



**FINAL MEETING MINUTES**  
**PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee**  
Thursday, July 19, 2007  
Leavenworth, WA

PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Members

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

**Attendees:** \* indicates committee member

\*Russell Langshaw, GCPUD  
Curt Dotson, GCPUD  
Edrie Kelly,  
Charity Davidson,  
Julie Yount  
Denny Rohr, Facilitator  
Greg Ferguson, Consultant

\*Keely Murdoch, YN  
\*David Carie, USFWS  
\*Jerry Marco, CCT  
\*Kirk Truscott, WDFW  
\*Kris Petersen, NMFS (via conference line)  
Rob Jones, NMFS (via conference line)

**ACTION ITEMS:**

- Truscott will follow up with the USFWS office to clarify the interpretation that Grant PUD could have a take authorization for operation of the PRP, but not take authorization for mitigation actions for the Project.
- Murdoch suggested having additional statistical staff from WDFW and USFWS (Matt Cooper, Andrew Murdoch, Kris Petersen, and Tracy Hillman in particular) to better explore the issue of negative hypotheses assumption method in the M&E. Rohr indicated this should be added as an agenda item at the next meeting, with these additional staff invited (and any others who may be helpful). Langshaw will forward the HGMP document as well as the HCP document for comparison.
- Rohr will check with Sarah Morford at Grant PUD to determine if the public meeting location has been booked for August 15.
- Langshaw suggested re-review of his proposal on the reference stream issue. Langshaw will send Rohr a copy of his proposal for review again.
- Langshaw will submit a PIT-Tag study proposal prior to the next meeting.

- Regarding the fall Chinook HGMP timeline, Langshaw will review the fall Chinook/Priest Rapids Hatchery production timelines and construction schedules and provide information back to the committee prior to the next meeting.

## **I. Welcome and Introductions**

Rohr welcomed attendees. Charity Davidson and Edrie Kelly from Grant PUD's Licensing/Regulatory Compliance department were introduced and are in attendance to give a presentation on NEPA/SEPA process.

## **II. Agenda Review**

Rohr briefly reviewed today's agenda.

## **III. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

- A. May 8, 2007 Conference Call – Approved. Scribner forwarded approval via email
- B. May 17, 2007 Committee Meeting – Approved. Petersen forwarded approval via email.
- C. May 17, 2007 Public Meeting – Approved.
- D. June 7, 2007 Conference Call – Tabled for additional review time.
- E. June 21 Committee Meeting – Tabled for additional review time.
- F. June 21 Working Group Meeting – Tabled for additional review time.

## **IV. Action Items Review**

- Monthly summaries were sent by Keely to Chris Carlson. Chris forwarded them to Rohr, who forwarded them to the committee. Rohr requested in the future they be sent directly to him by Yakama Nation, to expedite.
- Follow-up and comments on the HGMPs were forwarded to Ferguson as requested.

## **V. Scheduling and Planning Review**

**A. NEPA / SEPA Discussion** – Charity Davidson and Edrie Kelly, Grant PUD Regulatory Technicians gave a PowerPoint presentation on the NEPA/SEPA processes for evaluation of projects to ensure that no permitting issues are left unresolved as a project moves forward. Kelly and Davidson reviewed the NEPA and SEPA considerations (cultural, historic, archaeological, aesthetic & community, and environmental) to stress that each aspect must be considered and reviewed.

NEPA and SEPA were compared and Davidson stated that some aspects can be piggy-backed, and stated at times the SEPA requirements may be more stringent than the NEPA pieces. Scoping is an example of a part of the process that would be combined for both requirements.

Ferguson questioned what the first step in the NEPA process on the White River program would be. Davidson stated the HGMP may trigger this process, with formal notice to NMFS, and NMFS may then determine that an EA is required, or perhaps an EIS. A letter to NMFS may also trigger the process, as NEPA is

triggered with notice to the lead agency, in this case NMFS. For the SEPA process, Grant PUD would be the lead agency, and information would be submitted to Ecology (WDOE). Discussion was held on the definition of the “lead agency” versus “project proponent” and who may have the authority to stop a project. Ferguson questioned if WDFW would have authority over a project. Davidson explained that WDFW would provide comments on fish and wildlife issues, but in the SEPA process, WDOE provides the final determination after consideration of the WDFW comments.

