



Meeting Minutes

PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee

Thursday, January 17, 2008
Grant PUD SeaTac Office

PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Members

Kris Petersen, NMFS

Jerry Marco, CCT

Tom Scribner, Keely Murdoch, YN

Kirk Truscott, WDFW

David Carie, USFWS

Russ Langshaw, GCPUD

Carl Merkle, CTUIR

Denny Rohr, Facilitator

ATTENDEES: (*denotes PRCC HSC members)

Kris Petersen, NMFS*

Jerry Marco, CCT*

Tom Scribner, YN*

Kirk Truscott, WDFW*

Bob Pfeifer, WDFW

Denny Rohr, Facilitator*

David Carie, USFWS*(by phone)

Russ Langshaw, GCPUD*

Curt Dotson, GCPUD

Debbie Williams, GCPUD

Greg Ferguson, Sea Springs

Chuck Peven, CPUD

Distributed Items:

- **Section 10 Reporting Requirements**

Action Items:

- **Langshaw will contact Paul Hoffarth (WDFW), who is sampling naturally produced fall Chinook, after determining how many samples are needed per marking subset for otolith reference samples.**
- **Grant PUD will develop a SOA outlining the marking protocol to be implemented at Priest Rapids Hatchery.**
- **Langshaw stated Grant PUD would provide a presentation to the PRCC HSC upon completion of the value engineering study.**
- **Langshaw stated Lenz would be willing to do Section 10 report comparisons.**
- **Langshaw will provide net pen transfer information to the PRCC HSC at the next meeting.**

- Langshaw will provide net pen permitting timeline to PRCC HSC before next meeting.
- Scribner requested Langshaw provide more information on use of the CWT field detection wands on spring Chinook..
- PRCC HSC requires review edits and comments prior to White River/Nason Creek newsletter public distribution by Grant PUD.
- Scribner requested a white paper be drafted by the Hanford Reach Working Group on the M & E and the PRCC HSC is given the opportunity to review and edit the draft.
- Truscott requested Langshaw provide all HSRG recommendations pertaining to Priest Rapids Hatchery to the PRCC HSC at the next meeting.
- Petersen requested ongoing otolith monitoring be used to provide understanding of the direction for the M & E.
- Dotson stated Grant PUD will present to the PRCC HSC a water profile on Gloyd Springs at the next meeting; it will include flows, temperature, what volume is available at the site.

Decision Summary:

- PRCC HSC approves transfer protocol of White River spring Chinook F1s to Little White Salmon National Fish Hatchery.

Final Meeting Minutes

- I. **Welcome and Introductions** – Rohr welcomed attendees. Kirk Truscott introduced Bob Pfeifer, WDFW; he will be assisting Truscott on the PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee as well as other projects.
- II. **Agenda Review** – Rohr reviewed the agenda and requested additions and edits. Langshaw requested that discussion of Priest Rapids fall Chinook marking protocol, hatchery update, reproductive success, pathogens, non target taxa, and reference stream be added to the agenda.
- III. **Approval of Meeting Minutes**
 - December 13, 2007 – Approved.
- IV. **Action Items Review** – Members reviewed and updated action items.
- V. **Priest Rapids Hatchery Egg Update (Russ)**
 - A **Marking** - Langshaw explained that BY07 fall Chinook are currently being intentionally marked with a schedule of temperature changes to band their otoliths, and thermal marking will continue with each brood year until the Priest Rapids Hatchery M & E is finalized. Truscott questioned if all PRCC HSC members had been contacted regarding Grant PUDs decision to mass mark at Priest Rapids Hatchery, stating otolith marking is only a temporary solution. Langshaw noted that he

