***Draft Summary of Meeting Notes***

**REGIONAL MEETING FOR THE REFINEMENT PROCESS FOR PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES – SALMON AND STEELHEAD**

### **June 3, 2015**

June 3, 2015

Large Conference room,

Northwest Power and Conservation Council,

851 S.W. Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100, Portland, Oregon 97204

**Attendees**

*Room:* Jason Sweet (BPA), Bill Towey (CCT), John Arterburn (CCT), Russell Scranton (BPA), Bob Austin (USRT), Jay Hesse (NPT), Brent Hall (CTUIR attny), Keith Kutchins (UCUT), Tom Rein (ODFW), Tom Iverson (YIN, CRITFC), Lynne Krasnow (NOAA), Heather Ray (USRT), Doug Taki (SBT), Catherine Corbett (LCREP), Michael Tehan (NOAA), Erik Van Dyke (ODFW), Pat Zimmer (BPA), Elmer Ward (CTWSRO), Jen Graham (CTWSRO), Agnes Lut (BPA), Julia Doumbia (BPA), Bryan Mercier (BPA), Michelle Dehart (FPC), Steve Haeseker (USFWS), Eric TInus (ODFW), Tom Pansky (BPA), Chris Wheaton (StreamNet), Jim Litchfield (Litchfield Contuling Group), Amy Puls (PNAMP), Mike Banach (PSFMC), Howard Schaller (USFWS), Laura Gephart (CRITFC), Aja DeCoteau (CRITFC), Peter Cogswell (BPA), Dan Rawding (WDFW), Nancy Leonard/Patty O’Toole/Laura Robinson/Lynn Palensky/Tony Grover/Mark Walker (NPCC staff), Erik Merrill (ISRP/AB staff), Karl Weist (NPCC – OR)

*Phone:* Jeff Allen (NPCC – Id), Heidi McRoberts (NPT), Brian Bellgraph (PNNL), Kerry Berg (NPCC-Mt), Brenda White (SnoPUD), Kenneth Ham (PNNL), Brent Nichols (Spokane Tribe), Stay Horton (NPCC – WA)

**Action Items from meeting**

* Please review and submit edits on the draft meeting notes by July 9th to Nancy Leonard (nleonard@nwcouncil.org)
* All participants to review database by July 9th 2015
	+ Structure for ease of use and missing fields
	+ Content for accurate inclusion of their entity’s objectives. Note search both the qualitative and the quantitative section of the database as objectives may be placed under either category (<http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/am/home/june-3-2015-meeting-objectives-salmon-and-steelhead/>)
* Contact Nancy Leonard (nleonard@nwcouncil.org) to inform her of any concerns about:
	+ Inability to review database at this time due to lack of support or other reason
	+ Process related suggestions for program objective task (sideboards, overall process etc.)
* Next steps, please email Nancy Leonard (nleonard@nwcouncil.org) with any comments prior to July 9th about database structure, information compiled, lack of time to provide feedback, no agency support to engage at this time, or anything else related to this task (process/content). Another meeting may be called a few months later for more discussion. The Council staff will take the information collected, and comments on the process to the Council’s Fish and Wildlife committee for additional discussion and direction.

**Summary points from the meeting discussion**

Meeting Presentations

The meeting was called to order by Dave Ward (meeting facilitator). Bill Bradbury, Chair of NPCC Fish and Wildlife Committee provided welcoming remarks.

Background information was provided about the below topics (hyperlinks to slides included):

* [Purpose](http://www.nwcouncil.org/media/7149284/1_overview-of-meeting-dave-and-nancy-2june2015.pptx) (Dave Ward, HDR, meeting facilitator)
* [History of Program Goals/Objectives](http://www.nwcouncil.org/media/7149293/2_biological-objectives-vers-2-june-2015.doc)(John Shurts, NPCC General Counsel)
* [Communicating Progress through Program Goals/Objectives](http://www.nwcouncil.org/media/7149290/3_costs-report-ppt-for-goals-and-objectives-seminar-may-2015.pptx)(Mark Walker, NPCC Public Affairs Division Director)
* [NOAA’s Columbia Basin Salmon and Steelhead Goals Process Overview](http://www.nwcouncil.org/media/7149291/4_salmon-presentation-bruce-s.pptx)(Bruce Suzumoto,  NOAA)
* [Program Goal Statements for Salmon and Steelhead Overview](http://www.nwcouncil.org/media/7149288/5_program-goal-statements-for-salmon-and-steelhead-overview-leonard-robinson-otoole-2june2015.pptx)(Nancy Leonard, NPCC Fish, Wildlife, and Ecosystem Monitoring and Evaluation Manager; Laura Robinson NPCC Program Implementation and Liaison Specialist; and Patty O’Toole, NPCC Program Implementation Manager)
* [Overview of Objectives Database](http://www.nwcouncil.org/media/7149289/6_database-objective-presentation.pptx)(Binh Quan and Neil Ward, QW Consulting)

