

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 September 15, 2008 Meeting – FINAL
DATE: Thursday, October 2, 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	Wednesday, October 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and discuss agency progress on potential allocation approaches Initial exploration of Phase II
Columbia River Fisheries Working Group	Monday, November 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TBD

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. Share comments, questions, and reactions on allocation approaches – send to: commission@dfw.wa.gov ; Daniel.edge@oregonstate.edu ; and pdemorgan@resolv.org	Working Group Advisors	Monday, Sept. 29

5. Develop and distribute expanded allocation approaches	ODFW and WDFW staff	Friday, October 10
--	---------------------	--------------------

Phase II	Who	Completed by
6. Develop draft Phase II approach and communication plan	ODFW and WDFW staff	Wednesday, Oct. 15

Miscellaneous	Who	Completed by
7. Develop website to include information distributed at meetings and updates on upcoming meetings	ODFW and WDFW staff	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.

After introductions, Oregon Commissioner Dan Edge described the Committee (Working Group) Charge as defined by the Oregon and Washington Fish and Wildlife Commissions. Referencing the “Columbia River Management Plan Development Process” document (dated August 9, 2008), he explained that the six Commissioners were being asked to develop “a consensus recommendation for a management plan for the Columbia River that is developed in two phases” Phase I includes two parts:

- a) developing a recommendation regarding the allocation of spring and summer chinook harvest opportunities between the primary stakeholder interests; and
- b) design of the process to achieve the desired outcome for Phase II including a communication plan.

Washington Commissioner Jerry Gutzwiller then explained the roles of the advisors and staff. Using the same document, he stressed the need for the Commissioners to hear from the advisors about the “... diversity of views from the constituencies they are there to represent ...” He also reiterated that the Commissioners are the ones who are being asked to reach consensus and as such, there may be times in the meeting agendas when the Commissioners need to have discussions focused on their reactions to and thoughts about the various perspectives. He closed by noting that the staff at the table are there to assist the Commissioners in developing proposals and securing information necessary to enable development of the recommendations.

III. BACKGROUND PRESENTATIONS

Spring Chinook/Summer Chinook Management Overview

Guy Norman, WDFW, gave the group a presentation on the landscape for managing the stocks which included an overview of the stocks involved, how forecasts and in-season updates are used, and existing obligations affecting the management (e.g., *U.S. v. Oregon*; ESA). Curt Melcher, ODFW, then built on the conservation responsibilities that drive the agencies decision making around fisheries.

LCRSF Stakeholder Process – What was Learned

Mr. De Morgan presented an overview of the “Review of Previous Stakeholder Process” white paper which was developed by ODFW and WDFW staff at the conclusion of the Lower Columbia River Salmon Fisheries Stakeholder Group process. The document, an overview of the information learned by the agencies during the process, was reviewed and edited by those stakeholders still involved at the end of the effort, however the document was not considered a ‘product’ of the Stakeholder Group.

IV. FISHERY MANAGEMENT – GENERAL AND OBJECTIVES

During the presentations and the ensuing conversations, the advisors identified issues that they believed the Commissioners need to consider in developing their recommendations:

- Utilization of in-season adjustments
- Relative timing of commercial vs. sport seasons
- Pre-season estimate process
- How wild and hatchery fish do relatively?
- Implications of *US v. Oregon* and fish management plans coming on line in the basin
- Context – other impacts on fisheries
- Role of select fisheries
- Dependability/stability as a key interest for both fisheries

The timing of the allocation agreement was discussed by the advisors. Some indicated a shorter term agreement would be better, in part to enable Phase II deliberations to impact the allocation decisions. Others felt that a longer-term agreement would allow for more certainty for everyone as well as creating an opportunity for each fishery to develop a ‘plan’ for their future.

Different perspectives were shared by advisors on the role of ‘conservation’ in developing an allocation recommendation. One perspective was that conservation is addressed elsewhere and the Phase I conversation should be about equitable allocation. The other perspective offered was that conservation is an important aspect of why the advisors are at the table – in part because everyone benefits from more fish.

During the conversations a suite of potential fishery management objectives were identified:

- Meet/exceed conservation requirements
- Increase certainty/stability for commercial/sport fisheries

- Increase adaptability (to environmental circumstances)
- Keep quality as high as possible (for commercial -> keep access to high quality fish)
- Include a spread to the season
- Clearly define and understand risks, costs, and benefits

One advisor suggested the Commissioners think more broadly than just the issue of spring and summer Chinook allocations as a way to address the interests of the fisheries.

V. ALLOCATION FRAMEWORKS

Two potential allocation frameworks were presented by the agencies as a starting point for deliberations. A 'matrix' based approach, presented by Guy Norman, and a 'conceptual framework' approach, presented by Curt Melcher. They both stressed to the group that the numbers in the approaches were just for illustration and should not be considered proposals by the agencies. Rather, they requested the group focus on the underpinning aspects of the approaches, which they added were not to be considered mutually exclusive.

During the conversation the group raised questions to be answered for any approach:

- What are the assumptions underlying an approach and what happened in the past relative to those assumptions?
- What are the funding requirements (e.g., production, select areas)?
- Who is bearing the risks and the costs?
- What are the impacts on communities?

The group also discussed the issue of how to obtain funding for production. It was suggested that if BPA continues to be a source of funding, then efforts to influence them need to be coordinated between the fisheries. One commercial industry advisor suggested that if that was the case, one way to encourage support from the sport fishing industry would be to create a more balanced allocation in the short term with a shift pending additional funding for an expanded select area fishery program.

