
“GREEN SHEET”

Meeting dates: October 5, 2012, Commission Meeting

Agenda item #4: Klickitat Hatchery Improvements and Master Plan Update – (Briefing)

Staff Contact: John Easterbrooks, Region 3 Fish Program Manager

Presenter(s): John Easterbrooks and Bill Sharp (Yakama Nation Yakima-Klickitat Fisheries Project (YKFP) Klickitat River Coordinator)

Background:

The Yakima-Klickitat Fisheries Project (YKFP) partners (BPA, Yakama Nation and WDFW) are nearing completion of the Final NEPA EIS for the Klickitat Hatchery Complex Expansion (the draft FEIS will be distributed for internal review Sept. 5 – Oct. 10). BPA is the lead agency and will tentatively issue a NEPA Record of Decision (ROD) in late 2012 or early 2013. The YN submitted an updated Klickitat Hatchery Complex Master Plan to the NPCC in July to accompany the NEPA EIS. Currently, the Klickitat Hatchery Complex Expansion (KHCE) is at Step 2 (preliminary design) in the NPCC’s 3-Step Process for hatchery development. YN’s BPA Fisheries Accord funding would be used to finance much, but not all of the expansion.

The purpose of this briefing is to inform the FWC on key elements of the proposed hatchery infrastructure expansion needed to support the fish production changes detailed in the Master Plan (MP). The primary goal of the MP is to recover populations of native spring chinook, steelhead (and Pacific lamprey) following HSRG stock conservation principles, while continuing to produce non-native (introduced in 1952 when Klickitat Hatchery was constructed under the Mitchell Act) fall chinook and coho to meet *U.S. v Oregon* harvest commitments.

Policy issue(s) you are bringing to the Commission for consideration:

None---briefing only

Public involvement process used and what you learned:

NA

Action requested:

None at this time

Draft motion language:

NA

Justification for Commission action:

NA

Communications Plan:

NA

INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS -- HOW TO PREPARE A GREEN SHEET:

This form is for staff-to-Commission communications and should be suitable for public distribution. You will succeed with this green sheet if you focus the attention on the actual Commission action you are requesting. Additional information that supports the green sheet summary should be included behind the green sheet in the Commission meeting notebooks.

The green sheet should represent your professional advice to the Commission to make a reasoned, considered decision. Give your professional judgment about the policy questions imbedded in your issue, and include the risks or downside of your recommendation. Specify your recommendation for a Commission decision, and include the consequences of no action.

Background: This is your chance to capture the essence of the issue you have been working on. If the item responds to a Commission request, make sure to include that here. In this section, frame the issue so a person can see it as a “snapshot” with all the history that got us to this point, current concerns, and, if applicable, probable future development of the issue. This is also a great place to give the Commission any “sound bites” it might need when communicating your issues to the public, other policy makers, and the media.

Policy issue(s): Any decision is a “policy”, and any policy is a statement of values. Articulate what “policy” you are bringing to the Commission. Present policy issues to the Commission for action, and clearly define the policy versus operational issues before the Commission. Then briefly describe the implementation procedures the Department plans to take once the Commission makes the policy decision.

Public Involvement/Input Summary: Tell the Commission what public participation process(es) you used, including mailings and public forums. Be sure to summarize what the public said, both pro and con. If the public is split, say so. If you changed your recommendation because of public input, identify that as well. The Commission holds a high value on public participation.

Action requested: This is the punch line for the green sheet. Do not repeat the discussions described above; be concise and present action steps in logical order. **Examples:** “Adoption of the rule amendments as proposed.” OR “This is the rule briefing and public hearing opportunity. The Commission will consider final adoption of the rule proposals at its _____ meeting in _____.” If Commission action is needed at a future Commission meeting, include that information here, and briefly describe the action you will be seeking at that future time. If no Commission action is needed (now or in the known future), indicate “N/A.”

Draft motion language: “I move to...” Use the exact language the Commission needs to adopt the rule proposals or Policy Documents. Think through how to convert your requested action into an actual motion. Be precise and include specific WAC numbers. Example, “I move to adopt WAC XXX-XX-XXX as proposed.” If no Commission action is requested at this meeting, indicate “N/A.”

Justification for Commission action: Required for the official record. Articulating a justification also helps the Commission streamline its process and explain to the public why a decision is being made. This is another good place to describe the most important “sound bite” of your issue.

Communications Plan: The content should pick up where “Public Involvement Process” left off. Provide answers to the questions: What's next? How will the Department get the word out to constituents/stakeholders if the rule change or policy is implemented? How will you educate the public on this issue following a decision?

Contact the Commission Office at (360) 902-2267 with questions.

Revised 10/16/08