Clarification was made on Section 6 of ESA. Davidson stressed that Grant PUD is not a resource agency, and thus not covered under the Section 6 provision. Davidson also stated that Grant PUD is not covered if cooperative agreements with resource agencies were made to do the work under Section 6. Petersen questioned if this was accurate, as other PUDs do not follow this approach. Truscott indicated that as long as the take numbers do not exceed the overall provision between USFWS and WDFW, this should not be a factor. Davidson indicated if Grant PUD were to obtain written clarification covering this issue of cumulative take numbers, this would be preferred prior to using the Section 6 provision. Langshaw stated there is a bull trout BiOp which covers take for operation of the Priest Rapids Project, Priest Rapids Hatchery operation, and included acclimation and release, egg collection, monitoring. Truscott questioned how we could have a take authorization for operation of the PRP, but not take authorization for mitigation for the project. Truscott will follow up with the USFWS office to clarify the interpretation. Langshaw clarified with Truscott that he checked the bull trout consultation and confirmed Grant PUD submitted the supplementation plan, and were given incidental take on the White River program only, with additional consultation required for the other program elements.

Davidson went on to clarify exemptions under the Shoreline Management Act for substantial development permits. The County must still make this determination. The exemption is intended for improvements to fish passage or habitat only.

Marco questioned the timing of cultural resource surveys asking if it would be part of the EIS process, or when the agency seeks a cultural resource permit? Davidson stated it can be done at any time, and sooner is preferred to avoid a late “show-stopper.”

Ferguson asked again about next steps. He wanted to clarify specifically if the next step is to request initiation of NEPA to NMFS via a letter. Davidson asked Petersen what their formal trigger would be. Petersen stated the trigger would be the submission on the HGMP documents. Data collection can and should begin sooner than that. Once the HGMP is delivered to NMFS, they will then determine if an EA or an EIS is required to evaluate fully the HGMP. Once this piece is completed, the HGMP determination will be made by NMFS. Dotson questioned if it would be prudent to move forward with completion of an EIS in advance of NMFS determination if it is needed. Petersen stated that it was very likely that an EIS would be required for the White River program, based mostly on public involvement and comment to date.

Discussion was held on the nature of EA vs. EIS preparation. Rohr asked if Davidson could prepare a planning process to move forward with EIS preparation. Davidson stated that it would begin with a definition of the work, outlining: 1)

proposed action, 2) purpose and need for the action, 3) alternatives, 4) existing conditions, 5) potential impacts and mitigation. She indicates Grant PUD staff discuss this information at weekly meetings. Attention should be paid to data gaps at this time, determining where information is missing. Truscott points out that many components are included in the HGMP or the EA, but more site specific information will be necessary.

Marco questioned if an EIS can be completed without site specific information. Ferguson indicated his understanding is that you can proceed with NEPA evaluation without site specific data, but SEPA would require it. Truscott suggested carefully reviewing the EA to consider if each of the key elements are adequately covered (environmental, historic, archaeological, cultural, community values and aesthetics) to determine additional information which would be necessary to complete an EIS. The anticipated timeline for completion of an EIS is approximately 18 months. Rohr clarified that the committee should assume an EIS would be required. Any preliminary work would be beneficial. Site selections are necessary in order to move forward, and Truscott recommended making some firm decisions on sites and locations.

Rohr thanked Davidson and Kelly for the helpful information today.

### **B. White River/Nason Creek HGMP Development**

Langshaw stated the HGMP was posted to the Grant PUD website on July 11, and since that time he has received 3 general comments by email. He is working on responses to these comments.

Ferguson presented a series of questions which have come up during the HGMP reviews by committee members and on other HGMPs. His purpose in presenting these questions today was to simply have the committee members be prepared to answer them during public meeting discussions.

Some discussion was held on the use of EDT or some other evaluation protocol. Petersen indicated EDT was not necessarily available for this committee's use, but Truscott stressed evaluation methods will continue to be looked at to determine the most prudent method.

Another series of questions addressed what would happen if performance standards are not met. Murdoch suggested that many of these questions would be covered under the M&E plan which is still not developed. The specific questions may not be answered, but a decision matrix will be determined and outlined.

Ferguson indicated some refinement is required within the performance standard language of the HGMPs.

Discussion was held regarding handling of excess hatchery fish and the criteria for managing adults. The determination regarding productivity vs. abundance needs to be outlined. This is a case where best management practices must come into play, but monitoring and tracking of origin composition will be key. Ferguson asked what the ideal census population would be (currently set at 80 fish). This has not yet been determined. Petersen indicated she was not aware of a specific set number. Jones indicated for a population that is important for recovery, a sliding scale should be laid out to evaluate productivity vs. abundance. A critical threshold should be determined in order to determine the PNI objective specific to the White River program. Truscott questioned where data could be evaluated to make this

decision. Ferguson asked what the minimum number of fish to establish a viable population is. Murdoch stated there is information on viable populations with a minimum set at 500 fish, which is not realistic for the White River. Petersen indicated she does not believe that 80 fish would be the number of fish for the White River Program in order for PNI to be employed. Murdoch stated this should be looked at with relation to carrying capacity. A decision matrix may be the best approach. Jones indicates that a sliding scale would be useful, to set a viability goal, then once that is reached, begin consideration of hatchery influence. Marco stated this is a question for a geneticist, to determine a specific viability goal appropriate for this program. Jones indicated some of the Snake River programs have the sliding scale approach, and Petersen stated the draft modifications to the Chiwawa program would be useful.

