

**FINAL MINUTES**  
**PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee**  
**Thursday, August 16, 2007**  
**9:00 am to 2:00 pm**  
**Howard Johnson Motel, Leavenworth, WA**

PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Members

Kris Petersen, NMFS	Dave Carie, USFWS
Jerry Marco, CCT	Russell Langshaw, GCPUD
Tom Scribner, Keely Murdoch, YN	Carl Merkle, CTUIR
Kirk Truscott, WDFW	Denny Rohr, Facilitator

**Attendees:**

\*Russell Langshaw, Grant PUD  
\*Kris Petersen, NMFS (via conf. call)  
\*Kirk Truscott, WDFW  
\*Jerry Marco, CCT  
\*Dave Carie, USFWS  
\*Tom Scribner, YN  
Keely Murdoch, YN  
Greg Ferguson, Consultant  
Ben Lenz, Grant PUD (via conf. call)  
Tracy Hillman, BioAnalysts, Inc.  
Curt Dotson, Grant PUD  
Denny Rohr, Facilitator  
Julie Yount, Grant PUD

**Action Items:**

- Truscott requested Action Items be distributed to the committee members within a few days of the meeting.
- SOA 2007-17 Dotson and Langshaw will reword the summer Chinook HGMP time extension SOA to include consideration of the Settlement Agreement signature date and will forward a new draft to committee members.
- Truscott asked the JFP members present to commit to having an answer on whether facilities below or above Tumwater would be recommended for summer Chinook. Truscott will pursue a decision by the JFP by the end of August.
- JFP will review Entiat summer Chinook data. Carie will examine spawner distribution data if it's available.
- Ferguson will give the committee a summer Chinook facilities update at the September meeting.
- Langshaw indicated that the (spring Chinook) M&E Plan would be discussed internally within Grant for consideration of rewording some of the hypothesis statements.
- Discussion will be necessary between Grant and YN staff regarding Grant PUD's coho obligation. Changes can be made to the language of SOA 2007-16, then emailed to the committee members for approval.
- Ferguson will work on a draft response to Wild Fish Conservancy HGMP comments received and work with Langshaw to assist in a final draft.
- The committee members will consider the HGMP comments one by one for evaluation and appropriate modifications to the HGMPs. Ferguson will send out key points for consideration.

PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee  
August 16, 2007  
FINAL meeting minutes

- Petersen will pursue internally a response on the Sockeye HGMP question and reply back to the group.
- Petersen will pursue internally a response on the Fall Chinook HGMP/M&E extension question and reply back to the group.

**Distributed Items:**

- SOA 2007-17 Summer Chinook HGMP Development Time Extension #2
- SOA 2007-16 Grant PUD's Coho Obligation

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

**II. Agenda Review**

Rohr briefly reviewed the day's agenda.

**III. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

**June 7, 2007 Conference Call**, deferred from last mtg:

Truscott recommended the following edits/comments: Second Action Item performance standard number was not listed, so uncertain if this was complete.

Within the HGMP questions, last bullet, should be ESA permit limits, not HCP.

**June 21, 2007 Committee Meeting**, approved.

**July 9, 2007 Conference Call** – not yet distributed.

**July 19, 2007 Committee Meeting and Working Group**– not distributed to group.

**IV. Action Items Review**

Rohr indicated all action items from the last meeting were contained within the agenda today so no need for review.

Truscott requested that an Action Item list be forwarded to the committee within a few days of the meeting, not held until the minutes go out for review.

**V. Summer Chinook Program**

**A. Entiat**

Truscott reviewed spawning ground data in the Entiat and spawning overlap with spring Chinook. He provided this data to the JFP and asked for review and input on the data. No response has been received yet. Carie and Scribner indicated they would look at it. Truscott indicated there was significant overlap of reaches. Carie indicated there is no GPS data on summer Chinook, but do have GPS on springers. Truscott indicated summers were supported much more by natural origin fish, rather than hatchery origin. Truscott indicated consideration should be given to methods to remove hatchery origin fish from the spawning grounds.

Murdoch asked about the distribution data by origin, if it is available. Carie indicated he would look up this data. She wanted to know if the overlap was occurring in the lower areas, which would then become less of an issue with the discontinuation of hatchery introduction.

