



## Meeting Minutes

### PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee

Thursday, February 21, 2008

Leavenworth, WA

Howard Johnson Motel Conference Room

#### **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)**

---

Lynn Hatcher, NMFS\*

Jerry Marco, CCT\*

Tom Scribner, YN\*(by phone)

Keely Murdoch, YN\*

Greg Ferguson, Sea Springs, Inc.

Chris Carlson, GCPUD (by phone)

David Carie, USFWS\*

Russ Langshaw, GCPUD\*

Kirk Truscott, WDFW\*

Curt Dotson, GCPUD

Debbie Williams, GCPUD

Denny Rohr, Facilitator\*

#### **Distributed Items:**

- **Grant PUD 2007 Progress Report of Activities**

#### **Action Items:**

- **Grant will clearly identify new BiOp language concerns and present them to the PRCC at the February meeting.**
- **Langshaw will notify Scribner and Murdoch regarding future Hanford Reach M & E meetings.**
- **The Skalski Draft Marking Precision Report will be distributed to the PRCC HSC by Langshaw.**
- **Williams will resend M & E Draft Plan to PRCC HSC members.**
- **Truscott will look at peak spawning dates for summer Chinook in the Wenatchee and Methow Basins.**
- **Lenz will send out Section 10 reporting requirements outline prior to the next PRCC HSC meeting.**

- **Langshaw, Ferguson and Jacobs will develop a combination of acclimation plans for the White River.**

**Decision Summary:**

- **PRCC HSC members approved 21day comment period (March 13, 2008) for the Draft PRH M & E Plan. PRCC HSC members will email comments to Langshaw by COB on the 13th.**
- **PRCC HSC members decided White River/Nason Creek newsletters will have committee approval before distribution.**
- **PRCC HSC members approve 2 week review and edit period for White River/Nason Creek newsletters.**
- **The PRCC HSC April meeting being held in Seattle at the Grant PUD SeaTac office.**

## Meeting Minutes

- I. **Welcome and Introductions** - Rohr welcomed attendees and Lynn Hatcher, who will be attending PRCC HSC meetings when Kris Petersen is unable to.
- II. **Agenda Review** - Murdoch stated a draft of the Nason Creek Smolt Trapping Report was sent to Grant PUD and BPA on January 31, 2008 for 30 day review and comment period and e-mailed to PRCC HSC members on February 18, 2008. Yakama Nation is required to submit the final report within 30 days of comment receipt, Murdoch explained. Ferguson, Sea Springs, requested discussion on flow and density, in regards to holding capacities.
- III. **Approval of Meeting Minutes** - Truscott asked for clarification of the January 17, 2008 agenda item 11A: JFP HGMP Meeting/Discussion, White River and Nason Creek. Truscott stated recommendations have not been made by the JFP as to how PUDs will conduct broodstock management. He stated the scope of topics being considered for the white paper being written by the JFP discusses if and how genetic diversity would be improved, as well as using existing hardened structures (Tumwater) and fish wheels. Minutes approved with changes.
- IV. **Action Items Review** - No items reviewed.
- V. **New License BiOp** - Langshaw stated Grant PUD has concerns regarding inconsistencies of language between the new BiOp and the Settlement Agreement. He requested clarification from the PRCC HSC on the following sentences.
  - 1.24 - Decisions regarding management of anadromous fishery resources in the UCR basin not directly linked to the Project are the purview of the agencies and Tribes.** Langshaw notes language

