

## **FINAL MINUTES**

### **PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee**

Thursday, June 7, 2007

9:00 – 10:50

## **CONFERENCE CALL**

#### PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Members

Kris Petersen, NMFS

Jerry Marco, CCT

Tom Scribner, Keely Murdoch, YN

Kirk Truscott, WDFW

David Carie, USFWS

Russell Langshaw, GCPUD

Carl Merkle, CTUIR

Denny Rohr, Facilitator

#### **Attendees:**

Kirk Truscott, WDFW

Greg Ferguson, Consultant

Denny Rohr, Facilitator

Dave Carie, USFWS

Jerry Marco, CCT

Russell Langshaw, GC PUD

Tom Scribner, YN

Julie Yount, GC PUD

#### **Action Items:**

- Rohr will ask NOAA about the status of the TRT Scientific Review white paper regarding the White River and Nason Creek supplementation programs.
- Truscott still evaluating performance standard numbers (Truscott unclear which numbers) and how it should be approached; committee recommends that this be done before the draft is released to the public.
- Ferguson will forward updated drafts of the White River and Nason Creek HGMPs on Monday, June 11.
- Rohr will invite Sarah Morford to attend the June 21 committee meeting to discuss public interaction at public meetings.
- Langshaw will provide draft language for invitation to the June 21 working group meeting. Rohr will work with Morford to finalize and send out.

#### **Distributed items:**

- HGMP Comments and Questions - Ferguson (emailed 6/6/07)
- Additional discussion information regarding the June 21 regular hatchery meeting and the public meeting planned for July 19 – Rohr (emailed 6/7/07)

#### **Decision Summary:**

- Committee members agreed to move forward with an invitation to hold a public meeting on July 19, 2007, at the Lake Wenatchee Recreation Center, as previously suggested at the May 17 meeting.

- Committee members agreed to complete review of the draft Nason Creek and White River program HGMPs within 2 weeks (by June 22, 2007). New drafts to be forwarded Monday, June 11.

### **HGMP Questions: Greg Ferguson**

- Adding summaries to the start of each HGMP. Two conflicting objectives, to make them simple enough for the general public to understand, but contain enough information for agencies.
- Different format used, NPPC which Ferguson believes it is easier to read, and he is advised this is a preferred format. Ask that everyone review and advise if this is okay.
- Section 1.15 Are other alternatives being considered. Truscott indicates that NOAA was to develop a white paper. Langshaw indicates it would be very helpful to state what has been done, who did it, and alternatives which has been considered. Denny will ask NOAA staff today to see if a draft has been developed.
- What if performance standards are not met? Needs to be addressed – Truscott suggests it is contained in the decision matrix. The diagram answers the captive brood question, but what about other indicators, such as smolt survival? Ferguson suggested the need to just consider and be prepared.
- Section 10.10.2 – swamping of natural spawning population. Truscott has added some additional language to this section. There needs to be clear measurable standards and indicators. Truscott still evaluating the numbers and how it should be approached; committee recommends that this be done before the draft is released to the public. Looking at the Chiwawa program for reference.
- Rohr stated need to consider not getting ahead of ourselves, but need to ensure that the draft HGMP is complete. Langshaw questions putting off public meeting to August rather than July to ensure a good draft to review, Ferguson stated committee could also indicate in the document where there are areas that are still under review and are not complete.
- .3% return rate – questioned if this is from the Chiwawa data. Truscott indicated it was a number referenced in the BAMP. Need to establish reasonable SAR for this program, considering the lake crossing, etc. Scribner suggests need to tie to some reference material, be it BAMP or some other source.
- Section 2.2.1, “...separation from all other natural origin spring Chinook...” ACTION - Truscott will review the reference for clarity.
- 2.2.2 regarding stray rate – Ferguson suggests needing additional references and scientific citations in this section, regarding water supply in relation to homing fidelity. Perhaps reference summer Chinook overwinter study (Ferguson will review). Truscott indicates this may be WDFW unpublished document.
- 2.2.3 and 7.2 – Ferguson questions 33% natural origin collections from Chiwawa program. Truscott indicates ESA need to determine permit limits. Langshaw indicates permit limits will create limiting factor. Scribner indicates this needs more discussion and would be a good area to indicate this section is still under review on release of the draft. For White River Program, in order to use Chiwawa format (1/3 rules), there would need to be 100 wild fish to collect the 33 for the program. May not be able to meet the needs of the program, just as Chiwawa has had difficulties. Need agreement from the comanagers on a direction to proceed, which has not yet occurred. Ferguson suggests trying to identify a process to reach this decision. Scribner suggests this should go through the Joint Fisheries Parties for direction. Chiwawa was set up without the benefit of recent studies and new information. This program can be designed following review and consideration of this information. Truscott reminds all that adult collection will not occur until 2012, although the HGMP needs to delineate a plan. Scribner suggests simply