and Skalski are in the process of determining what a sufficient marking rate at Priest Rapids hatchery is. Grant PUD is currently evaluating past data to determine which marking protocol (CWT, PIT-tags, otolith banding) should be used noted Langshaw. Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC) uses PIT-tags and CWTs to mark fish of natural origin noted Langshaw. Truscott questioned what the sample rate of otoliths would need to be. Langshaw stated ten percent are being analyzed but that it depends on the objective and number of carcasses recovered. WDFW would like to process one sub sample of 40 otoliths before processing the remaining 500 otoliths that have been collected to date noted Langshaw. He noted preliminary results are expected in early February. WDFW believes otolith markings should be able to differentiate between natural origin and hatchery origin fish stated Langshaw. Petersen expressed concern with Grant PUDs decision to go ahead with otolith marking without developing a SOA outlining a concise process for approval by the PRCC HSC. She questioned what sampling level expectations are and if they would work at Priest Rapids Hatchery over the next several months. **Langshaw will contact Paul Hoffarth (WDFW), who is sampling naturally produced fall Chinook, after determining how many samples are needed per marking subset for otolith reference samples.** Petersen questioned if all of the otoliths collected from spawning broodstock would be examined, and when the PRCC HSC could expect the results. Langshaw stated that a subset of 40 is being processed for feasibility and the remainder would be processed if there are sufficient natural marks. Reference samples will be collected from BY07. **Grant PUD will develop a SOA outlining the marking protocol to be implemented at Priest Rapids Hatchery.**

- B **Egg update** - Committee discussed how surplus eggs from Bonneville would be divided among hatcheries, noting that Ringold eggs would be used for short falls in other programs. Langshaw stated Grant PUD sent a letter to the Corps stating that Grant PUD would not receive 1.7 million John Day fish from another facility into Priest Rapids Hatchery because of disease concerns and there is no contract in place. Grant PUD mitigation for fall Chinook will be short 500,000 eggs stated Langshaw. Scribner questioned whose decision it was not to bring the 1.7 million Corps eggs into Priest Rapids Hatchery. Langshaw stated the decision was made by Grant PUD with input from all agencies and tribes involved. Ferguson questioned if the botulism problem at Ringold had been solved. Langshaw wasn't sure but stated they need to take steps to ensure it is and that chlorine could be an option. Pfeifer noted

that live liquid micro organisms were used with success to remove botulism at the Tober Creek Hatchery.

C **HSRG review** - Langshaw stated the HSRG visited the Priest Rapids Hatchery on Jan. 16, 2008. He noted their recommendations would be given on Jan. 18, 2008. The HSRG should conclude hatchery data collection of the Columbia Basin by November 2008. A white paper outlining HSRG recommendations will be drafted upon completion.

D **Priest Rapids design update** - Priest Rapids Hatchery remodel designs are 90% complete and under review by Grant PUD and facility operators (WDFW). A value engineering design review will be completed by an independent engineering group in the next couple of months noted Langshaw. Scribner questioned if the value engineering group could give a presentation to the PRCC HSC when final review is complete. **Langshaw stated Grant PUD would provide a presentation to the PRCC HSC upon completion of the value engineering study.** Truscott questioned if WDFW engineering staff should review the designs now. Langshaw and Ferguson agreed the review shouldn't take place until the value engineering evaluation has been complete.

VI. **Section 10 Reporting Requirements (Ben)** - Petersen suggested other reports be looked at to keep content similar. **Langshaw stated Lenz would do the Section 10 report comparisons.** Truscott commented that the Section 10 reporting requirements are very clear as to what the report should contain. Truscott noted the 2006 Chelan report would be the best document to look at. Petersen stated one comprehensive report that includes a summary of results, methodologies, discussions, and annual program reports would make more sense than doing two reports. Peven stated Chelan PUD has written an annual report (2006) that includes permitting requirements and meets ESA compliance.

VII. **Nason Creek Spring Chinook Update (Russ)**

A Screwtrap operations - Scribner stated that Yakama Nation performs excellent maintenance on screwtraps in the off season, and they will take care of the maintenance needs of the Nason Creek screwtrap.

