

Date: December 12, 2017

Place: Best Western Hotel, Dayton, WA

Format: Regular Meeting started at 4:00 p.m.

Board Members Present for Regular Business Meeting: Roland Schirman (CC), Mike Talbott (CC), Don Jackson (CC), Billy Bowles (GC), Justin Dixon (GC), Jerry Hendrickson (AC), Brian Shinn (AC), Jerry Hendrickson (AC), Jack Peasley (GC), and Larry Hooker (WWC)

Board Members on Phone: Brad Johnson (AC), Todd Kimball (WWC), Gary James (CTUIR).

Others Present: Joe Bumgarner (WDFW), Jeremy Trump (WDFW), Jim Peterson, Terry Bruegman (CCD), Justin Pearson (CCD), Megan Stewart (ACCD), Kris Fischer (CTUIR), and John Foltz (SRSRB).

Others on Phone: Joanna Cowles (WWCCD), Chris Donnley (WDFW), Duane Bartels (PCD), and Chris Hyland (WWWMP).

SRSRB Chair, Roland Schirman called the meeting to order at 4:00pm and verified a quorum (10 present, 3 on the phone for a total of 13). Roland welcomed everyone to the board meeting and asked for introductions from those present.

Verify Quorum and approve Agenda

Action 1: A motion was made by Mike Talbott to approve the meeting agenda it was seconded by Jerry Hendrickson and the Board approved the motion by consensus.

Consent Agenda:

October 2017 Expenses as follows:

(HCSR) RCO: \$9,185.31

(HCFW) LE: \$3,510.83

(HCB9) BPA: \$9,964.32

October 17, 2017 Meeting notes

Action 2: A motion was made by Brian Shinn to approve the October 17, 2017 meeting notes with the amendment that Brad Johnson abstained from action 3, *Funding Guidelines Subcommittee Report and Recommendation*, and approve the financials for October 2017 expenses, it was seconded by Bill Bowles and the Board approved the motion.

Update: Announcements and Items of Interest

Executive Call Actions – John noted that no action was taken during the Executive Committee conference call.

Tucannon Landowner Outreach Tour – John reported back to the Board that the November Tucannon Landowner Outreach tour, a follow up request from the landowner picnic in 2016, was well received. The intent was to provide an opportunity for Tucannon Landowners to see some habitat restoration projects that have recently been completed in the Tucannon basin. Attendees got to visit projects on both private and public property. Fourteen people attended, including several landowners in the Touchet basin who had an interest in seeing completed project work. Don Jackson was interested in having more landowner input in the future for the event. A follow up event of some sort will likely be planned for 2018.

Asotin Watershed and Conceptual Restoration Plan – John let the Board know that the draft plan is currently out for comment. This plan will be the basis for project implementation for the next 5-10 years and beyond in the Asotin Basin. Megan Stewart noted that it is currently available on the ACCD webpage; hard copies can be provided upon request.



Snake River Salmon Recovery Plan – The full Snake River Salmon Recovery Plan, for the entire Snake Basin including Idaho and Oregon, was just recently published in the federal registry. The Snake River Salmon Recovery Plan for SE Washington, originally approved by NOAA in 2005 with an update via the federal registry in 2011, is a component of the now complete Snake River Salmon Recovery Plan. John noted that it is time to start thinking about an update to our 2011 plan – NOAA suggested working through the GSRO utilizing PCSRF funding to Washington State for this purpose.

Columbia River Salmon and Steelhead Recreational Anglers Board (CRSSRAB) – The CRSSRAB currently has an opening and is soliciting nominations for the position – applications are due December 15th. The position is a two year term with a minimum of two meetings a year. After discussion, the Board felt that having an eastside representative would be beneficial and asked if Bill Bowles would be willing to accept a nomination from the Board.

Action 4: Nomination of Bill Bowles for the CRSSRAB (not on the agenda).

A motion was made by Brad Johnson to nominate Bill Bowles to serve on the CRSSRAB and send a letter of support from the Board to be signed by Roland, it was seconded by Brian Shinn and the Board approved the motion by consensus. John will work with Bill and Roland to finalize the letter by the 15th and submit.

Update: Regional Updates on adult returns, hatchery production, and tributary overshoot – Joe Bumgarner (WDFW).