**B. Program Goals**

Truscott indicated that original intent was to plan for production plus 10%. Rohr asked if specific goals had been set for the program. Langshaw indicated no specific goals were set, Truscott indicated the overall goal was to achieve NNI. The goals and objectives will be set within the HGMP. Langshaw stated discussion on goals needs to be completed regarding productivity, segregation, conservation, etc. Marco indicated the Chief Joseph Hatchery (CJH) program goals depend on how you look at the groups of fish being considered within the program.

Langshaw then stated the group needs to determine if the HGMP will consider the full 833,000 fish, or if the Okanogan portion are to be covered under the CJH HGMP. Marco indicated all 833,000 fish should be considered within the HGMP, and to include portions of the HGMPs from the HCP programs. Goals and objectives for the HCP programs are contained within the M&E's.

Ferguson asked if there would be an objection to not including Grant PUD's Okanogan fish in CJH harvest objective. Truscott and Scribner stated they would agree this is acceptable, but there would be M&E harvest objectives targeting supplementation fish.

#### **C. SOA 2007-17 Summer Chinook HGMP Development Time Extension #2**

Dotson explained this SOA involves a 6-month time extension. The previous extension was through August 14, 2007. The language of SOA 2007-17 contains the same language as the previous extension, with only date changes.

Marco asked how the extension affects the overall schedule. Dotson stated the SOA reflects that no effect to the overall schedule is proposed, only a matter of paperwork as it is clear the HGMP is not yet complete and the prior extension was not met. Scribner asked for clarification on how the delayed HGMP submittal may affect the overall timeline. Dotson indicated that even if the HGMP were not extended, the timeline for site evaluation, permitting, facility design, etc. will take a minimum of 5 years (2012). Grant PUD continues to move forward with those planning elements following the issuance of the Settlement Agreement, but admits that meeting the timelines set in that Agreement are becoming more difficult. Langshaw pointed out, however, that the summer Chinook HGMP will not require the additional informal public review like the White River and Nason HGMPs have. It will be written and submitted, then follow the standard HGMP process and should move then more quickly.

Scribner requested that within the SOA the last sentence of paragraph 2 be stricken. He would like to see the statement "*They [HSC] do however recognize that the schedule may need to be revisited in the future*" removed. He would like to keep optimistic that the schedule can be met and not plan for additional delays at this juncture.

Langshaw and Dotson agree to striking that sentence. All committee members agreed. Scribner indicated at some time in the future if a schedule change should become necessary, this can be revisited.

Marco requested that the first paragraph be revised to state a specific date such as "...agrees to extend the timeline for the completion of an HGMP to February 29, 2008." Scribner asked if the date of the submittal to NOAA should be indicated. Dotson expressed concern that if the draft is complete but the committee review is not complete at that time it would be difficult to discern the submittal date. Langshaw suggested stating that "*the final draft would be submitted to the committee for review and approval no later than February 1.*" This would allow Ferguson time for review and incorporation of comments. Ferguson stated that the HGMP will be fairly complex due to the involvement of 3 watersheds.

Truscott indicated that the SOA suggests that delaying the HGMP for another 6 months pushes the overall schedule out by a year. This results in bumping production out to 2013. Dotson responded that if the HCP program is planning for up to possibly a 50% reducing in their hatchery requirements in 2013 and if Grant PUD is scheduled for full production in 2013, one possibility for use of production facilities would be to make use of those facilities not in full production due to being reduced in the HCP programs in 2013. Knowing that the HCP reduction in 2013 isn't guaranteed, Grant is currently working on the planning components of additional facilities to meet Grant's obligations, which would accelerate the schedule... Truscott stated he realizes that internal planning has likely been occurring but this is a risk that Grant PUD has to assume.

Ferguson stated that this discussion should be delayed until the full plan is completed and can be presented as a sequential plan to the group. Grant PUD is not necessarily doing this planning sequentially, but rather completing tasks in parallel.

Langshaw stated that he is comfortable with adding language to clarify the original timeline. He agreed some language stating the HSC approval is to be complete by one year from the February 6 signing date could be added. Ferguson asked how a potential 3-year review by NOAA would affect the program. He did stress that site selection is ongoing at this time, not waiting until after the HGMP completion.