General Comments

* Budget and recognize labor-intensiveness of this process
	+ If regional coordination funds not adequate for participation in objective refinement process will the Council assist in supporting this effort?
	+ Any budget for this effort? Is there funding for this work (Tony Grover replied that this work can be covered by the regional coordination funds).
* Value added of this task? What is big picture?
	+ More guidance and big picture needed to proceed with this task.
	+ What big picture defined before we move forward. Need more context and definition and scope before we start deciding which objectives/goals are needed for the program
* Why should we participate?
	+ Why should we invest the time in this effort if not sure how it will be used and not sure of financial support? Need to hear from the Council about will they support participating if additional support needed. Not willing to invest time in checking over the details unless we understand how this information may be used.
	+ What is the incentive to be involved and how will this produce be used? Want input from the Council on who this effort will help inform decision making
* Clarify how the Council will be using these program goals and objectives. Be more explicit of how these will ‘really’ be applied to adaptive manage the program.
	+ Will Council use these to identify where to focus funding?
	+ What decisions will be informed by these goals and objectives. What is the decision framework/points and where do these goals and objectives fit?
	+ How will actions be connected these broader goals, how can these goals/objectives be used to inform on program effectiveness
	+ What are the questions that the Council want answered (and for what purpose) with these goals/objectives
	+ Need better context. Clarify what is the Council’s ‘measuring stick’ (what is some areas show no progress?), what is the spatial context to measure
	+ We need to understand how this information fits into a framework before we can know what to look for in the data.
* Looking for assurance that this effort is not designed to lower our goals/objectives.

Comments about Existing 2014 Program Qualitative Goal Statements (not objectives)

* Confusion in why all species include in the goal statements
* Some goals could fit other themes, blurry which goal fits which theme especially between theme 2 and 3. There is a blurriness between theme 2 (species) and Theme 3 (hydro), how to determine what is in one versus the other
* Are goals supposed to be ‘measureable’? Seems to want to be since includes words such as ‘partial’ and ‘full’
* Define terms such as what do we mean by ‘achievable’ and ‘full mitigation’. What does “full” mitigation mean? If this is a measure perhaps it should be included as a measurable objective not a goals. Others like it here – means mitigating for all of the losses.
* Use of BiOp term in goal statements doesn’t seem to fit since too specific. Should aim to write the goals to be at the same scale. Currently seem to have apples and oranges all being used as goals
* Clarify in the fifth goal statement if ‘natural’ refers to the fish type or the flow type
* Themes are not clearly distinct, especially theme 2 and 3
* Don’t think additional goal statements are needed as they appear comprehensive and aspiration in coverage
* The goals need better organization. They are not clear. Perhaps reconsider lumping all species in one goal and instead split these out as it is confusing for the refinement process to have goals that include more than salmon and steelhead
* Need a clear hierarchy of levels of thought: Northwest Power Act (full mitigation) vs. BiOp and Recovery.
* Should wildlife be included? Move to other theme.
* Need to clarify: all fish listed and not listed? Should lamprey / sturgeon be here or not?
* Some are more qualitative, others seem quantitative. Non-quantitative goals would be hard to measure. Desire for more qualitative goals.
* Subbasin plans should be referenced.
* The first two goals are redundant, but when looking at their associated objectives, the second goal has more quantitative objectives, and the first has more qualitative.
* The goals are aspirational