VIII. **White River Spring Chinook Update/Discussion (Russ)**

A **Net pens** - Langshaw met with Rick Halstead (park ranger for Lake Wenatchee State Park), and Chelan PUD staff on Jan. 14, 2008 at Lake Wenatchee to determine which launch method would be utilized to launch the net pens. Chelan PUD recommended the beach launch site would be the best. Other launch options would be by boat or helicopter noted Langshaw.

Truscott questioned how fish would be transferred. Langshaw noted that in the past a barge with a tank was used. It won't be available this year stated Langshaw, because it has been condemned. Truscott noted the USFS has a small landing craft that might be used. Langshaw stated he didn't want to transport fish in small tanks or have to move them onto a barge in small tanks. Langshaw questioned how to get equal dispersion from a transfer truck to smaller tanks. **Langshaw will provide net pen transfer information to the PRCC HSC at the next meeting.** Langshaw updated PRCC HSC on net pen permitting timeline, stating permitting is progressing without any issues. **Langshaw will provide net pen permitting timeline to PRCC HSC before next meeting.**

- B Tagging protocol 06/07** - Langshaw noted the White River spring Chinook tagging protocol was sent to PRCC HSC members after last months meeting. Langshaw stated 30,000 fish, 10,000 per ELISA group will be PIT-tagged. The major change for BY07 is to place CWTs in the snout. White River BY07 spring Chinook will be uniquely marked within the Wenatchee basin because they will be the only adipose present snout tagged fish. Langshaw stated changes to the tagging protocol were made to reduce handling of the fish and costs. Truscott wants to ensure sufficient adipose clipping rates to minimize collection of Chiwawa River fish. Peven clarified that all Chiwawa spring Chinook are adipose clipped. Methow fish are adipose present noted Truscott. Scribner stated he didn't have any problems with Grants tagging protocol. Petersen noted concern using field detection wands for snout tag detection, stating they are not 100% effective. Petersen questioned if use of an auto tagging trailer would result in less stress to the fish and how VIE tags work on Chinook. Petersen stated CWTs in the adipose fin may be the most cost effective way to identify fish. She questioned how much confidence you would have in detecting snout tags with a wand if the fish had no visual indication (adipose clip) present. Peven stated all fish should be scanned and PIT-tagged under other ongoing studies. Petersen agreed. **Scribner requested Langshaw provide more information on use of the CWT field detection wands on spring Chinook.** Carie stated USFWS has very good success using wands. Scribner questions if a tube detector might be more effective than a wand. USFWS finds tube detectors and wands equally effective noted Carie. PRCC HSC members will continue the discussion at the next meeting.
- C Genetics** - White River spring Chinook \$14,000 genetics contract is in Washington, D.C. awaiting NOAA signature.

- D **Action Item: Transfer protocol for move to Little White Salmon NFH. Approval requested. - PRCC HSC approves transfer protocol of White River spring Chinook F1s to Little White Salmon National Fish Hatchery.**
- E **Transfer update** - Langshaw stated chlorine will be used for effluent treatment at Little White Salmon National Fish Hatchery, noting Jacobs Engineering will design the effluent treatment facility. Construction will take approximately six months to complete.
- IX. **White River/Nason Creek newsletter (Russ)** - Langshaw stated the White River/Nason Creek newsletter had been approved internally by Grant PUD staff and was being distributed publicly. Petersen and Scribner questioned if the newsletter would be sent to the PRCC HSC for review, edits and comments before public distribution. Langshaw stated the decision was made to send the newsletter without PRCC HSC review because in the past, the PRCC HSC wasn't forthcoming with edits in a timely manner and didn't review the last newsletter before it was sent out. Members agreed if Grant PUD sends out a White River/Nason Creek newsletter without review by committee members, a disclaimer should be included stating the PRCC HSC was not involved. **PRCC HSC requires review, edits and comments prior to White River/Nason Creek newsletter public distribution by Grant PUD.**
- X. **Okanogan Spring Chinook SOA (Jerry)** – Rohr stated the SOA had received final approval by the Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee at their December meeting.
- XI. **JFP HGMP Meeting/Discussion**
 - A **White River and Nason Creek** - Truscott stated a meeting of the JFP scheduled for Jan. 8, 2008 has been rescheduled for Jan. 23, 2008. WDFW continues to develop Wenatchee basin wide White River spring Chinook management strategies noted Truscott. WDFW is working on a draft document to present to the PRCC HSC stated Truscott. Marco questioned if notice was given regarding the meeting on Jan. 23, 2008. Truscott stated the meeting is between WDFW and the Yakama Nation. Truscott stated WDFW is trying to decide what the best approach is to manage these fish including escapement and broodstock. Langshaw stated Grant PUDs concern is that the requirements for HGMPs are not being met in a timely manner because the JFP can not come to consensus. Langshaw questioned if it would speed the process if Grant PUD developed the HGMP based on their opinions of a scientifically sound program for submission to NOAA for review. The other co-managers could then come to consensus and participate in developing the final HGMP while it is in the NOAA review