Scribner suggested to tighten the timeline, language should be added to indicate the overall timeline is based upon the signing of the Settlement Agreement, not approval of the HGMP.

Dotson and Langshaw will reword the SOA to include consideration of the Settlement Agreement signature date and will forward a new draft to the group.

#### **D. Location of Summer Chinook Acclimation Sites**

Langshaw indicated discussion needs to occur regarding Wenatchee and Methow acclimation locations. Scribner asked what the response would be to a request for multiple sites rather than single

point releases. Langshaw indicated he would like to see justification for the request, but would certainly consider this if it makes sense biologically. Langshaw indicated it was his understanding that Dryden was selected to segregate hatchery fish from wild fish (generally upstream) and that releases below Tumwater have not appeared to be effective at segregating hatchery and wild fish.. Truscott indicated the HCP objective has not been to segregate wild and hatchery fish. Consideration would need to be given to the abundance of wild summers above Tumwater, and abundance of spawners at Dryden. Hillman presented data on redd counts in the Wenatchee reaches. Hillman stated that reaches below Leavenworth are considerably more sparse than those above Tumwater. Truscott indicated that wild fish predominately spawn in the upper reaches, but hatchery fish spawn in lower reaches. Hillman presented HCP data which indicated hatchery fish spawn predominantly in the reach immediately downstream of Tumwater Canyon. Murdoch had concerns regarding historical distribution of summer Chinook, that virtually no summer Chinook spawned above Tumwater prior to the last few years. It appears that an adaptation is occurring with wild fish. This demonstrates an increased the risk of potential impacts to listed species. Langshaw and Carie agreed with this assessment.

Rohr asked how consideration of the three separate reaches would be done.

Ferguson indicated that decisions would need to be made regarding the feasibility of constructing a large facility above Tumwater. Would the water intake be feasible, permitting, etc?

Truscott indicated a primary concern had to do with lack of over-winter acclimation. Ferguson then stated the impact resulting from over-winter acclimation on adult returns and abundance would need to be addressed.

Rohr stated that questions need to be outlined and a forum to answer these questions established. Ferguson indicated questions can be sent out one by one via email for response from the group.

Murdoch suggested that facility operations could dictate how and where fish are acclimated. If higher releases are desired, fish could be trucked upstream.

Langshaw pointed that we are currently six months into the site selection/evaluation timeline and a decision on upstream or downstream location has not been established. Langshaw indicated a decision has not yet been made on whether joint facilities will be feasible, so work continues on planning for separate facilities.

Truscott asked the JFP members present to commit to having an answer on whether facilities below or above Tumwater would be recommended. Marco stated that at this time, he would recommend below Tumwater with the option to move fish above if necessary via truck planting or remote acclimation sites. Scribner would need additional time to consider this. Truscott will pursue a decision by the JFP by the end of August. This will then lead to an SOA for facilities planning.

#### **E. Facilities Update: Overwinter acclimation at Dryden and Carlton Ponds**

Dotson indicated there are issues with water flow at Dryden and restraints on water access and timing issues on flows/permitting. Truscott stated an assumption that the facility would be non-consumptive. If a new diversion site would be necessary, consideration should be given to pumping water back to the original diversion site. Truscott asked about feasibility of using the canal during winter months after ice-out. Jacobs is currently working on de-icing considerations for intake screens. Ferguson indicates a lot of work is still necessary in analyzing this site.

Ferguson stated an intent to give the committee a facilities update at the September meeting. Information on Carlton Ponds is not yet ready for discussion.

#### **VI. M&E Discussion:**

Murdoch stated Tracy Hillman was invited today to address concerns about the hypotheses statements presented by Langshaw and the “guilty until proven innocent” approach. She indicated her concern with the lack of statistical power and stated a strong desire to develop a red-flag system similar to that of the HCP program. Murdoch indicated a concern with deciding what point decisions on harm, no harm, etc. are made within the current format. Langshaw stated there is a lack of evidence to begin with an innocent until proven guilty approach. There is a burden of proof upon the M&E program and hypotheses testing. Murdoch indicates that it will take decades to obtain the statistical power to prove these hypotheses. She does not see the benefit to the resource with this approach, without a strong red-flag system.