in the Priest Rapids Project Salmon and Steelhead Settlement Agreement indicates decision are made on a consensus basis and questions if the above mentioned sentence relates only to listed species. Langshaw stated the previous BiOp didn't differentiate between the decision making processes for Project management and resource management. Hatcher assumed input regarding language of the new BiOp was given to Scott Carlon (NMFS) by Grant PUD. Hatcher stated his agreement with the new language, noting it makes sense for the co-managers to make these decisions. Truscott questioned the purview of fisheries resource managers and the PRCC HSC, stating he thought Grant PUD wouldn't want to be tied up in those kinds of decisions. Langshaw stated he is unaware of anyone from Grant PUD that knew that language would be included in the BiOp. Langshaw then stated decisions about resource management could be supported in other ways. Grant PUD doesn't want to be involved in decisions about what to do with hatchery returns, but would like to have a say as to what methods are used to remove hatchery fish. Truscott said it should be a joint decision with the PUDs, but decisions about tribal or recreation fisheries should be JFP fisheries decisions, not PUD decisions. Langshaw agreed with Truscott. Truscott stated it attempts to identify consensus agreement regarding things linked to the PR Project vs. management of the hardened structure itself. Langshaw stated Grant PUD interprets the new language to say, if it doesn't relate to dam management, Grant PUD is not part of the decision making process. Truscott didn't agree and contended that the hatcheries were mitigation for the construction and operation of the "project" and were therefore linked to the "project". Langshaw stated that operations of the PR Project are consensus based and the new BiOp language doesn't give Grant PUD any decision making rights. Hatcher noted Grant PUDs concern. Marco stated all species are linked to the PR Project. Truscott stated that escapement levels and the ability to manage supplementation for enhancement and recovery are all things that are linked to the PUD, but are JFP management purview. Truscott stated the BiOp and Settlement Agreement were originally linked to the PR Project as mitigation requirements so this new language has little impact to Committee function.

**1.24 - When carrying out activities that may affect land and water resources within local watersheds, the Hatchery Subcommittee should coordinate with relevant local planning and permitting entities, including the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board.**

Hatcher stated this language was included in the BiOp to implement timely coordination and completion of activities and projects amongst all entities including the PRCC HSC. The coordination should occur in the implementation phase and not the decision making phase.

**VI. 1.28 - Grant PUD is also in the design process of an adult trapping facility and juvenile acclimation site to rear a total of 250,000 yearling smolts, if determined necessary by the Hatchery Subcommittee and NMFS.** Langshaw questioned what the HSC and NMFS were determining necessary. Is it the designs or facilities? Hatcher stated NMFS isn't trying to say Grant PUD had to do this, when co-managers and tribes hadn't determined what they wanted to do. NMFS is trying to be flexible as to what they require Grant PUD to do. This sentence is very important stated Hatcher; it gives the PRCC HSC flexibility. Langshaw stated that if a trapping facility and juvenile acclimation site is deemed to be necessary, Grant PUD would build it, but noted that no production levels are required under the new BiOp language. The only language that refers to a requirement is in the last paragraph of 1.28. **The design of the required facilities should factor in an additional 10% buffer in production capacity beyond the production levels required above.** The interim BiOp clearly stated production of up to 250,000 yearling smolts but the new BiOp only references levels required above without a clear requirement. Langshaw asked if Grant PUD is still required to produce 250,000 spring Chinook yearling smolts under the new BiOp. Marco suggests the sentence be rewritten because it does not state clearly what is required of Grant PUD and it could be interpreted the HSC will decide on production levels. Rohr questioned if this document can be changed, and if not, could Grant ask for an addendum? Langshaw asked if SOAs should be written for clarification purposes. **Grant will clearly identify new BiOp language concerns and present them to the PRCC at the February meeting.**

**1.29 – Grant PUD may, in consultation with the PRCC and NMFS, work with the HCP and Priest Rapids Hatchery Subcommittees to renew cost sharing agreements for supplementation of Methow River Basin spring-run Chinook salmon.** Grant PUD interprets this to say the PRCC and NMFS will be involved in negotiating cost sharing agreements but the language doesn't even refer to Douglas PUD. The existing protocol is that Grant PUD works with Douglas PUD to develop a cost sharing agreement and the HCP and HSC approve the production requests. Langshaw stated the language should have reflected the current process. Hatcher stated Carlon needs to address these issues with the PRCC. Hatcher isn't sure how this document can be amended but thought SOAs might be the best way to move forward.

**VII. Fall Chinook**

**A Marking**

- **Otolith results** - Langshaw noted the otolith sub-sample results are not yet complete. The otolith lab notified Langshaw they wouldn't need to collect wild samples.

Langshaw questioned why a SOA regarding marking protocol needs to be developed. Truscott stated the SOA needs to be larger in scope than just marking. WDFW desires to have an SOA to define marking protocols for more than the 2007 brood year noted Truscott.

