limited information have to beware of making major mistake

This exercise helped all the attendees better understand the options and the differences. The group then discussed their initial reactions and offered thoughts for the Commissioners to consider moving forward.

Some advisors suggested that Option 1 reduces commercial opportunity, to give sport stability, and as such, Option 2 would likely be better for the commercial fishery. For the sport fishery it appeared that the Option chosen would not matter as much as meeting the interests of certainty and opportunity (e.g., fewer good opportunities in April is better than more bad opportunities in March). Everyone appeared to acknowledge that the allocation decision would be attempting balancing stability against good opportunity for both fisheries.

An advisor asked about the season setting process. He then suggested that the Commissioners consider different approaches to implementing seasons such as: consider closing season for “a week” in the peak of season; or identifying six weekends early on and guarantee two four-day weekends and make two more four-day weekends tentative based on numbers. Agency representatives indicated implementation of seasons is driven by lots of varied interests but that these are creative ideas to be considered.

A number of advisors stressed that predictability with an expectation of reasonable success is of paramount importance. They further indicated that the Commissioners need to get outside the box in making this allocation decision. Another common theme was that decisions should be made utilizing science.

The group all agreed that a large buffer was needed regardless of the option chosen and that would be necessary until confidence in the run models used increases. The issue at hand, the advisors suggested, was not so much the size of the buffer as who “carries” the buffer. And, understanding how and why the respective fisheries are being asked to carry different parts of the buffer.

At the end of the discussion, some additional information needs were identified such as who actually “gets” the commercial fish? What other supplies of fish are in the market and where from? Is a comprehensive economic analysis needed? While the group felt these were useful questions to answer, it was generally noted answers would be unlikely in the short term process, but the questions would need further exploration in the long-term planning of Phase II.

V. ALLOCATION APPROACH FOR SUMMER CHINOOK

Guy Norman, on behalf of the agencies, presented a brief overview of the current allocation approach for summer Chinook. He indicated that given the complexity of the spring Chinook deliberations and the different nature of the summer Chinook allocation approach, that the agencies recommend continuation of the existing approach for now, but that the issue be revisited in Phase II. Some of the advisors raised general issues about how the allocation is currently made, the timing of the season, and why the fishery is not a non-selective fishery. However, no one indicated a concern with the recommendation. At the conclusion of the discussion, the Commissioners indicated they agreed with the recommendation.

VI. COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING PHASE I AND PHASE II

Phil Anderson, WDFW, presented two draft documents for the group's consideration:

- a Communications/Outreach Plan; and
- an Outline for Working Group Brochure.

The first document described the agencies' initial ideas on the objectives for the outreach effort; audiences they would strive to reach; messages to send; and approaches/tools to utilize. The advisors indicated an understanding of the approach and how it could be helpful moving forward. The second document laid out an outline of one of the tools to be used. While it was initially proposed to be finalized prior to an allocation recommendation, the group clarified that the decision was intended to be made in early/mid-December and as such, the brochure would be coming out after the decision was made. The Commissioners suggested this be a joint Oregon and Washington brochure and asked staff to work together to move it along prior to the next meeting. One advisor suggested the brochure also address the issue of how the Willamette River numbers affect the allocation decision. Agency staff agreed to work with the advisor to see how to convey that information, either in the brochure, or via another medium.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Near the end of the meeting, members of the public were given an opportunity to comment on the Columbia River Fish Working Group efforts. Four individuals shared thoughts with the Working Group. Below are the names and very brief indication of the topic they addressed.

- Hobe Kytr – who provided the group with an overview of the SAFE areas and described why other SAFE area options are limited in the Lower Columbia River.
- Jim Wells – commented that both fisheries need fair treatment; he raised the issues of mortality rates and mark rates and his sense they have not been managed or addressed in an equitable manner.
- Cary Johnson – shared his perspective on the difficulties of making a living as a gillnetter presently; he indicated the percentages for commercials needed to be no less than 60% and that terminal areas only would not be suitable.

Speakers were thanked for their comments and encouraged to submit written comments, as appropriate, to the Working Group.