- stating the resource managers are considering all information and will make the decision jointly. Langshaw indicates this is also being considered by the HSRG. ACTION- Truscott will forward to Scribner some initial points to consider for discussion. Scribner suggests having this reviewed by Heather Bartlett first, which Truscott agreed.
- Attachment 5 – Chiwawa Protocols - Ferguson suggests leaving this out, because the protocols could be different. Truscott suggested instead leaving in the attachment, but simply removing references to broodstock collection protocols.
  - 6.2.4 – “Phenotypic traits ...” Ferguson states this needs a citation. Langshaw indicates this is an assumption which could be clarified as such. Scribner suggests that we refer to a west-side captive brood program to determine if this information can be referenced, even as unpublished data (i.e. White River on the west side, Twisp). Truscott and Ferguson will look for such reference.
  - 7.3 – Are F2s adipose clipped – NO
  - 7.4.2 – Fry per redd numbers conflict. Should it be 100 or 135. Langshaw indicated numbers were changed because production goals were adjusted. Ferguson will change this to “up to 135”.
  - Why have F2 releases been larger than 15 ffp. Langshaw indicates this is due to water temperatures at AquaSeed. Action has been taken (installation of chiller) and fish moved to Little White. Should resolve the issue.
  - 10.4 Nets pulled during first high water event. Language could be toned down to state nets “may be” pulled. Truscott indicates several factors are considered. Scribner indicates listing all the factors used to determine schedule to clarify.
  - Addendum A – 15.4
  - Tables need to be updated – ACTION Ferguson will send to Truscott those which need updates.
  - How to reduce the size of the document – Ferguson indicates that Petersen suggested taking out all redundant language and indicating “see section...” All agreed if it satisfies NOAA’s requirements. Remove the report on the Nason Creek captive brood program and indicate a short paragraph with a citation.
  - What is the White River escapement goal? Were Nason and White the same number? Truscott stated it may be listed in the BAMP. Where did the number 80 come from?

### **July Public Meeting**

- Meeting Date: July 19<sup>th</sup>  
HGMP schedules consideration. Ferguson indicates the next draft will be available early next week of both White River and Nason Creek.
- Location: Rohr suggests Lake Wenatchee Rec Center
- Meeting Notification: Needs to go out very soon if going ahead with this date. Should this be reconsidered?  
Ferguson suggests Facilities/Conceptual Designs would not be prepared at that time. Intent is to utilize the meeting to receive public comment on the HGMP drafts. Langshaw suggests it depends on the discussions during the June 21 meeting. Ferguson suggests that a cover letter be drafted to indicate the sections still under review, including facilities. Langshaw concern that it will draw undue attention and restrict parties from actually reviewing the rest of the document. Would be preferable to indicate within the document all the areas still unresolved.  
Discussed implications of pushing the public meeting date back to August. Langshaw indicates may affect the HGMP schedule originally set. Rohr states the July date was noted at the May 17<sup>th</sup> public meeting, so moving it could create poor impression. If the documents are ready for release to the public by the end of June deadline, Scribner and Langshaw indicate it would be a good idea to go ahead as planned. Ferguson stated that

Petersen has provided good comments, and edits by Petersen and Truscott will be incorporated by early next week. Substantial changes have been made, but if released by early next week, this will allow two weeks for committee member review (by June 22), then one additional week for Ferguson to incorporate comments received. The drafts will include notation in the sections that will continue to be reviewed by the JFP. Rohr clarified that if this deadline is met, we will go ahead with the July public meeting. Members agreed.

### **June 21 PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Meeting**

#### **Comments received from the May 17 public meeting:**

Langshaw indicated that the suggestion was made to have some training for committee members on public speaking and interaction. Suggested having Sarah Morford attend the June 21 HCP meeting to address some of the concerns. Rohr will invite Sarah to attend.

**Schedule 9:00-3:00** – Concern that the agenda will be quite full, Rohr questioned if anyone had objection to lengthening the meeting to 4:00. No objections voiced.

#### **Working Group**

Rohr reviewed list of individuals indicating interest in the Working Group. Thus far he has been contacted by: Tom Clark (advocate- Chelan resident), Steven Girard (Leavenworth resident), and Ramon Vandenbrulle and Nick Gayeski (both Wild Fish Conservancy representatives). Rohr had a call from Gordon Congdon indicating he will be decreasing his public involvement and allow Bob Bugert to get established as the CDLT representative.

Discussed the benefits of having a small working group. Discussed that thus far there is little involvement with area residents and it would be beneficial to encourage more to come. Langshaw indicated if a special invitation is presented to any, it would be best to send the invitation to the entire contact list. An email to extend the invitation would be most efficient due to time constraints. Rohr will send a notice to the email list.

Rohr suggested having the working group scheduled during a certain block of time. Truscott suggests having the Working Group at the end of the meeting so the meeting ends with that session. Members decided on 2:00 for the working group meeting to start.