

# Columbia Basin Collaborative Harvest/Hatcheries Work Group Meeting Summary

Tuesday, November 1, 2022, from 1:00pm – 4:00pm PT/ 2:00am – 5:00pm MT

## Attendees

**Participants:** Aaron Lieberman (Idaho Outfitters and Guides Association), Andrew Gibbs (Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife), BJ Keiffer (Spokane Tribe of Indians), Brad Halverson (NW Steelheaders), Brandon Weems (Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde), Brent Hall (Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation), Casey Baldwin (Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation), Chris Sullivan (Idaho Fish and Game), David Bain (Orca Conservancy), Eric Kinne (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife), Gary Marston (Wild Steelheaders United), Glen Spain (Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen), Guy Norman (State of Washington), Jay Hesse (Nez Perce Tribe Department of Fisheries), Joe Zandt (Yakama Nation Fisheries), John Powell (Idaho Fish and Game), Joseph Oatman (Nez Pierce Tribe), Maureen Hess (Northwest Power and Conservation Council), Natasha Preston (National Marine Fisheries Service), Rebecca Johnson (Nez Pierce Tribe), Robert Sudar (Independent Salmon Distributor), Ryan Lothrop (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife), Scott Patterson (Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife), Sean Tackley (Army Corps of Engineers), Steve Manlow (Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board), Stuart Rosenberger (Idaho Power), Tom Iverson (Yakama Nation Fisheries), Tucker Jones (Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife)

Observers: Denny Rohr, Heather Nicholson, Mark Martin, Mitch Silvers, Patty O'Toole, Shane Scott, Four others via phone

**Facilitation Team:** Liz Mack (Kearns & West), Amira Streeter (Kearns & West), and Grant Simmons (Kearns & West)

## Welcome, Agenda Review, Updates, and Introductions

Liz Mack opened the meeting and went over the proposed agenda.

## Feedback from I/RG

Liz shared the I/RG feedback to this work group. This included the addition of language to the Harvest/Hatchery Work Plan. This also included updates to the Recommended Action Form. and asked if there were any questions.

## Harvest Impacts and Connections

Guy Norman, State of Washington, then presented on Harvest Impacts and Connections. This presentation covered harvest management forums. Guy also went over management cycles and tools used for managing fisheries. This management piece included catch quotas. Guy went over how catch quotas originated and pointed out how they differ stock to stock and organization to organization. He concluded the presentation by going over the current harvest levels stock by stock by showing data from the recent Phase 2 Report of the Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force (CBPTF Phase 2 Report).

The group had the following discussion and posed the following questions:

- Question: Is there scaling of harvest levels where natural-origin fish are present?
  - Answer: Yes, there is but sometimes there is a delay in scaling to account for changes in natural-origin fish abundance levels.
- Members discussed the relationship between harvest conditions and hatchery conditions and how hatchery conditions affect harvest conditions over a sustained period.
- Question: Regarding the Summer Chinook, is there a reason they are labeled as a low size goal seeing as there is little difference between hatchery origin and natural origin?
  - Answer: They are listed as a low size goal with their current habitat in the Columbia Basin system factored in. They are meeting current goals and so there is no need for them to be anything other than a low size goal.
- Question: Is there consideration for the harvest of natural-origin fish in addition to hatchery-origin fish being a more common method for managing fisheries?
  - Answer: Yes, there is.
- Members discussed the importance of terminal fisheries and what entities are responsible for those.
- Question: Has the allocation of fish taken by tribes in Washington State changed recently?
  - Answer: We are not aware of any changes.

## Hatchery Management

Becky, Natasha, and Maureen gave presentations on hatchery management. Maureen Hess, Northwest Power and Conservation Council, shared that while Columbia basin hatchery programs primarily serve the purpose of mitigation, they are managed to achieve different objectives (i.e., harvest, supplementation, reintroduction). She introduced the presenters, Natasha Preston, National Marine Fisheries Service and Becky Johnson, Nez Perce Tribe, who described how hatchery operations are managed to minimize risk while aiming to meet both

mitigation and conservation objectives. Natasha described how Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans (HGMPs) are reviewed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) to ensure consistency of hatchery operations with the ESA. Becky described the implementation context of hatchery management by providing examples of integrated and segregated hatchery programs in the Snake River Basin and how programs are managed to meet harvest and conservation objectives. Becky Johnson showed a graphic showcasing the list of deferred maintenance at federally-funded hatchery facilities in the Columbia basin which accumulates to almost a billion dollars.