Langshaw thought a SOA was premature at this point. As the PRCC HSC develops criteria of what needs to be done to implement the M & E plan, it would be a good time to determine a SOA stated Truscott. A SOA isn't needed for the 2007 brood year stated Truscott, but noted the need to determine a timeline before it's time to mark the 2008 brood year. Langshaw noted the Hanford Reach M & E meeting will be held on March 18, 2008.

**Langshaw will notify Scribner and Murdoch regarding future Hanford Reach M & E meetings.**

**B Priest Rapids Hatchery HSRG review** - Langshaw outlined draft recommendations made by the HSRG after their visit to Priest Rapids Hatchery on January 17, 2008:

- 1) Mark sufficiently to evaluate straying and harvest.
- 2) Attempt to incorporate more wild broodstock into the program.
- 3) Move 3.5 million fall Chinook from Ringold Hatchery to Priest Rapids Hatchery.

Because of water deficiencies, the HSRG is reconsidering the transfer of fish from Ringold to Priest Rapids Hatchery. Truscott stated that he had not heard of WDFW plans of moving fish from Ringold to Priest Rapids Hatchery. HSRG will meet in Vancouver, February 22, 2008 noted Langshaw.

**The Skalski Draft Marking Precision Report will be distributed to the PRCC HSC by Langshaw.** Initial indications are that the current marking program may be sufficient for evaluation purposes. Langshaw stated, WDFW desires to mark hatchery fish such that broodstock can be actively managed. However, broodstock are crossed randomly and this group needs to decide to actively manage broodstock before decision can be made about marking.

**C Priest Rapids Hatchery design/VE study update** - Grant PUD is proceeding with potential candidates to conduct the VE study for Priest Rapids Hatchery noted Langshaw. Truscott stated WDFW has concerns after reviewing the latest set of drawings, specifically the lack of ability to mass mark, renovation of the old incubation building vs. building a new incubation building and housing for hatchery staff. Truscott stated the current incubation building doesn't meet the needs of WDFW hatchery

staff or program. Ferguson stated the original plan was to renovate the old incubation building. WDFW doesn't believe the current infrastructure is appropriate to meet Grant PUDs mitigation requirements stated Truscott. Housing of WDFW hatchery staff is an issue that is being worked on stated Langshaw, noting Grant PUDs concern with the needs of hatchery staff. The present direction of Grant PUD is designing for its own mitigation requirement, stated Carlson. This would include remodeling the current incubation building by redoing the headbox water supply to provide well and surface water to individual stacks and remodeling the office area. Other structures will need to be built to accommodate for the loss of shop and food storage due to the sturgeon program. Truscott contends that Grant PUD is not at a 90% design phase, and should come to agreement with WDFW as to what facilities are required, if the 1.7 million Corp fish are not raised at the hatchery. Carlson stated that these are not actually 90% drawings because the electrical and monitoring/alarm modules, as well as the shop and fish feed storage facilities are not included. Langshaw stated it is common for definitions of percent completion to differ and whether they are called 90% or something else isn't important. The important part is that we are pressing forward with a design level to submit the permitting packet. Carlson stated the Corp of Engineers is still very interested in Grant PUD raising their 1.7 million mitigation fish and Grant PUD is working with the Corps to get a written financial commitment for rearing their fish and capitol costs associated with new facilities. The purpose of the VE study is get an independent assessment of the latest hatchery design to meet Grant PUD mitigation requirements and ensure the best cost effective designs are used, stated Carlson. Grant PUD and WDFW will continue discussions off line regarding hatchery design.