Joe provided an update on adult returns, hatchery production, and tributary overshoot in the region. With regard to hatchery production, the Lower Snake River Compensation program for Washington has been and is meeting goals for both steelhead (4,656) and fall Chinook (18,300), but not for spring Chinook (1,152). He also provided an update on juvenile releases, which are summarized here:

Species/Location (Stock)	Past and/or Current Program	New
Steelhead		
Cottonwood (Wallowa)	200,000	225,000
Lyons Ferry (Wallowa)	60,000 – 110,000 ^A	50,000 *
Dayton (Wallowa)	85,000	100,000 *
Walla Walla (Wallowa)	100,000	0
Tucannon (Tucannon)	50,000 - 150,000 ^{A, B}	150,000 ^B
Touchet (Touchet)	50,000 ^B	50,000 ^B *
Spring Chinook		
Tucannon (Tucannon)	225,000	225,000
Touchet (Carson)	0	250,000
Asotin (Tucannon)	0	250,000 *
Fall Chinook		
	4,100,000	4,250,000

^A Production for the Lyons Ferry Release is tied to the Tucannon per US v Oregon

^B 50,000 of each group not AD Clipped for Harvest

Joe noted that NOAA dictates the maximum number of hatchery releases – which is 150,000 steelhead for the Tucannon. The question of why this number and why the limit – Joe stated that it was related to the ration of hatchery



fish to wild fish on the spawning grounds among other things, and how this impacted the genetic make-up of the population and the reproductive success. Given that the smolt to adult return ratios have gone down with the switch to the endemic steelhead stock, there could be a possibility of increasing the releases, but the sportfish catch would need to go up – the run timing for this stock cannot be changed however.

With regard to adult returns, these numbers are variable over time, but in general his interpretation over a recent period of years was:

River / Stream	Spring Chinook	Fall Chinook	Summer Steelhead
Asotin Cr	?????		Increase
Tucannon	Stable – depressed	Increase	Stable - depressed
Touchet			Stable - depressed
Walla Walla			Stable
Snake River		Increase	

Joe also shared the latest information with regard to adult fish tributary overshoot, where fish destined for a particular stream or river overshoot that tributary to head up above lower Granite Dam with some returning but some remaining above the dam. In general, the number of fish that overshoot as a percentage of the run is consistent from year to year. In the case of Tucannon steelhead, 50% remain above Lower Granite Dam. In summary:

Species/Stock	Smolt Age	Ice Harbor to Lower Granite Conversion	Fallback Rate	Percent into Tucannon River	Percent Above Lower Granite
Tucannon SPCH	1+	20%	60%	92%	8%
Tucannon SuSH	1+	65%	20%	40%	50%
Snake River FCH	1+	50%	50%	NA	25%
	0	85%	40%	NA	50%

Joe also shared some common questions specific to the Tucannon River. The text from his presentation is as follows:

- Why don't we have salmon/steelhead in the Tucannon River? We do, but they just aren't as plentiful as they once were, much the same across the Snake River Basin. The Tucannon is not unique.



- What did past Natural #'s look like in the Tucannon?
Spring Chinook: As many as 30,000? Early 1900's
Summer Steelhead: As many as 3,500? Pre-70's
- What did past Hatchery #'s look like in the Tucannon?
Spring Chinook: Generally 300-500 fish annually.
Summer Steelhead: Generally 1,500-2000 annually.
- Why the drop in numbers of spring Chinook and steelhead. Lots of answers: change in hatchery programs, overshoot, ocean conditions, outmigration conditions, hydro-system operations, predators (bird and fish), hatchery fish, ocean and downriver harvest (also degraded habitat)..... Many of the same trends seen in the Tucannon are basin-wide across the Columbia and Snake rivers Chinook and steelhead populations.
- How are we fixing these decreased numbers?
 - new hatchery broodstock for steelhead in Tucannon, additional rearing space at Lyons Ferry (2-4 years?).
 - in discussion with other agencies about overshoot and providing more ways for fish to get by the dams.
 - harvest discussions and harvest regulations.
 - Continuing with monitoring/evaluation on natural origin survival (Life Cycle Model work), other studies that are in progress, new studies that might come soon.
- Is there any new natural production: Not Really (graph)
- When will these #'s rebound? Don't Know
- How many fish are released?
Spring Chinook – 225,000
Steelhead – 150,000
- How many hatchery fish will return?
Spring Chinook – $225K * 0.22\% - OS = 420$
Steelhead – $150K * 1.00\% - OS = 750$

The Board discussed the possibility of drafting a letter of support to endorse what is currently going on now with the Lower Snake River Compensation Program hatchery production and to support increased rearing capacity, although some progress has been made in the arena. The Board could also continue to shed light on the overshoot issue in that letter and also with the Army Corp of Engineers. No action was taken at this time.