The group had the following discussion:

- Question: Was there ever spring Chinook production above the three mainstem dams on the upper Columbia?
  - Answer: Those dams were built in the 1950s, and when those three dams were constructed most spring Chinook production was lost.
- Question: Are the HGMPs designed to consider whether hatchery programs will rebuild populations?
  - Answer: Those plans often incorporate recovery goals into hatchery goals. For instance, in the Snake River Chinook population, we are incorporating both the recovery goals and goals that are in line with the CBPTF.
- Question: How often are the hatchery programs reviewed under the HGMPs?
  - Answer: NOAA often has various scenarios of production in their review process. However, a ESA Section 10 permit has a ten-year review process with annual reports included. NOAA may do a five-year review period while also accepting annual reports. NOAA tries to take the pulse of hatcheries on an annual basis.
- One member pointed out that there are areas of the basin where Tribes are unable to get their allotted take of fish even with hatchery production.
- Question: How long will the hatchery program last in Snake River?
  - Answer: The HGMP was released in 2018 and it is a 10-year program. The ESA Section 10 permit was acquired in 2017 so the program will reconvene and reassess in 2027.

## Gaps and Needs

Liz then introduced a list of gaps and needs for Hatcheries and Harvest broken up by type. She emphasized that this list came out of the last meeting of this group. Types included analysis/info needs, hatchery impacting wild stocks, infrastructure needs, maintenance, performance, management, and release/timing. Liz led the group in an activity to identify the most critical information and implementation gaps as well as needs and opportunities. She explained that these, along with recommendations from other efforts, would be used to develop draft recommended actions.

Liz then asked the group if there were other gaps that needed be added. The following were suggested by group members:

- Climate change impacts on hatchery production.
- Building new hatcheries.
- Implementing recommended hatchery reform actions at existing hatcheries.

Liz asked the group to identify the hatchery gaps and needs that could be developed into the first round of recommendations. She emphasized that they will first focus on gaps and needs that the group has general agreement on first and later move into a more robust discussion on the other gaps and needs. The group identified the following gaps and needs that could be turned into a recommended action:

- Scientifically valid studies to address impacts or benefits of hatcheries (this group to consider)
- Need to increase production or build new hatcheries (specifically for Upper Columbia)
- Overview of mitigation performance (meeting or failing to meet adult return goals), data showing release/return goals throughout basin
- Focused goals on adult returns

Additionally, there were two other gaps and needs that were identified to be considered after those listed above:

- For infrastructure, implement recommended hatchery reform actions at existing hatcheries (need to consider site specifics, what has been done and monitoring and reporting for adaptive management)
- For management, random vs. selective spawning of broodstock to improve age and survival of hatchery fish (some of this information is available and site-specific)

During this activity the group had the following discussion:

- One member asked that the group consider a wide range of scientific input when moving forward.
- Question: What is the difference of smolt-to-adult return (SAR) ratio between natural fish and hatchery fish?
  - Answer: Chris Sullivan volunteered to pull together some of this information.
- One member stated that scientists and managers have data or plans that address a lot of these items, but some of the group members are unfamiliar with the information. Another member agreed and pointed out that the implement hatchery reform at existing hatcheries gap is a good example of work that is already identified.
- One member noted concern that this group could turn into a platform where each member tries to advance their own agenda for hatcheries. When it comes to recommended hatchery actions, that is not a straightforward or given assumption. Recommended actions differ from group to group.

- One member noted that the monitoring and evaluation of actions is where this field is struggling. They shared that monitoring and reporting is a big gap that is fundamental to adaptive management.

Liz then went over the harvest gaps and needs and asked if there was any clarification needed or if any additional items that should be added to the list. The group had the following discussion:

- A member clarified that the information gap of recent levels of harvest supported by mitigation/conservation hatcheries in the basin should be clarified to state that this is relative to their mitigation goals.
- One member suggested a new coordination need: how tributaries are accounted for in the overall Columbia River data.

### Between Meeting Work

Because the group ran out of time to complete identifying hatchery funding needs and harvest gaps and funding needs, Liz informed the group that there would be some work to do between this meeting and Meeting #3.

Liz asked the group to fill out [a survey](#) that would be sent out soon after the meeting. This survey would ask members to select the hatchery funding and harvest need that they see as best suited to be developed into actions.

### Confirm Next Steps, Upcoming Meeting Topics, and Summary

Liz closed the meeting by thanking members for a productive meeting and asked them to prepare for next month's meeting.

Action items:

- K&W: Send PowerPoint slides as follow up
- K&W: Send needs and gaps document
- K&W: Send meeting summaries for September and October meetings for the groups review.
- Chris Sullivan: Share info on SAR between natural/hatchery fish with meeting