Hillman discussed how the HETT approached this idea and looked at the basic statistical analysis of hypotheses as they related to hatchery programs. He explained that a decision need to be made that either the group wants to start from the perspective that we have had an effect on wild productivity, and want to prove that we can accomplish restoration; or we want to maintain productivity and affect the distribution. Or we start with a program that proves that hatchery fish have a detrimental effect on wild productivity, and strive for no effect on wild fish. Hillman stressed that rejecting then null hypotheses either way is accomplished by assessing the same data.

Murdoch had a concern that the current format of 'guilty until proven innocent' only opens the door for external groups to point to potential detrimental effects. Hillman indicated that under each of the formats, critics will be looking at the same data sets and still be critical if that is their intent Grant's program may appear then more proactive in reacting to effects.

Murdoch indicated she has expressed her concerns and now would leave it up to the committee to determine if coverage is made within the M&E's.

Rohr asked for next steps. Scribner suggested developing a table (matrix) for when management actions should be taken. Hillman suggested that the decision criteria would be more restrictive under the proposed hypotheses statements in order to better protect the resource. Truscott questioned how more restrictive decision criteria should be used if the same statistical power is used under the HCP M&E's and Grant's.

Hillman indicated that his impression is that Grant's proposed M&E program appears to involve more intensive monitoring than the Chelan program. Langshaw responded that it's not necessarily more intensive because only so many redd surveys, for example, can be conducted.

Truscott indicated he is having difficulty in pointing in the direction with hypotheses statements that show damage to the resource and how policy folks will react to this approach. He believes this may result in policy changes before statistical power is established.

Petersen agreed with Murdoch's assessment and suggested that the JFP may want to look at the wording of the M&E plan as Murdoch indicates this program casts a negative light on hatchery programs. The way the wording is now she believes that policy staff at NOAA would have difficulty accepting this plan. She asked if it was worth going to battle over agency policy. Truscott agreed that changes should be made. Marco stated he does have issues with the wording from a policy perspective in focusing on detrimental effects. Carie indicated he would tend to agree he has concern over the negativity of the statements but would need to discuss this with other internal staff.

Lenz stated that other approaches should be considered at a policy level. Petersen stated again that with either approach, the same data is collected.

Scribner expressed appreciation of the information presented by Hillman. He does agree there is issue with the negative approach. Murdoch pointed out that a matrix should be developed and that red-flags could be set more restrictively in the Grant PUD program than those utilized by Chelan. Hillman stated that statistics will always be seen in a negative light, but a decision matrix showing reaction to data will demonstrate positive management decisions.

Rohr asked how Langshaw would react to this assessment. Langshaw indicated this would be discussed internally. Based on what was stated today, he would consider rewording some of the statements. Truscott pointed out this is a 5-year M&E plan, and can be revisited.

## **VII. SOA 2007-16, PRCC and PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee SOA on Grant PUD's Coho Obligation**

Petersen wanted to clarify point #8. She suggested that the reference to evaluation in 2017 should potentially be removed. Scribner suggested instead that the portion "...for consistency with the ESA" be removed. Petersen agreed this would correct her concern.

Scribner suggested under item #1 changing the last sentence to change "may be" to "will be" and add "if consistent with the YN Master Plan." Under item #5-i, add "facilities," after "hatchery performance, ". Under item #6, add "through 2017" after "negotiated".

Petersen asked what survival standards were intended under item #6. Item 4 indicates no survival studies would be required, so this creates a potential conflict.

Langshaw indicated a question came up yesterday regarding Grant PUD's meeting their coho obligation. Discussion will be necessary between Grant and YN staff. Changes can be made to the language, then emailed to the group for approval.

## **VIII. Scheduling and Planning Review**

### **A. White River/Nason Creek HGMP**

Ferguson reviewed comments received on the HGMPs. One response was received from the public, from the Wild Fish Conservancy (WFC). He reviewed the key points from their response:

- Supplementation involved inappropriate level of risk
- Assertion that supplementation will avoid immediate extinction is not supported
- Large smolt size
- Adult management does not eliminate impacts to wild population.
- Program duration is not clearly identified.
- Performance standards are not quantitative.
- Use of the watersheds as reference streams would be eliminated.
- Supplementation should be more fully evaluated before new projects are initiated.
- Conflicting obligation – recovery and mitigation.

