



## FINAL MEETING MINUTES

### White River/Nason Creek Working Group

Thursday, August 16, 2007  
Howard Johnson Hotel  
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	Chris Carlson, Grant PUD
*Kirk Truscott, WDFW	Mike Nicholls, Grant PUD
*Dave Carie, USFWS	Curt Dotson, Grant PUD
Keely Murdoch, YN	Dick Reiman, WFC
Greg Ferguson, Consultant	Denny Rohr, facilitator
John Soest, NCW Audubon	Julie Yount, Grant PUD
Paul Gray, Resident	Ben Lenz, Grant PUD (via cc)
Mike Kaputa, Chelan Co.	
Tom Clark, Advocate	

#### **I. Welcome and Introductions**

Around the room introductions were made. Paul Gray was new to the group and introduced himself as a long-term resident of the White River and property owner.

#### **II. Agenda Review**

#### **III. Review of August 15<sup>th</sup> Public Meeting**

Dick Reiman wanted to stress last night that it was appreciated that the offer was made to organize a policy review. He wanted to be sure to urge Rohr to follow through with this meeting.

Kaputa has had contact with Patty Murray and Doc Hastings regarding pursuing National Research Council review of the program. Hastings is in town this evening for a public meeting. Chelan County fully supports the offer of the upper

level policy meeting and pursuing an independent scientific review. He would like to see this arranged in the near future.

Soest wanted to advise that he was asked directly if further review was done at a policy level and then decision was made to move forward with this program, would he then support it. He stated the review was just one component of three concerns. He continues to have concern that this is a pristine area and the intrusion is still not welcome. Another concern is that over the last two years, he does not view revisions to the plans as major modifications and still has concerns over large amounts of concrete being involved in the process.

Gray stated he appreciated the invitation to the table to be involved in the program and understands his role as a major property owner in the area.

Clark asked the primary purpose of the policy meeting. Kaputa stated that the offer was made last night to invite upper level review of the program with local interested parties.

Gray stated he has no objection to increased numbers of salmon in the river, but questions the methods being proposed, such as releasing older fish. Langshaw stated there is no intent to introduce older fish. The fish will be larger but the same age.

Gray asked if the Tall Timber location had been considered as a possible location for a facility. Langshaw indicated that that location was actually the first location the group considered.

Gray wanted to know why we would not simply introduce large numbers of fry and simply let nature take its course. Clark responded that he personally viewed fingerlings being preyed upon by cutthroat. Truscott indicated that statistics have shown that fry releases have historically not returned adults. Clark stated that unnatural conditions in the watershed, modified from the way it was in the 60's. Other methods need to be looked at to make up for the changes.

Gray asked about the effect of boaters and rafters. Truscott indicated the educational materials have been posted to assist in educating recreationists. Clark encouraged the PUD's to continue further education of residents and public.

Kaputa wanted to clarify that it was his understanding that Rohr will be setting up the policy meeting. Rohr stated he would assist Bugert and will contact him to discuss details.

Truscott indicated that it was clear that supplementation is a sticking point with many individuals still at this point, and that other aspects are being pursued concurrently (habitat, hatchery, etc.)

Kaputa asked if a significant change would be anticipated from a policy meeting, or will we be in the same place. Truscott indicated he could not state a significant change will be made, but there is potential to affect program revisions.

Reiman stated he was of the belief that the interim biological opinion was written several years ago and based on perhaps outdated ideas.

Reiman stated he wanted to be sure that other alternatives were fully considered. Two that he pointed out were use of the Entiat Hatchery, and broodstock collection at Tumwater Dam, etc. He indicated he read the complete HGMP and had concern that the program was so very artificial. He stated a

concern that it appears that we are running out of reference streams, and it may just be that the White River should remain as such.

He would like to see that there is scientific backing though scientific review to support involving the White River in such an artificial program. He would like affirmation that the chosen alternative is comfortable with everyone involved. Reiman indicated that the county elected officials feel that they have been ignored, as the watershed planning work has been disregarded by NOAA and Grant PUD. Truscott acknowledged that the PRCC did not get off to the most appropriate start at the initiation of this program, but indicated that the county was involved in the Recovery Plan and a section within that plan addressed hatchery supplementation to achieve recovery, as well as habitat recovery and other concerns.

Clark stated that with respect to "science" it is often based on the opinion of the individual scientist. Politics becomes a part of the process and would not like to see this settled on a political basis.

Kaputa again stressed the need to not allow some of these issues to linger longer than they have. Truscott requested that concerns be formulated into agenda items to be addressed at the policy level review. Rohr indicated he also needed to put additional thought into how this will be approached, and will contact Bugert to discuss further.

### **White River and Nason Creek Activities**

Langshaw indicated that most of the activities were covered last night and he did not want to review if this would be repetitive.

Kaputa stated he had a brief conversation with Charity Davidson, GCPUD compliance, last night regarding the need to plan ahead for projects to be done this fall and winter which may not fall under the shoreline exemption. He wanted to stress that permitting can take several weeks to 4-6 months, so this delay should be considered. Langshaw indicated that there is no plan for overwinter acclimation this winter, and any other activities would likely be occurring this spring. Kaputa encouraged that information be submitted as soon as possible. Langshaw indicated last spring the net pen operation was covered under Chelan PUD's shoreline permit. Next spring the same operation is planned, with only a different launch site. He committed that he would submit the proposal as soon as it is put together. Soest asked if overwintering activities were covered under the current Section 10 permit. Langshaw stated there is not the intent to hold any overwintering activities under the current Section 10. This would require infrastructure that is not yet in place.

Kaputa wished to stress that cumulative activities should be looked into as this may trigger the need for a full permit, such as multiple net pens by Grant, Chelan and/or others. Langshaw indicated that the current plans for net pens fall under the permit limitations by the current Chelan shoreline permit, same numbers, locations, etc.

### **White River and Nason Creek HGMP's Review**

White River & Nason Creek Working Group  
August 16, 2007  
FINAL meeting minutes

Langshaw stated that comments were received by Chelan PUD as well as from the Wild Fish Conservancy. The committee has had little time to review the comments and make decisions on how to most appropriately respond. No major updates can be made at this time. A comment received last night regarding impact to Lake Wenatchee will also be considered.

Soest pointed out that the comments made by WFC are quite extensive and it appears that a good deal of time will be necessary to review such comments and adjust the HGMPs as necessary. Ferguson indicated that the comments made by WFC were not necessarily unexpected and careful review is being made. Some of their requests, particularly on performance standards, have been issues the committee has been working through previously. These are hard issues to finalize but the committee is committed to doing this.

Soest asked the relationship between the HGMP the new Biological Opinion. Langshaw indicated that there is not an affect on the new Biological Opinion with the submission of the HGMPs. The White River program is a small component of the full mitigation RPA's.

Ferguson stated it was important to clarify that the program started in the 1990's prior to the Priest Rapids Project BiOp. In 1995 White River population dropped to single digits, and the program began as an emergency action. Discussion was held regarding the ESA recovery criteria and spawning aggregates.

## **Summary**

**Next Meeting:** Thursday, September 20, 2007, Howard Johnson Motel, Leavenworth, WA.