

Columbia River Policy C3620 Five Year Review

WDFW Staff

Bill Tweit, Ryan Lothrop, Cindy LeFleur

March 2018

Columbia River Policy C3620 Review

- Overview of the Policy
 - Background
 - Objectives, Principles, and Provisions (Action Items)
 - Adaptive Management Approach
 - Comprehensive Review Provision

Overview of Policy

- Adopted in 2013, expires in 2023
- Culmination of several years and considerable stakeholder and agency effort, including the Bi-State Panel.
- Three primary “purpose” objectives: orderly fisheries (particularly concurrent regulations with Oregon), conservation and recovery, and economic well-being and stability of sport and commercial fisheries.
- In recognizing uncertainty in implementation, the policy was to depend on continued economic and biological monitoring, and rely on adaptive management.
- Designed to establish recreational priority for salmon and steelhead in the mainstem Columbia River.

Columbia River Policy C3620 Review

- Structure of review and evaluation
 - January 23 tasking (40 emphasis questions)
 - Data from the last five years, not all questions can be answered.
 - Supplemental staff analysis beyond the 40 questions
 - Advisory Body Comments
 - Detailed review of Analysis Report occurred at the Fish Committee Meeting Thursday afternoon

Structure of Staff Analytical Report

- For the five year evaluation, staff compiled a listing of all emphasis questions tasked on January 23 (40 items)
 - Prioritize them for this review in terms of resources necessary to address the questions.
 - Compared results from 2013-2017 with prior years, usually 2010-2012.
 - Collaborated with ODFW staff; joint development of data.
- Staff also added supplemental evaluation analysis beyond the 40 questions as appropriate for comprehensive approach.
- Detailed results in Analytical Report, which is a work in progress

Results Overview

- High Level Evaluation Questions:
 - Have the primary "purpose" objectives been met?
 - Have the principles been followed?
 - Have the action items (provisions) been accomplished?
- General high-level evaluation of primary objectives follows

Results: Objectives of the Policy

- Promote orderly fisheries (particularly in waters in which the states of Washington and Oregon have concurrent jurisdiction),
 - Performance Measure: Difficult to define ‘orderly’, suggest using changes in amount of concurrent policy and regulations.
 - Assessment concludes there has been a slight decrease in concurrent regulations from years before Policy due to differing policy guidance from OR and WA Commissions. Overall, a high level of concurrence remains.
- Advance the conservation and recovery of wild salmon and steelhead,
 - Performance Measures: Natural escapements and trends in pHOS.
 - Assessment: difficult to disentangle from other actions to reduce pHOS. Without consistent use of alternative mark selective gears, will be difficult.

Results: Objectives of the Policy

- Maintain or enhance the economic well-being and stability of the fishing industry in the state.
 - Performance Measures: None stated in the Policy, decision documents provide some metrics.
 - Angler trips by season for recreational fisheries, considering run size
 - Ex vessel value for commercial fisheries, considering run size
 - Assessment:
 - Additional analysis is needed.
 - Difficulties in measuring “opportunity” and “profitability” or sustainability

Results: Consistent Themes

- Recreational Priority? - Yes, management has prioritized recreational opportunity in the mainstem. Different mechanisms for spring, summer and fall.
- Alternative Gear development – Not fully implemented, several obstacles identified: “small mesh” problem, agency resources are tapped out.
- Off-channel fishing area development – No additional locations identified after thorough evaluation. OR production increases have occurred.

Results: Fall fishery issue

- WA guidance allows large mesh gillnet fishing in the mainstem for harvest of URBs through 2018.
- No alternative gear available for 2019.
- Decision point for the Commission in 2018.

Possible Next Steps

Today

- Questions from Commissioners on Analytical Report content
- Discussion of next steps

Future Commission Meeting

- Staff to provide balance of comprehensive evaluation
- Commission consider if adjustments to policy are needed or further adaptive management
 - Assignments to staff for further analysis
- Commission discussion about concurrency with Oregon

Possible Next Steps (continued)

Later in the Year

- Joint meeting with Oregon Commission to discuss concurrency
- Initial staff report on further analysis (independent of joint meeting with Oregon Commission)

End of Year Commission Meeting

- Consideration of adjustments to the policy and/or further adaptive management steps, including large mesh fall chinook fishery guidance.
 - Staff analysis report and Advisory Body input
 - Public testimony

Questions?

THE END