The idea of select area fisheries was a topic of interest to all. Some in the group expressed concerns with using, or overusing, the tool because of possible problems with straying hatchery fish and other ecological impacts. Others disputed the extent of those problems. Another issue was the costs of expanding these which, it was explained, are currently borne more by the commercial fishery despite benefits for all. Finally, while some of the sport fishing interests indicated a possible solution for consideration should be a commercial fishery exclusively in the select area fisheries, the commercial representatives were adamantly opposed to being out of the mainstem of the river completely.

The advisors also suggested that the Commissioners and the agencies explore inclusion of a variety of tools in the allocation approaches (e.g., using days of the week; timing restriction; etc.)

VI. INFORMATION NEEDS

During the meeting the group kept track of information that could be of use in the Commissioners efforts to develop consensus recommendations. Specific suggestions included:

- For each allocation approach:
 - What are the costs (e.g., how select area fisheries are paid for)?
 - How will they be funded?
 - How will they be implemented?
- Run 'Matrix' model (presented by Guy) with certain numbers (e.g., last 3 years or using last year's numbers as the base then $\pm 10\%$)
- Expand on 'Conceptual Framework' approach (presented by Curt) proposal
- Describe OR/WA legislative funding proposal options?
- Escapement numbers for listed stocks -> compare to projected escapement
- Information on existing select areas -> foundation of/assumptions behind
- Impacts on 'communities'
 - Retail sales
 - Community health
- Number/size of commercial industry on Oregon side
- Seasonal expectations based on run sizes

In addition, the agency staff shared a list of existing information which is available at the websites associated with the prior stakeholder process:

- <http://wdfw.wa.gov/fish/regions/reg5/stakeholder/index.htm>
- <http://www.dfw.state.or.us/fish/LCRSFSG/index.asp>

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.

- Liz Hamilton – who provided a series of comments on the issues being discussed with a focus on the economic issues associated with sport fishing.
- Rob Sando – who commented on the scale of the second phase of the Working Group's charge (large) and suggested it would need significant effort to plan and accomplish.
- Harry Barber – who offered some specific thoughts on the possible approaches to allocation presented by the agencies.
- Dan Grogan – who stressed the importance of opportunity for the sport fishing industry and the difficulties associated with any attempt to reduce it.

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)*
September 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
- Carmen MacDonald (alternate for 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 September 15, 2008 Meeting

Fishery Management Comments

- In-season adjustments
- Estimate process and appropriate response
- Wild/hatch fish – how do they do relatively?
- Timing of Commercial vs. Sport seasons
- Implications of US v. Oregon
 - Lower some time; higher others
 - Management plans coming on line
- Length of ‘decision’
- Take into account other impacts on fisheries
- Select fisheries
- Dependability/stability
- Protect ESA species
- Longer-term agreement benefits
 - Stability for all
 - Opportunity for each fishery to ‘plan’ (e.g., SFA is working on one)
- Select area fisheries – opportunity for expansion but not replacement of Columbia River
- This isn’t about conservation (Phase I) but rather equitable allocation
- With increase population in Columbia River Basin – do we have time to develop a plan after we do allocation decision [instead develop plan now – select area fisheries]
- Conservation is why we’re here ...
 - Truly selective fisheries – requires very good monitoring
 - Make pie bigger everyone benefits

Fishery Management Objectives

- Meet/exceed conservation requirements
- Increase certainty/stability for commercial/sport fisheries
- Increase adaptability (to environmental circumstances)
- Keep quality as high as possible (for commercial -> keep access to high quality fish)
- Spread to the season
 - For Commercial -> buyers across season
 - Early in March (pre-other fresh fish coming on market)
 - Later in week (but not big deal)
 - May 20th -> Copper River comes to market
- Economic impacts broadly
- Value your customer
- Think about the ‘bones’ (i.e., throw ‘em a bone)
 - Multiple bones
 - Expand good stock’s fishing opportunity

- Commercial/sport catch numbers
- Advances sport fishery and recognizes the importance of the resource to our approach (boats, catch rate, etc.)
- Risks and costs clearly defined

Allocation Frameworks

- Need to know the assumptions and what has happened in past (e.g., how many smolts to select areas now?)
- Net pen area – funding?
- Risk and cost ... who is bearing?
 - Initial view – commercial on both fronts
 - Select areas – commercials tax selves but this benefits all ... how to make equitable?
- No incentive for selective gear (e.g., tanglenet)
- Funding for production
 - Where coming from?
 - Huge amount of unknown/risks
 - BPA – need to be joint effort to get their money
- Community impacts
- Select Area Fisheries – concerns
 - Straying hatchery fish problems increase
 - Assessing ecological impacts
- Consider putting onus on sport fishing in short-term (e.g., select area fishery needs funding)
 - Contingency planning
- ODFW concept – might be more of a Phase II
- Shad come in May and commercials then can't use Tanglenets -> Higher mortality rate
- Front loading sport season is good
- Good for Commercial when agencies over predict
- What does “X” approach do to the communities?
- Days of the week; timing restriction; etc.
 - Stability; certainty

Information Needs

- Costs associated with approaches
 - E.g., select area fisheries
- Funding – how?
- Implementation of approaches
- Funding proposal to OR/WA legislatures
- Run ‘Guy’s’ model with certain numbers (e.g., last 3 years)
- Escapement numbers for listed stocks -> compare to projected escapement
- Information on existing select areas -> foundation of/assumptions behind
- Impacts on ‘communities’
 - Retail sales
 - Community health

- Number/size of commercial industry on Oregon side
- Seasonal expectations based on run sizes
- Expand on ODFW proposal – with various numbers