process. Petersen stated members of the PRCC HSC weren't able to comment because upper level management is still working on it. The JFP still has the opportunity to meet, come to consensus and get Grant into the hopper stated Petersen. Petersen stated it wouldn't gain Grant anything by moving forward with submitting an alternative draft HGMP to NOAA, Grant will just have to wait. Petersen stated she started a draft document for JFP discussions that took into account particulars of the PRCC HSC members. She shared the document with the JFP, she's hopeful the work she did in concept will be included in the paper being developed. Truscott noted he has also had input on the initial drafting of the white paper. Scribner stated he will eventually be able to edit and make comments after he receives the white paper. Scribner stated resource management is the responsibility of state and tribal agencies. Then NOAA's role is to determine if it is consistent with ESA guidelines noted Scribner. That's determined by the co-managers of the resource, and NOAA stated Petersen. Peven questioned if the PUDs could go back to the resource managers and NOAA if they didn't agree with cost that could be incurred. Truscott stated the program has the possibility for a great amount of success, but it's taking longer to meet consensus because of a difference of opinion as to the best approach to the program. Truscott stated Grant should proceed with details of the HGMP that can be processed while waiting for the JFP to write their white paper.

XII. **Scheduling and Planning Review**

- A **White River HGMP development** – see discussion above.
- B **Nason Creek HGMP development** – see discussion above.
- C **Priest Rapids Hatchery HGMP/M & E development** -
Langshaw stated a draft Priest Rapids HGMP will be out to the PRCC HSC within the next couple of weeks. Langshaw stated he has concerns about how the Priest Rapids Hatchery M&E plan is developing. Initially the M & E plan was to be developed by Grant PUD in consultation with the PRCC HSC. The PRCC HSC felt other members of their agencies may be more familiar with the Hanford Reach so task was then given to the Hanford Reach Working Group. That group narrowed so that now Grant PUD and WDFW are developing the M & E plan. Scribner questioned if CRITFC should be involved with the development. Langshaw stated they are part of a similar more comprehensive group that is required under the 401. Langshaw noted the original concept of the M & E plan has changed since the PRCC HSC originally discussed the topic. He asked the committee to define the path they would like Grant PUD and WDFW to follow