Ferguson asks the committee to take a look at the binomial key to determine if it effectively describes the transition decision-making process.

Ferguson asked if the negative hypotheses assumption method would be correct for the M&E. Murdoch indicated additional discussion is necessary on this topic. Murdoch compared the approach for analysis framework in the White River program presented by Langshaw in his hypotheses statements to those in the HCP setup. Murdoch indicated Langshaw's approach is that of "guilty until proven innocent" where the HCP's are more "innocent until proven guilty." Murdoch stated that although it appears on the surface to be more conservative to the resource, this may not be the case. Her concern is that implementation may be difficult with regard to making decisions to modify the program in particular. Langshaw indicated he felt strongly that there is not enough evidence to assume no harm. Murdoch suggested having additional statistical staff from WDFW and USFWS (Matt Cooper, Andrew Murdoch, Kris Petersen, and Tracy Hillman in particular) to better explore this issue. Rohr indicated this should be added as an agenda item at the next meeting, with these additional staff invited (and any others who may be helpful). Langshaw will forward the HGMP document as well as the HCP document for comparison.

**C. Sockeye HGMP Development** – Rohr questioned NMFS response on the sockeye HGMP question. Petersen indicated she anticipates a final letter from NMFS indicating the Sockeye Management Plan would be adequate to meet the HGMP requirements. Langshaw questioned if this will trigger any permitting. Petersen and Jones stated no, they were not aware of any required permitting for the sockeye program.

## **VI. Review and Discussion of White River and Nason Creek Public Meetings**

### **A. Meeting Schedule and Logistics**

Rohr will check with Sarah Morford at Grant PUD to determine if the meeting location has been booked. The plan is to hold the meeting again at the Lake Wenatchee Rec Center at 6:30 pm, Wednesday, August 15.

### **B. August 15th Meeting Details**

Rohr questioned the group to determine what the goal of the next public meeting should be. Suggestions were:

- Presenting review and categories of HGMP public comments.

- Discussion of the process to answer questions on the HGMP drafts– not necessarily answering the questions at that time.
- Statement that we are evaluating the comments and give a general status.

Additional discussion was held regarding this issue. Decisions on how the comments will be processed, recorded and shared were discussed. The suggestion was made to simply list all of the comments with a paragraph stating the intent of the extra comment period was to assist in the development and finalization of the HGMPs. Direct responses would not be listed specifically.

- Cover the gaps that remain within the HGMPs.
- Stress that additional comment opportunities will be available during the NEPA process.
- Discuss the status of the HGMPs and next steps
- Discuss the Working Group involvement and acknowledge their input and changes made as a result. Rohr asked if there was a way to incorporate the Working Group into this meeting.
- Facilities planning update – Ferguson stated there are substantial developments since the last public meeting.

Jones questioned if the issue of independent scientific review would likely come up at the public meeting. Rohr indicated it may come up during the Working Group meeting this afternoon, and he is prepared to state that this would not be the correct forum. Jones clarified that he would then expect that the facilitation at the onset of the public meeting would state the specific topics **not** to be addressed in that forum, and set ground rules for the specific subjects to be addressed. He indicated it would be best to state that the individuals who would best cover other topics, such as scientific review, are not present to speak on this topic. Langshaw and Dotson stressed another avenue should be provided for such questions to be directed. Rohr asked Jones what the direct answer should be: Jones suggested stating we have brought together tonight individuals prepared to speak on the items listed on the agenda. Jones stated Congress has mandated that all hatchery programs be scientifically evaluated (HSRG). Jones stated that if continued questions on the ISAB or ISRP, have them contact the Council directly. Truscott indicated that at some point, someone has stated they have approached the ISRP and got the response that they would review the program, but needed to be invited by NMFS to do so. Jones suggested it may be beneficial to have the ISRP or the ISAB respond in writing as to what they can or cannot do with regard to the WR/NC programs.

Jones asked about the plan to do public notices or newspaper advertisement of the meetings. His concern is that there had been some contact to NMFS staff prior to the last meeting asking about the purpose or intent of the meeting. It may be beneficial to provide intent and agenda topics.

## **VII. Discussion of Invited Speaker for August**

Ferguson stated the preference would be to have Brian Kennedy speak to the group regarding stock identification. He is busy for the summer so is unsure of ability to attend.

### **VIII. Reference Condition Proposal from Grant**

Langshaw stated most are waiting on the HCP reference stream process to see how reference stream/treatment streams would be identified. According to the method used by the HETT, it appears there would be no reference streams identified for the White River. Langshaw suggested re-review of his proposal on the reference stream issue. Langshaw will send Rohr a copy of his proposal for review again.