Attachment A

**Columbia River Fisheries Working Group – Attendees *(not including the public)*
October 15, 2008 Meeting**

Working Group Members in Attendance:

- Gary Douvia
- Dan Edge
- Jon Englund
- Jerry Gutzwiler
- Skip Klarquist
- Conrad Mahnken

Advisors in Attendance:

- Bruce Buckmaster
- Jack Glass
- Dave Eng
- Irene Martin
- Robert Sudar
- Axel Swanson
- Brian Tarabochia
- George Trott
- Ed Wickersham

Advisors Not in Attendance:

- Jim Harmon

ODFW and WDFW Project Staff in Attendance:

- Phil Anderson
- Curt Melcher
- Guy Norman
- Steve Williams

Facilitation Staff in Attendance:

- Paul De Morgan

Attachment B

Columbia River Fisheries Working Group – Flipchart Notes October 15, 2008 Meeting

Commercial/Sport Objectives

- Talking about a long term planning with a short-term agreement (1-2 years) to cover the “transition”
- SAFE – set aside (for long-term planning) for now
 - Issue is going to be \$
- Focus on short-term
 - Preference for matrix
- Question of timing -> reprogramming to SAFE areas
 - Caution: “Don’t put cart before the horse”
- Like idea of increasing fish numbers (will improve situation) but worried that as do long-term and come up with short-term plan that expects movement of commercial out of system
- Matrix – like; but driven by Willamette numbers
- Willamette – what is wrong with those fish? Hatcheries?
- Not sure why go with “Oregon’s” approach of reducing from start
 - What is the rationale?
- Buffer -> sport get ‘second chance’ whereas commercial not so much
- Like higher % for sport -> offers more consistency for the middle-level angler [maybe other ways to get there (e.g., 4 days/week)]
- Disappointed in limited option/availability for public fish
 - Early creates buzz for Commercial too
 - Safe areas change fishery completely
 - Later commercial involvement
 - More impact quality
 - Lower quality
- Angler (sport) – times are tough
 - What are we selling to them?
 - How can we encourage them?
- Up and down of rec/sport season is very challenging for entire industry
- Timing of SAFE/mainstem different and creates inequities
 - SAFE – later; Mainstem – earlier
 - Mainstem – higher quality

Allocation Options

- Components:
 1. Buffer
 2. Early season opportunity
 3. Allocation

Option 1 (ODFW)

- 75/25 – early (pre)
- 50/50 – late (post)
 - ⇒ 65/35 depending ... on actual run size
- * Decision(s) based on early and late objectives
- * 40% buffer off the top

Option 2 (WDFW)

- 60/40 – allocation for year
- PRE:
 - 75% of 60 -> sport
 - 50% of 40 -> commercial
 - => 35% buffer
- Post
 - Manage to get to 60/40
- Notes:
 - Can use 'static' number or matrix on allocation;
 - Because of limited information have to beware of making major mistake

Concerns/Issues

- What does it look like at end of year?
 - Want to avoid what happened with Willamette River approach
 - Helps address big problems earlier
- Option 1 – reduces commercial opportunity to give sport stability
- Option 2 – better for commercial
- Options don't matter as much as certainty and opportunity
 - Fewer good April > more crummy March
- Stability balanced against good opportunity
- Setting Seasons – how? What's important? Do you (agencies) make decisions based on days of week
- Implementing Season – options:
 - Consider closing season for “a week” in the peak of season
 - Choose 6 weekends; guarantee two 4-day weekends and make two more 4-day weekends tentative based on numbers
 - NOTE: implementation driven by lots of varied interests
- Certainty with opportunity is key
- Predictability with expectation of reasonable success
- Have to get outside box in allocation decision
- E.g. closed rec fishery while commercial fishery day went on
- Drive with science
- Buffer Issues
 - # not so much the issue rather who “carries” the buffer
 - Large buffer until confidence in run model increases
- In season changes – go to the 'new' box for upriver fish (but not likely for Willamette because of timing)

- Information Needs – Who gets commercial fish? Where does it stay? What other supplies of fish? Depends on timing (niche vs. commodity)
- What about \$ from recreational fisheries (costs to catch a fish)
- Need comprehensive economic analysis?

Summer Chinook

- Agreement of the Commissioners
 - -> Continue with existing approach but revisit in Phase II context

Action Items/Timeline

- Develop brochure (ODFW and WDFW to do together)
- Discuss decision to fish Willamette River but not Lower Columbia – Axel, Curt, Guy propose approach to clarify for public

- Thursday, October 23
 - Distribute ‘hindcast’ (10 years and consider extremes as well) and more analysis of both Options – ODFW/WDFW
- Wednesday, October 29
 - Submit comments on the options to the Commissioners – Advisors to Paul
- Thursday, October 30 [3:00-4:30]
 - Agency/Commission call to discuss options
- Wednesday, November 5 [12:00-1:30]
 - Agency/Commission call to discuss options
- Friday, November 7 (or Monday, November 10)
 - Distribute materials for November 17 meeting – ODFW/WDFW
- Monday, November 17
 - CRFWG Meeting 3