Discussion: Discussion regarding potential Board recommendations.

The Board was asked to consider some policy recommendations and seek some discussion and feedback:

- 1. No limit on any warm water, non-native fish and extend bounty program to smallmouth bass Columbia basin wide (above Chief Joe Dam) and 2. Petition the Fish and Wildlife Commission to require all non-natives be kept.**



The Board previously supported the no limit WDFW fishing policy on warm water, non-native fish in the Columbia River below Chief Joe Dam. Given ESA concerns and the economic value of salmon and steelhead, extending this to the full Columbia River system could be worthwhile; additionally extending the bounty program beyond northern pike minnow to smallmouth bass and walleye may also be a useful management option. Another management approach for consideration would be requiring all non-native fish be kept when caught – by contrast currently all hatchery steelhead are required to be kept.

The Board discussed this idea and decided not to take action at this time. In summary, the Board felt that they should focus their efforts in-region given that the existing local non-native populations are more the issue than those upstream (even though that is where they likely originated). While the idea of extending the no-limit policy was supported in theory, this action would be tough politically given that there has been no salmon or steelhead fishery above Chief Joe Dam for 80+ years. Biologically, eliminating those non-native species would be near impossible. The Board also felt that when salmon and steelhead runs declined, sturgeon, walleye and other game fish were valuable for sport fishermen and guides. Additionally, enforcement of a mandatory retention would be very difficult to regulate.

Chris Donley (WDFW) also noted that there are very liberal bag limits on bass and walleye above Chief Joe Dam (10 bass and 16 walleye). Biologically, we will never get rid of these fish, but can shape their populations. From a biological perspective, you want to keep the larger fish in the system to reduce reproduction – this is a compensatory mechanism, when you have no larger fish, reproduction goes up and fish reach sexual maturity at smaller sizes. Chris also noted that WDFW is updating and simplifying their fishing regulations, which will include getting rid of the mandatory retention of hatchery steelhead.

With regard to extending the bounty program, the Board thought that this approach had merit, but would be very tough to fund with current program funding coming from BPA. Additionally, both Oregon and Washington are not actively managing for these fish. John noted that there is a BPA proposal on predation in the Columbia River that sought to evaluate the potential of slight ramping of the hydro system to reduce reproductive success (targeting walleye) – he provided a brief summary of the proposal and asked if the Board would like to support this project by way of email? The Board agreed that this proposal should be supported and also elevate this discussion to the GSRO.

Discussion: Update from COR meeting – Senator Carlyle Request

John noted that there was a request from GSRO at the last Council of Regions (COR) meeting that came from Senator Carlyle. The request was to provide a simple list of five items that are needed to make substantial progress towards de-listing. The turnaround time on this request was very short, and John felt that he had the details needed to respond to this request, however he wanted to check in with the Board on this. The top items that John provided were:

1. Implement a **comprehensive monitoring program** to address salmon and steelhead population abundance and survival
2. Project funding for full fish passage on Mill Creek
3. Address mainstem Columbia and Snake River issues of **predation** and tributary overshoot
4. Stable planning, monitoring, and habitat project funding
5. Process review and identification of efficiencies for permitting and programmatic.

The Board agreed with these items. John noted that monitoring, predation, and project funding were common amongst all of the seven recovery regions. GSRO will provide a response to the Senator and will keep John informed on if anything comes of this exercise. The Board requested that our District 9 and 16 legislators be kept in the loop on this as well, and to “cc” them on the letter from the GSRO.



Discussion: Tucannon Monitoring – Columbia COR letter.

John shared three items of significance with the Board regarding Tucannon monitoring efforts.