in creating the M & E. Petersen stated she didn't believe the committee had given up their role in drafting the M & E. Scribner requested a tribal member be part of the group developing the Priest Rapids fall Chinook M & E plan. Marco questioned if there should be two different M & E plans, one for Priest Rapids Hatchery, and another for the Hanford Reach. Truscott stated the objectives in the draft should define if the program is segregated or integrated with supplementation by default. Peven noted that it is impossible to reach a goal if the objectives are not well defined. Truscott stated that wild vs. hatchery is the question and the committee's abilities to effect that need must be defined. Minimizing the impact of hatchery fish on wild population spawning grounds needs to be addressed in the M & E stated Truscott. Langshaw asked for clear guidance from the committee as to what the M & E should contain. **Scribner requested a white paper be drafted by the Hanford Reach Working Group on the M & E and the PRCC HSC be given the opportunity to review and edit the draft.** Peven stated that similar to the Turtle Rock program, operations are primarily set up to provide additional fish for fisheries. Monitoring is to determine whether you're getting enough natural broodstock or not and whether the fish are contributing to harvest. Most efforts should be directed towards producing enough fish for harvest noted Peven. Scribner questioned if the HGMP identified the program as segregated or integrated? Langshaw noted the HSRG visited Priest Rapids Hatchery on Jan. 16, 2007, he fully anticipates they will say the program is integrated and will require more wild broodstock. Langshaw believes the HSRG will also recommend all fish be marked. **Truscott requested Langshaw provide all HSRG recommendations pertaining to Priest Rapids Hatchery to the PRCC HSC at the next meeting. Petersen requested ongoing otolith monitoring be used to provide understanding of the direction for the M & E.** Langshaw noted his concern with Ringold Hatchery supplementing the same population without an M & E plan, stating M & E plans for Priest Rapids and Ringold Hatcheries should be consistent because of their close proximity and similar functions.

- XIII. **Summer Chinook HGMP development** - Dotson stated comments received regarding the summer Chinook HGMP are under internal review, and will be presented to the PRCC HSC shortly. Truscott questioned how the feasibility studies for Carlton and Dryden ponds are going. Dotson stated the Department of Ecology has proposed in-stream flow minimums and data (via installed pressure/flow sensors) is currently being collected for Chelan and Douglas facilities to evaluate whether the new rules will affect expansion at those facilities. Scribner questioned if over wintering is a viable option. Dotson noted canal

irrigation is the water source for Dryden Pond and with fish being brought in late fall for over-winter acclimation, de-icing could be an issue. Feasibility of Dryden Pond is still being considered stated Dotson. Peven stated Carlton Pond might have worse problems because there is not a deep water intake. Dotson stated USGS flow data will provide information regarding water flows during the winter months, along with Grant PUD installed flow data collecting sensors, to determine if ground water should be used for de-icing. Scribner questioned if the HGMP would lag because these questions are still unanswered. Dotson stated Grant is traveling parallel paths. Ferguson stated the HGMP won't be definitive as to where fish will be released, with Dryden or Carlton. Truscott questioned if agreements with other utilities have been drafted to provide long term rearing space. Dotson stated those discussions are on-going noting Chelan and Douglas have reserved (additional) capacity at these facilities to raise additional fish if required by them at a future date. An agreement between Chelan PUD and Grant PUD will look at feasibility after 2013 to make sure Grant will not impact Chelan's programs. In 2023, determination will be made as to Chelan PUD having to mitigate for more fish. Peterson stated the amount of time it takes to get programs online is an issue. Truscott questioned if pump test will be done at Gloyd Springs. Langshaw stated it was already done and the Kennedy-Jenks 2006 report can be provided. Truscott questioned if there is a volume issue as the aquifer draws down. Langshaw stated there is plenty of water in the summer, and the water permit for that site from the Bureau of Reclamation is for 20 cfs. The water pinch occurs in October when irrigation water is turned off for the season and the irrigation ground seepage stops. As water decreases, another place will be needed to continue rearing the fish. **Dotson stated Grant PUD will present to the PRCC HSC a water profile on Gloyd Springs at the next meeting; it will include flows, temperature, and what volume is available at the site.**

XIV. **Sockeye**

A NMFS Letter (Kris) – Grant PUD has requested a formal determination from NMFS on whether an ESA permit will be needed for the Okanagan Nation Alliance's 12-Year Experimental Reintroduction of Sockeye into the Skaha Lake program. Petersen stated that Grant PUD's letter is under review by NMFS staff.

XV. **Next Meeting:** Thursday, February 21, 2008, 9:00 – 4:00, Howard Johnson Motel, Leavenworth, WA