

PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee

Tuesday, May 8, 2007

3:00 – 4:30

CONFERENCE CALL

FINAL MINUTES

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:

*Russell Langshaw, Grant PUD	*David Carie, USFWS
*Kris Petersen, NMFS	Greg Ferguson
*Tom Scribner, YN	Denny Rohr, facilitator
*Kirk Truscott, WDFW	Julie Yount, Grant PUD
*Jerry Marco, CCT	Shannon Lowry, Grant PUD

Distributed items:

- NMFS HGMP Outline, Use and Purpose Description (emailed 5/8/07)
- NMFS Wenatchee Basin Spring Chinook Scientific Review Document (emailed 5/8/07)
- Revised draft of Greg Ferguson's HGMP PowerPoint presentation. (Provided via Grant PUD FTP site 5/7/07)
- Facilities Outline (guidelines, needs, next steps) sent by Greg Ferguson via email 5/7/07

Decision Summary:

- Committee members agreed to extend an invitation to the public to participate in a working group who would be involved in discussions on planning and development of HGMPs, but who would have no decision-making authority.
- Committee members agreed to temporarily hold fish at Eastbank until such numbers are collected to make transfer to AquaSeed feasible.

Action Items:

- Carie will look into having some bull trout information on hand at the public meeting.
- Petersen agreed to pursue a letter from R. Walton indicating the NMFS decision not to recommend ISRP or ISAB review.
- Rohr will review the Implementation Team and Advisory Group for the Upper Columbia Implementation Plan as an example of language to outline a working group's role and "tweak" language to meet needs of the HSC.
- Petersen to meet with Langshaw and Ferguson in Wenatchee on Tuesday, May 15 to define what topics each will address at the public meeting.

I. May 17th Public Meeting

- A. Meeting logistics, committee seating/attendance, overhead setup/screen - other?**

Discussed configuration and determined committee will sit up front. All members on this call confirmed their attendance. Lowry confirmed necessary equipment will be available.

Bull Trout questions – Carie confirmed he and potentially others from USFWS will be in attendance and will address any questions. Suggestion was made to have bull trout statistics available. Carie will look into having some information on hand.

B. Draft Agenda Review / Layout

Dresser suggested to Rohr (earlier today) that there is no need for opening comments – item should be removed from the draft agenda.

C. Discussion of the Question of Scientific Review

Petersen stated the decision by NMFS that there is no need for scientific review by Independent Scientific Review Panel (ISRP) or Independent Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB). The committee reviewed and discussed a draft document emailed by Petersen to the group earlier today. Petersen explained that at the last public meeting, individuals requested review by the ISRP or the ISAB. At that meeting, Rob Walton committed to look into it. Contact was made to interested individuals to invite them to a meeting on scientific review. Most did not respond to invitations. Petersen acknowledges the uncertainty of the program, but that scientific review would only reveal what is currently known. The proposed hatchery programs do not fall under the purview of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council, for which the ISAB and ISRP were formed. Hatchery Scientific Review Group (HSRG) review is scheduled later this year, as part of the Columbia River Basin Hatchery Reform Project. Scribner suggested that since the request was directed to Rob Walton, it would prove more substantial to have Rob Walton's decision regarding ISRP and ISAB review on NOAA stationery in official format to hand out to the public at the outset of the meeting. Petersen agreed to pursue such a letter, and intends to have her draft documents and the letter to hand out as a package. Langshaw suggested handing the documents out at the end of the meeting to avoid distraction. Petersen welcomed any comments or recommendations in finalizing this information. It was decided that the documents would be handed out as people enter the meeting.

D. Discussion of the Process for Public Involvement

Rohr – The committee has previously discussed having Hatchery SC meetings in the Wenatchee or Leavenworth area. The committee has also discussed having a working group join the meetings during set timeframes. This could be an item added to the sign-in sheet to indicate if an individual would like to be involved in a “working group” or added to an email list. Langshaw indicated he is supportive of such invitation. Peterson also agreed. Rohr will address the idea with Ron Walters to see if he would stand up and support such a working group. Truscott, Marco, and Carie all agree with this approach. Rohr stressed the committee would need to commit to having a working group participate if the suggestion is made. Must be able to make clear to the potential participants that the invitation would be to participate in *discussion* of HGMP planning/development and provide input, but the working group will not have decision-making authority. Petersen indicated that the latest version of the HGMP outline indicates (by color) sections on which the public may have input. It involves a large part of the outline – more than half. Petersen suggested looking at the draft Implementation Team and Advisory Group for the Upper Columbia Implementation Plan as an example of language to outline the working group's role. Rohr will review and “tweak” language to meet needs of this committee. There must be clearly outlined expectations for positive feedback, and not destructive force.