1. Email of support for BPA walleye and bass predation proposal. (The Board previously discussed this item and supported an email of support and noted that we need a full court press on monitoring and predation).
2. SRSRB memo seeking continued support and coordination of BPA monitoring funding in the Tucannon – John noted that the Columbia Habitat and Monitoring Program (CHaMP) program is scheduled to be defunded in early 2018 and that we rely on that funding for the habitat monitoring effort that the Board helps coordinate in the Tucannon. Staff and partners are working to put together a memo outlining the importance and value of the Tucannon monitoring program and requesting continued support. The Board was supportive of this memo and that it be sent as needed – they also requested that it be shared when finalized.
3. A potential letter from the Council of Regions supporting continued BPA monitoring support in the Columbia Basin – John noted that this is regarding the same issue previously mentioned with the defunding of CHaMP and that other recovery regions are also interested in supporting future monitoring funding and efforts. If a letter is finalized amongst the COR, John will share it with the Board.

Update: Lead Entity Scorecard update

John informed the Board that the Lead Entity Co-Leads (Conservation Districts) met several times following the 2017 SRFB grant round to review the process and the scorecard. We received feedback and input from the Board, from the Lead Entity Committee, and also from a Committee survey. In summary, a scorecard update sought to leverage additional matching funds, sought to keep the Board from being the only project funders on expensive projects, and allow for more committee discretion within the priorities identified. John noted that full scorecard details would be shared in depth at the Lead Entity Committee meeting on December 14th where the Committee would review and approve for the 2018 grant round. John invited the Board to attend that meeting if they were interested and volunteered to share more scorecard details if there was interest from the Board. The Board asked that the scorecard be sent out after the Lead Entity Committee meeting and that there be some time to review at a future Board meeting. John noted that it would be helpful to have some context and explanation when reviewing the scorecard.

Action 5: Approve January 23, 2018 for next Board meeting to be held in Pomeroy at the USFS Building at 4:00 PM.

A motion was made by Bill Bowles and seconded by Jerry Hendrickson to set the next meeting at 4 p.m. in Pomeroy at the USFS Building on January 23rd. The Board approved by consensus.

Meeting adjourned at 5:59 p.m. by SRSRB Chair, Roland Schirman.



Review of Tasks					
Action Title	Motion	Second	Consensus	Vote	Pass
Action 1: Approve the meeting agenda	Mike Talbott	Jerry Hendrickson	Yes		Yes
Action 2: Approve October meeting notes with amendment	Brian Shinn	Bill Bowles	Yes		Yes
Action 3: Nomination of Bill Bowles for the CRSSRAB(Not on Agenda)	Brad Johnson	Brian Shinn	Yes		Yes
Action 4: approve January 23 rd for next board meeting	Bill Bowles	Jerry Hendrickson	Yes		Yes

Approval Of Meeting Minutes

Date: _____

Signed By: _____

Bill Bowles, Vice-Chair, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board



BOARD ATTENDANCE FOR EXECUTIVE BOARD AND CONSERVATION DISTRICT MANAGERS

Name	Attendance for July 2017 – June 2018										
SRSR EXEC BOARD	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
*Brian Shinn	yes	yes	N	yes	yes						
Brad Johnson	yes	yes	yes -	yes-	yes-						
Jerry Hendrickson	yes -	N	N	yes	yes						
Don Jackson	N	N	N	N	yes						
Roland Schirman	yes	yes	yes	N	yes						
*Mike Talbott	yes	N	yes	yes-	yes						
*Justin Dixon	yes	N	N	N	yes						
Del Groat	yes	N	N	N							
Bill Bowles	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes						
*Perry Dozier/ Todd Kimball	yes	yes	yes	N	yes-						
Larry Hooker	N	yes	yes	yes	yes						
Yancey Reser	yes -	yes -		N							
Gary Ryan	N	N	yes	yes							
*Michael Largent/ Art Swannack	yes	yes -	yes	yes							
Jon Jones	yes	N	yes	yes							
Gary James	yes -	yes	N	N	yes-						
CONSERVATION MGRS											
Duane Bartels	N	N	yes -	N							
Jennifer Boie	N	N	yes	N							
Terry Bruegman	yes	yes	yes	N							
Megan Stewart	yes	yes	yes -	N							
J Cowles/ R Hadley	yes -	N	yes -	yes-							
* County Commissioner ! First Meeting as a Board Member # Last Meeting as a SRSRB Member - Call In by Phone											