**D HGMP**

- **Objectives** - Langshaw asked the PRCC HSC if they had reviewed the M & E meeting notes sent to committee members regarding an M & E meeting held by WDFW and Grant PUD, noting the PRCC HSC needs to determine objectives needed in the M & E. Hatcher questioned if the objectives are holding up the HGMP, stating NOAA has issues with it not being completed. He continued to say that Peterson will talk to the committee regarding this issue at the next meeting, and NOAA may ask Grant PUD to submit it without the M & E component. Langshaw stated Grant PUD is continuing the HGMP and M&E plan on parallel paths. Langshaw questioned

Hatcher if this is concerning the Priest Rapids HGMP. Hatcher thought it was. Langshaw stated the Settlement Agreement doesn't mention a completion date for the Priest Rapids Hatchery HGMP and there is a permit in place that currently covers production at that facility. Langshaw noted that originally Peterson stated Priest Rapids Hatchery was a harvest argumentation program and the M & E should be easy. Then during discussion with WDFW, questions arose surrounding a reference population, disease, and impacts to non target taxa. Grant PUD is bringing this issue back the HSC to develop clear direction for the objectives of the plan. Truscott stated that in depth objectives need to be defined so a harvest augmentation program doesn't harm the wild population. Estimated Hanford Reach escapement from Priest Rapids hatchery is 7-8% and criteria for a reference stream in the HCP process is less than 10% hatchery escapement on the spawning grounds noted Langshaw. So by definition, the Hanford Reach is a reference population stated Langshaw. was concerned that too much time would be devoted to finding a reference stream and suggested we wait until better data can be collected that would support or refute our current understanding of spawning composition. Truscott stated it is prudent to identify a systematic timeline to fill the data gap, and determine if the Priest Rapids Hatchery program is segregated or integrated. The program needs to be identified as having an impact on wild populations or not stated Truscott. If it is impacting the wild population, then continual monitoring should take place; if and when new technology is available the program should continue to be explored for potential processes stated Truscott. If there is a 10% or less contribution to the wild population, the program should be deemed segregated, if more than 10% is found the program will be determined to be integrated. The M & E should be based on what the program is determined to be stated Truscott. He suggests the PRCC HSC follow parallel paths so time isn't wasted once it's determined if the program is segregated or integrated. Productivity if the key factor to determine stated Truscott. Langshaw questioned what productivity is for the Hanford Reach, noting his lack of confidence in data collected since 1940. Langshaw questioned if aerial surveys or escapement estimates should be used to evaluate productivity, and added that there is no data on smolt productivity in the Reach. Truscott stated we will

continue to know very little about the Hanford Reach without an M & E Plan. Because 15% of Alaska's open sea harvest are Hanford Reach fish Langshaw believes Alaska should be involved in the M & E Plan development because they have no obligation for M & E in the Hanford Reach. Another difficulty will be to differentiate project effects from hatchery effects stated Langshaw. Hatcher questioned what positive or negative effect the hatchery has on the Reach, noting he isn't sure the program should be monitored or not, but doesn't believe that looking at harvest will give conclusive information, and doesn't want to spend time on dead end ideas. Hatcher suggests that because of the size of the Reach, Grant PUD should conduct a workshop to determine what questions need to be asked. Langshaw agreed it would be good to hold a workshop, but doesn't believe it will get the PRCC HSC any closer to developing an M & E Plan. PRCC HSC members will continue discussion offline. Truscott encouraged PRCC HSC members to look 50 yrs down the road when thinking about this process. **Williams will resend the Draft M & E Plan to PRCC HSC. PRCC HSC members approved 21day comment period (March 13, 2008) for the Draft M & E Plan. PRCC HSC members will email comments to Langshaw by COB on the 13th.**

- **M & E** – see discussion above

## VIII. Summer Chinook

- A **Gloyd Springs presentation** - A presentation was given by Ferguson, Sea Springs, Inc. regarding Gloyd Springs and its potential use as a summer Chinook facility. Fish will be raised at Gloyd and then moved to acclimation sites for final release. Ferguson noted the property is fed from irrigations seepage of the farm land and low canals. Timing is critical when moving fish to acclimation sites stated Truscott, noting you must avoid ponding juveniles when adults are spawning. Disease issues with adults spawning upstream must be considered, not necessarily because of BKD, but parasitic diseases stated Truscott. As water volume is lost at the end of the irrigation season, it becomes critical when fish can be moved to acclimation sites noted Truscott, stating summer Chinook aren't finished spawning by the end of September when irrigation water is typically turned off. Spawning ground reports will identify spawning dates noted Truscott. **Truscott will look at peak spawning dates for summer Chinook in the Wenatchee and Methow Basins.**