Ferguson stated that all of these points, except from the last, come from comments to other HGMPs the WFC has previously made. Discussion was held regarding the type of response to send to commenters. Ferguson will draft the response and work with Langshaw to assist in a final draft. The group will take the comments one by one for evaluation and appropriate modifications to the HGMPs. Ferguson will send out key points for consideration via email.

Ferguson then reviewed key concerns from Chelan PUD's comment letter:

- VSP recovery criteria
- Long-term impacts of supplementation
- Percentage of fish with high levels of BKD
- Spawning ground adjustments
- Large size of hatchery smolts
- Annual adjustments to the hatchery program
- Experimental approach for Nason Creek.

Truscott stated that individual responses to each comment received were not required, but the committee would use the comments submitted as a basis for any necessary changes to the draft HGMPs. Any changes would be reflected in the final HGMPs submitted to NOAA. Committee members agreed.

### **B. Sockeye HGMP Development**

Rohr asked Petersen of the status of a NOAA response to the letter Grant had sent requesting a concurrence letter from NOAA regarding this subject. Petersen stated she is waiting for a response internally on this question and she will pursue it further.

### **C. Priest Rapids Hatchery HGMP Development & Clarification of SOA 2007-4, Fall Chinook HGMP M&E Timeline Extension**

Petersen has asked for some input internally and has not yet received anything. She will pursue it further.

### **D. Summer Chinook HGMP Development (covered above)**

(Adjourned for PRCC Hatchery SC Working Group Session)

## **IX. Priest Rapids Hatchery**

### **A. Update of facility design**

Chris Carlson and Mike Nicholls entered the afternoon portion of the meeting (postponed until after the Working Group) to discuss updates to the PR Hatchery. Carlson and Mike Nicholls presented a PowerPoint with key points on the expansion and renovation. Carlson indicated that the modifications have been reviewed with Mike Lewis of WDFW and current hatchery staff for recommendations and input.

Particular attention was paid to the adult trap and holding ponds. Concern was expressed regarding holding pond depth and flow during adult fish holding and also during crowding and spawning activities. Carlson stated that there should be no problems because hatchery staff can regulate numbers of fish being held and holding conditions during the sorting period. The Committee inquired upon hatchery staff safety while working at the adult facilities. Nicholls assured the committee members that all OSHA and WSHA standards have been considered and will be met.

Nicholls indicated that this review is very brief, but intended to show the committee plans are moving forward and progress is being made. Additional work is still necessary, particularly with the handling John Day mitigation fish as well as the Klickitat Hatchery fish. These will dictate the number of adult fish required for holding and final facilities design.

Discussion was held regarding the predation cover over the rearing ponds, currently shown with chain link fencing over a domed frame. Ferguson asked if snow load and ice accumulation were considered. Nicholls stated yes, ice rating for the location is specified at 1/8 inch. Ferguson noted that a similar design had failed under snow load. Nicholls indicated that the design would be consistent with local requirements.

Release channel sections were discussed. Because of the very gradual slope, short orifice walls are planned intermittently to create artificial ponds and facilitate slow, low fish stress progress toward the spawning channel that empties into the Columbia River. Truscott expressed concern regarding the placement of repetitive obstacles and the possibility of impingement or descaling. Carie expressed the need for the orifice walls to be constructed of a smooth material. Options were discussed, such as having the orifice walls extend to the bottom of the channel, then having a v-notch at the top. Nicholls explained that the walls will not be extended to the bottom to allow for passage below the walls and to avoid standing or stagnant water behind the walls during low flows. Carlson explained the release system was designed to be self regulating in depth and the bottom orifices allow the fish to be flushed out below the walls and not become stuck during a low flow. The Committee concluded the designs as acceptable.

Truscott expressed appreciation for allowing review by Lewis prior to review by the committee, so that all involved are well informed of changes being considered.

**X. Next Meeting:** September 20, 2007, 9:00 am – 2:00 pm, Leavenworth Howard Johnson Motel  
Adjourned, 4:35 pm