There are good correlations between Nason Creek and the Chiwawa River, as well as the Naches. There is not any reference stream data available for juveniles. Langshaw stated there would need to be a bit of a leap with adult reference stream data compared with juvenile treatment stream data to arrive at juvenile reference stream assumptions. The proposal was to alternate two years of treatment with two years off.

### **IX. White River Update**

- A. PIT-Tag Discussion** – Langshaw will submit a study proposal prior to the next meeting.
- B. Brood Collection** – Grant PUD is setting up a contract to evaluation genetics. Petersen asked where the testing would be done. Langshaw stated he believed it was the intent to NMFS complete this testing to be consistent with the pedigree study done previously.
- C. F1 and F2 Rearing by USFWS** – The moving of broodyear 2007 eyed eggs to Willard is being worked out.
- D. Rotary Screw Trap Operations** – Murdoch reviewed the White River Rotary Trap monthly summary from June, 2007.
- E. Site Evaluation** – Grant PUD staff and consultants have identified five potential acclimation sites on the White River. Information has been supplied to the Grant PUD Lands staff to look into ownership issues and potentially make contact with owners.

### **X. Nason Creek Update**

- A. Site Evaluation** – Not covered due to time constraints.

### **XI. Priest Rapids Hatchery**

- A. Hanford Reach Working Group Update** – Langshaw has been working with Paul Hofforth, and Statements of Agreements are being developed to clarify some of the language in the Hanford Reach Agreement. Grant PUD is proposing an additional study for 2007 testing flows other than the reverse load factoring utilized under the agreement.
- B. Clarification of SOA 2007-4, Fall Chinook HGMP M&E Timeline Extension** – Rohr explained this SOA was approved at the PRCC in March. There was a question due to a wording inconsistency within the title of the SOA and the body text, if the SOA was intended to extend the timeline of the HGMP and M&E Plan, or the HGMP's M&E plan. Langshaw stated Grant PUD's position is that the intent was strictly for a time extension to complete the

M&E plan, because there is currently no timeline requirement for the Fall Chinook HGMP. He indicated he would not have consciously set a time restriction when there had not previously been one. Petersen stated she believed it was for both the HGMP *and* the M&E. Truscott stated he recalled discussion regarding the benefit of delineating a timeline for both the M&E and the HGMP. Langshaw stated he did recall the discussions, but did not recall supporting adding an additional timeline for the HGMP. Marco did not recall discussing a deadline for the HGMP. Murdoch stated she did not participate in the discussion. Langshaw stated that in a best-case scenario, additional production would not be on line for the Priest Rapids Hatchery until at least 2009. Langshaw indicated there is currently a time constraint on the summer Chinook HGMP that will not be met (August 2007), in addition to finalizing the White River and Nason Creek HGMPs. Adding an additional concurrent requirement for the Fall Chinook document is not feasible from a workload perspective. Langshaw asked what the priority should then be, summer or fall Chinook? Truscott asked for additional time to consider this question. The Settlement Agreement states Grant PUD will develop a schedule in consultation with the parties. Petersen indicated she reviewed a draft of the SOA from February which contains language she feels implies the HGMP and M&E were both intended for the timeline extension.

Rohr stated consideration may be made to identify a new deadline, to clarify this issue. Langshaw stated that within the scope of work for Ferguson, approved by the Hatchery Subcommittee, it outlined the White River and Nason Creek HGMPs being the first priority, summer Chinook being the next priority, and then finally the fall Chinook HGMP. The committee reviewed and approved this prioritization. This will have to be reevaluated if a deadline is enforced.

Langshaw further stated there are many unresolved issues (broodstock management, integrated vs. segregated, egg sharing) that may not be resolved even for the M&E completion deadline by December.

Rohr asked again if a new deadline could be determined. Langshaw stated he would be open to a new date being set if a reprioritization is completed. Truscott stated he would like to use the GANT chart similar to what was used in the development of the SOA in order to avoid setting back the end completion date. He suggested working backward from the set completion date in order to set a new reasonable time frame without affecting the final completion. Marco supported this approach, as did Carie and Langshaw. Petersen stated this approach would result in a time constraint for NMFS to process the HGMP. She requested additional time to consider this. Truscott indicated that NMFS would be consulted to set a reasonable time frame for NMFS consideration. Langshaw stated a concern with NMFS taking too much longer than 18 months may affect construction completion and production timelines. Langshaw will review the timelines and provide information back to the committee prior to the next meeting.

## **XII. Summer Chinook Program**

A. Update: further investigation is ongoing on potential overwinter acclimation at Dryden and Carlton Ponds.

**XIII. Next Meeting:** August 16, 2007, 9:00 am – 2:00 pm, location TBD (likely the Howard Johnson Inn, Leavenworth)