Program Objective Task – Phase I compilation

* Requested clarification about Phase 1 of the salmon and steelhead program objective task
	+ Entails collecting existing information on wild salmon and steelhead goals/objectives
* Comments about draft Database of Compiled Objectives
	+ Find a clearer spatial/geography based way to organize the database such as
		- Add subbasin organization to the database. Need to be able to sort by subbasin or maybe even have a geographic access point (map?).
		- Add HUC organization to the database
		- Add river miles
		- Add between X-dam and y-dam
		- Avoid blurry geographic terms such as lower and upper even if the plan used that term.
	+ Be able to access objectives not just by domains and NOAA language, but by Council regions (subbasin plans).Add a generic ‘search field to the database. Could use a general search function to allow the user to look for what one organization has for a specific species (i.e., WDFW + steelhead)
	+ Add maps that we can use to access the information, such as click your HUC to see objectives
	+ Add a field to indicate if the goals and objective in the database include a timeline (yes/no) and indicate that time line (e.g. 20yrs)
	+ Can be blurry whether an objective/goal qualifies as a quantitative or qualitative objective, so need to be explicit in how make this determination.
	+ Add HGMP information (NOAA working on extracting so perhaps can leverage that work). Hard to think about just in terms of natural-origin fish. Programs may be managed together – hatchery and natural origin. Most of the mitigation fish are hatchery fish
	+ Does parentage matter? In subbasin plans did parentage matter for abundance objectives? Should we define what is a ‘natural origin fish’?
	+ Define what resulted in an objective being identified as quantitative vs. qualitative?

Program Objective Task – next phases

* Requested clarification about what are the next steps, how will we identify program objectives and apply these, i.e., what is Phase 2?
	+ Phase 2 is working to identify quantitative objectives to be considered for the Program. Considering partnering up with the NOAA assessment process
	+ How do past efforts and current knowledge fits into the process? Such as how do the loss assessments, the density dependence report fit in?
		- These can be considered during Phase 2 when start to determine which objective may be relevant for Program tracking and adaptive management
		- Question about the subbasin plan goals. How does the Council view these goals? Council staff noted that the goals (adopted by the Council in the management plans) apply at the subbasin level only, that out of basin effects were not well described or quantified. These objectives could be helpful later on, in thinking about objectives and reporting at a larger scale, but that will be determined late
* Desire to have sideboards
	+ Is this effort about integrating actions or a way to evaluate the program?
	+ Define the goals, objectives, species, population names, what is a natural origin fish (wild parents, or hatchery parents, or?)
	+ What time-frame do we want to apply to objectives, 50 years? We need to figure what time and space we are interested in. We need sideboards to make progress. Is it 25 or 100 year timeframe?
	+ Are the blocked areas included?
		- What is the geographic scope? Mainstem, USA basin, entire international basin, ocean, estuary? Avoid ambiguous delineation such as lower and middle. Perhaps rely on subbasins or HUCs to define scope
* Better define scope of the task
	+ Any underlying structure already envisioned to help it all come together
	+ Is it NW Power Act the scope? Or ESA recovery the scope or something else perhaps a hierarchy with Power Act being broader and encompassing ESA?
	+ Need to consider all aspects affecting natural salmon and steelhead for this refinement phase to work. Need to include hatchery HGMP information and the other Hs. Can’t address natural salmon and steelhead objectives in isolation. HGMP’s have lots of information that would be valuable to this effort, many not yet approved due to backlog at NOAA need to have HGMP approval be a priority.
	+ At what scale should we focus for the objective/goal to be meaningful? Knowing all Chinook may not be as informative as knowing about the separate runs (fall Chinook etc.)
* Guarantees and Concerns
	+ Guarantee from Council that the intent is not to erode numerical goals/objectives to lower numbers
	+ What are the roles for subbasin objectives in all of this?
	+ Existing goals from various processes are valid and we need to understand how these fit together
	+ Need to have compatibility between goals/objectives at all scales. Hierarchy approach
* Approach for Phase 2
	+ Perhaps approach this task by dividing up within ESU or other geographic boundaries to avoid uniting people that have conflicting terminology? So lump all from an area who are already using the same terms in the same way
	+ Avoid a large group setting since difficult to make progress
	+ Consider a hierarchical approach. Need overall assessment of population from lower scales (e.g. subbasin) and figure out how to roll up to species so of use to broader reporting needs such as Columbia River treaty
	+ Perhaps should not focus on identifying which objective/goal to use but focus on translating among existing goals/objectives
	+ Need to define which group conducts evaluation at which level of group and what process used to evaluate. Need to determine who will be responsible for ‘evaluating’ progress towards goals. Should NOAA be responsible for evaluating the recovery goals/objectives (as they currently are) and rely on that
	+ Need to capture the variance (range) associated with objectives. One number not adequate for biological objectives
	+ Need to ensure the right goal is connected to the right question.
	+ There are socio-economic considerations that are not talked about. Programs funded through the Fish and Wildlife Program bring economic benefits to communities