E. Other Agenda Items

Updates: Langshaw to discuss general activities occurring this spring into summer in the White River and Nason Creek. Ferguson inquired if siting and facilities discussion would be initiated at this point. Group consensus was that this would wait and fall under HGMP discussion, though not included in the PowerPoint.

HGMPs: Petersen to cover general overview of the purpose, use, and content of the HGMPs. Group reviewed the draft overview document and gave a positive response. Petersen again welcomed any input.

Petersen and Ferguson indicated the need to coordinate their comments. Petersen will be in Wenatchee on Tuesday, May 15 and suggested she could meet with Langshaw and Ferguson to define what topics each will address. Ferguson will be available by conference call. Rohr requests being notified so that others can be involved if they choose.

F. DRAFT HGMP PPT Review and Discussion

Ferguson provided an updated draft of the PowerPoint for review, sent out yesterday. Langshaw stated it looks good. Ferguson suggests that the agenda item be listed as "White River and Nason Creek HGMPs *and Facilities*." Langshaw suggested softening to facilities "planning" or "concepts". Members agreed to adding "facilities planning."

Petersen indicated the slide containing a project schedule is difficult to read. Committee agreed it is but it was appropriate to leave in, as it shows planning activities and complexity of the process. Slide 7 –Truscott indicates changing "near capture sites" to "within or near WR basin." Same suggestion on Facilities slide.

Slide 14 –Truscott suggest removing the slide with a track-hoe. Committee discussed the impression it will give, with the result being construction of natural ponds. Need to be sensitive to give the public accurate information. Ferguson will look for photo of empty pond with no equipment, but does not believe he has such a photo. Discussion regarding if natural ponds would be kept filled at all times (not likely). Petersen, Scribner agree to take out the photo with the track-hoe.

Slide 13- Truscott indicated that with the rearing ponds at lower site and outlined constructed wetlands, it would be good to indicate total area to potentially be involved. Langshaw responded it may be ahead of where we are to indicate such a number. There is a meeting scheduled with adjoining land owner to discuss his requests if this design moves forward as the slide suggests it may. The slide is intended to show potential benefits.

Regarding distribution of the ppt, it will be posted to the GCPUD website and Ferguson will have copies available for those that request a copy at the public meeting.

Ferguson suggested removing items A & B from the agenda "Current HGMP Status and Needed Information," and "Conceptual Design Discussion."

II. Questions regarding M&E in the HGMPs

Ferguson asked about detail regarding collection of data, objectives and hypotheses. Langshaw suggests speaking in generalities, outside of the objectives. Ferguson suggests copying information directly from HCPs.

III. Clarification of Timing and Transition from Captive Brood to Adult Based Supplementation

Ferguson - 2009BY would be the last egg/fry take, then 2011 would be the first spawning year. Releases are planned to occur until 2016 currently. When would adult capture then begin to occur? If the final egg collection is in 2009 then the final release from that brood would occur in 2014 with a majority of it occurring in 2013. Langshaw suggested taking out the 2016 date and identifying when transition years would be planned.

IV. OTHER

Holding Fry: Langshaw asked Truscott about a memo to be sent today regarding the near term agreement relative to holding some fry until enough numbers are collected to make transfer to AquaSeed feasible. Committee members agreed to temporarily hold fish at Eastbank until such numbers are collected. Chelan is agreeable to this arrangement.

Collection of fry and need for genetic analysis if numbers are above the anticipated quantity. Langshaw suggests collection at night, as numbers observed during snorkel surveys were dramatically different. Need for coordination at the smolt trap if fry are captured.

Facilities Report: was sent out by Ferguson this morning. He encouraged everyone to review and ensure the committee agrees on the content, locations, BKD issues, site options. Langshaw indicates he supports the document (if same as he reviewed previously). Langshaw stated issues recently have come up on Cascade Gardens property and limitations have surfaced. Ferguson stressed the need to focus on brood holding location and groundwater issues. For over-winter acclimation, surface water is needed. McComas site has the water availability – across the river is a timbered location, with same benefits, higher ground, but no contact has yet been made with owner. With regard to BKD, water requirements listed in the HGMP for high BKD fish are enormous (95 cfs). This needs to be considered. Truscott suggests it should be reviewed, as this seems like a very high number. Low BKD fish require 21 cfs. It may help to sort by individual programs, as not all would be coming from the same water source. Langshaw suggests BKD management needs be discussed in greater detail within the group. Ferguson suggests everyone should take a look at water and space requirements for further discussion. This document is not to be addressed at the public meeting.

Public Meeting details:

Truscott requests amended PowerPoint and agenda to be sent to Joe Miller and Carmen Andonaegui at WDFW.

Lowry inquired about the sign-in sheet. Rohr indicates she or Sarah Morford should develop the sheet with the working group participation and email group options listed. Richelle Beck to send invitation to thank-you email list developed following the last public meeting.