**B HGMP**

- Facilities evaluation update – See discussion above

**IX. Spring Chinook**

**A Spring Chinook management in Wenatchee Basin white paper (Yakama Nation – WDFW)** - Yakamas and WDFW have met to discuss appropriate strategies to manage spring Chinook such as: incorporation of wild fish into the broodstock, escapement for the Wenatchee basin, and the ability to manage hatchery fish that return from the artificial augmentation program stated Truscott, noting the Yakamas are reviewing comments and will have a suite of options to WDFW possibly by early April. Rohr questioned what the expectations are when this white paper is complete. Truscott stated WDFW is hopeful to have JFP consensus on viable options, have those options incorporated into the White River and Nason Creek HGMPs and modify the Section 10 permit that authorized the Chiwawa program. Truscott stated the next step is to share the white paper with NOAA, the Colville's, and PUDs. He explained the white paper is being written because WDFW and the Yakamas are the farthest apart on the way the program should be run. The PRCC will be given the opportunity to review the white paper after the JFP supplies options noted Truscott. Rohr questioned who decides which options are utilized.

**B White River**

- **Section 10 Reporting Requirements** - Ben Lenz, Grant PUD will be completing the Section 10 reporting outline noted Langshaw. **Carlson will send out Section 10 reporting outline prior to the next PRCC HSC meeting.**
- **Net Pens** - It is anticipated that Grant PUD will receive the appropriate permits in time for installation of the pens, but ice on the lake may prevent installation. The HSC agreed to hold a conference call at 1 pm on March 14 to make a final determination for installation of the pens. The HSC agreed that if the lake is not completely free of ice, the pens will not be installed and the fish will be released directly into the White River. In the event a direct release is required, releases should occur ASAP and at locations below the Sears Creek Bridge to prevent interactions with wild fish.
- **Genetics** - NMFS approved contract, captive brood that were collected but later determined to have hatchery origin parents will be released at the same time as the

production fish. Flight boxes will be taken over on a flat bed and the fish will be released at the same site as the fish reared at the LWSNFH.

- **HGMP** Grant PUD is moving forward with the permitting process for McComas Ponds stated Langshaw. Scribner questioned if something temporary could be installed at that location to avoid the issues associated with the net pens. Langshaw replied that the magnitude of temporary acclimation would require extensive permitting that would likely take more than a year. Langshaw stated there is no well on the property, but water rights might be available from a neighboring property. The water rights at this location would likely qualify for priority processing, which could still take six to nine months for permitting. Scribner questioned when Grant PUD might have alternate acclimation sites available. Langshaw stated it will be difficult to acclimate 140,000 smolts in one location. Ferguson suggests a combination of acclimation plans/sites be utilized. **Langshaw, Ferguson and Jacobs will develop a combination of acclimation plans for the White River.** McComas will be under water this year because of run off stated Ferguson, noting shoreline permitting will have to be completed this year because the property is in the flood plain. Truscott suggested looking at the current Section 10 regarding facility development.

a) **JFP meeting** – See discussion above.

C **White river/Nason Creek Newsletter - PRCC HSC members decided White River/Nason Creek newsletters will have committee approval before distribution. PRCC HSC members approve 2 week review and edit period for White River/Nason Creek newsletters.**

D **Nason Creek HGMP development** – JFP meeting – See discussion above.

#### X. **Sockeye**

A **NMFS letter** - Hatcher stated the sockeye letter is low on NMFSs priority list and they will get to it when they get to it.

#### XI. **Steelhead**

A Douglas PUD and Grant PUD jointly entered into an Interlocal Cooperative Agreement to allow Grant PUD access to excess capacity at Douglas PUDs existing Methow and Wells fish hatcheries. Douglas PUD agreed to rearing of brood year 2009 fish as follows:

Group III - 80,000 steelhead for release into the Methow River, and or the Okanogan/Similkameen rivers.

Group IV – 201,000 yearling spring Chinook for release into the Methow River.

- XII. **Next Meeting:** Thursday, March 20, 2008 at Douglas PUD, Wells Conference Room.