



## **PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Conference Call**

**Thursday, July 11, 2006 9 a.m.**

### **PR Hatchery Subcommittee Members**

**Kris Petersen, NMFS**  
**Tom Scribner, YN**  
**Dave Carie, USFWS**  
**Carl Merkle, CTUIR**

**Jerry Marco, CCT**  
**Kirk Truscott, WDFW**  
**Russell Langshaw, GPUD**  
**Denny Rohr, Facilitator**

### **Meeting Agenda**

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Public advisory group concept
- III. Raising and rearing of mitigation fish at Wells and Methow facilities.

### **FINAL MEETING MINUTES**

**Participants: Russell Langshaw, Grant PUD; Tom Dresser, Grant PUD; Kris Petersen, NOAA Fisheries; Denny Rohr, facilitator; Dave Carie, USFWS; Tom Scribner, YN; Shannon Lowry, Grant PUD.**

#### **Action items:**

- Grant PUD will develop and distribute to subcommittee members a rough protocol outline for public involvement in the White River program prior to the subcommittee's July 20 meeting.
- I. Welcome and Introductions – Rohr welcomed subcommittee members to the call.
  - II. Public advisory group concept – A thank you letter to attendees of the White River public meeting was sent by Denny Rohr per subcommittee request.
  - III. Langshaw stated that an internal Grant PUD meeting was held following the June 22 PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee (HSC) discussion regarding public involvement in the White River spring Chinook captive brood/adult supplementation program. Grant PUD believes an open meeting atmosphere combined with public outreach forums, which would include residents of the Nason Creek area, would be a more appropriate way to involve the public than the possible advisory groups discussed at the PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee's

June 22 meeting. Scribner noted that subcommittee members had discussed having a separate public forum, because some of the frank discussions that occur at the HSC regular meetings may be compromised or hindered if they are opened to the public. The committee agrees that the White River process needs to be open and transparent to address the concerns of area residents. Dresser noted that Grant PUD had effective public involvement in its relicensing application process. Grant PUD staff believes such public involvement in the White River spring Chinook program can work in a similar way. Scribner suggested talking to key interested citizens about Grant PUD's open process and the subcommittee's concerns that open meetings may impede any progress on the White River captive brood/adult supplementation program, and using that input to make a decision about the format of public involvement. Carie agreed with Scribner, stating that too many people at a meeting could impede decision-making. Carie also stressed the important of public participation and transparency. Langshaw suggested discussion of the White River program be held during an allocated portion of the meeting. Scribner stated that a small advisory group allows for that transparency, and to have a role on larger scale public involvement. Rohr stated that any of the discussed forums would fulfill the need for public outreach, but noted that closing the regular meetings sends a message of non-transparency. Rohr also stated that if quality public outreach meetings continue to be held where people feel they've been heard, it is likely most of those people would not feel the need to attend the regular meetings, noting that such a protocol has been successfully used at prior PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee meetings. Langshaw stated that such a protocol would be acceptable. Scribner expressed concern about the added commitment of outreach meetings for subcommittee members would be difficult. Rohr suggested that it may not be necessary for all subcommittee members to be in attendance at each outreach meeting. Grant PUD will put together and distribute to subcommittee members a rough outline of a protocol for public involvement in the White River program prior to the subcommittee's July 20 meeting. Scribner requested assurance that mitigation would not be interrupted by any proposal for public involvement. Grant PUD staff noted that based on an internal discussions that there cannot be an "advisory committee" to the HSC, because of the definition of the term. Petersen noted that the term "advisory" has legal implications which is also problematic for NOAA Fisheries and agrees that the term is not appropriate, yet she believes there may be a role for a local focus group to assist the HSC. Petersen shares concern that progress on the District meeting their obligations could be impeded if the regular meetings are open to the public, but stressed the need for public involvement. Petersen noted that the greatest concern seems to be "What is it going to look like?" and "how is it going to affect me?" If those questions are answered, we may alleviate much of the public's concern. Petersen stated that while the subcommittee needs to make quick and noticeable progress in terms of outreach, to stay ESA compliant and make progress toward recovery goals, there are decisions the subcommittee must

make immediately. Petersen stated that Grant PUD must find the resources to do both in a timely manner.

- IV. Further discussion occurred on the status of the White River permit application to NOAA Fisheries. Langshaw noted that as the application is worked through, additional details and time have been necessary, but told subcommittee members to expect a draft in the next few days.

Rohr polled subcommittee members on their support of further exploring public process at the upcoming July 20 meeting. Scribner and Carie agreed, noting that PR is not the expertise of most of the subcommittee members, and that Grant PUD would be responsible for most of it. Rohr asked subcommittee members what they believed could not be discussed in front of the public. Dresser noted that there are sensitive issues that cause controversy among subcommittee members which must be worked through. He also stated that if the meetings are open, it changes the dynamics and the nature of discussion and decision-making among subcommittee members. Petersen stated that the committee works together to work out issues, and that it is most productive for the process to occur and then be shared with the public. Carie and Langshaw agreed with Petersen's comments. Rohr stated that a more detailed plan on public outreach will be presented at the July 20 meeting. Petersen stated she is unable to attend the next meeting, but the public relation's proposal should be focused on further outreach meetings outside the regular subcommittee meetings. Rohr stated he would provide Petersen with information from the next meeting. Petersen suggested holding outreach meetings in the Leavenworth area on the eve of subcommittee meetings. Dresser approved of this suggestion.

Raising and rearing of mitigation fish at Wells and Methow facilities – Dresser distributed Grant PUD's proposal and request for egg take in 2006: 200,000 summer Chinook, 100,000 steelhead, and 201,000 spring Chinook. Dresser requested subcommittee feedback on the proposal. Petersen expressed concern that the proposal does not identify a specific brood year and does not want it to be interpreted to a long-term solution to Grant's mitigation. Dresser noted that the Interlocal agreement with Douglas was put together in anticipation of the Biological Agreement and Salmon and Steelhead Settlement Agreement requirements. Dresser agreed to make it clear in the agreement that the proposal is for the 2006 brood year (BY06). Carie and Scribner indicated agreement as long as the BY06 is in the request section of the proposal. Dresser will send out an updated letter to the subcommittee following discussion with Kirk Truscott and Rick Klinge. Scribner noted his concern about reduced densities and BKD levels and how they may affect production levels. Scribner questioned Dresser on what happens if high BKD levels don't allow Grant to reach its mitigation requirement on spring Chinook. Dresser stated Grant PUD is looking for suggestions from the JFP. Scribner noted he asked Grant PUD for a contingency plan a year ago. Dresser

noted that Grant is actively searching for additional rearing space. Scribner stressed YN's stance on Grant PUD meeting mitigation requirements. Dresser noted that based on the requirements in the Biological Opinion, it may at times be impossible to meet the obligations; the White River as an example.