Grant County
PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT
Excellence in Service and Leadership

Meeting Minutes

PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee

Thursday, March 20, 2008
Douglas PUD - Auditorium
Wenatchee, WA

PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Members

Kris Petersen, NMFS	David Carie, USFWS
Jerry Marco, CCT	Russ Langshaw, GCPUD
Tom Scribner, Keely Murdoch, YN	Carl Merkle, CTUIR
Kirk Truscott, WDFW	Denny Rohr, Facilitator

ATTENDEES: (*Denotes PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Member)

Kris Petersen, NMFS* (by phone)	David Carie, USFWS*
Jerry Marco, CCT*	Russell Langshaw, GCPUD*
Keely Murdoch, YN*	Curt Dotson, GCPUD
Kirk Truscott, WDFW*	Debbie Williams, GCPUD
Denny Rohr, Facilitator*	Julie Pyper, Chelan PUD
Bob Pfeifer, WDFW	Chris Carlson, GCPUD
Chuck Peven, Chelan PUD	

Action Items:

- **PRCC HSC members will submit comments on the Nason Creek and White River 2007 Trapping Reports to Yakama Nation by March 28, 2008.**
- **Ten working days will be provided to PRCC HSC members for meeting minute review.**
- **Langshaw will supply the data used for the Precision Calculations for Hatchery Fall Chinook Salmon Adult Returns report.**
- **Langshaw will determine if Grant PUDs summer Chinook programs are included in HSRG evaluations.**
- **Petersen will forward data set used for PRH AHA model to PRCC HSC.**
- **Carlson will provide PRH draft engineering drawings for the incubation and office building to the PRCC HSC at next meeting.**

- **Lenz will work with Truscott to ensure the White River Section 10 reporting requirements are included in the annual captive brood report.**
- **Forward Water Quality Meeting announcement to PRCC HSC members.**
- **Ferguson will resend a full draft of the White River HGMP to PRCC HSC members. He will highlight previously approved sections that could change with the spring Chinook management paper or the final review. PRCC HSC members will be given two weeks to review each section of the White River HGMP.**
- **Ferguson will contact USFWS regarding the section of the White River HGMP that relates to non-NMFS related ESA listed species.**
- **Williams will set up a conference call for April 7, 2008 @ 3:00 pm to discuss the results of the genetics testing and decide which fish will be retained for the captive brood program.**
- **Langshaw will provide PRCC HSC members with Chelan County net pen permit process timeline.**
- **Ferguson and Langshaw will discuss potential acclimation sites at Napeequa River. Grant PUD will contact White River and Napeequa River landowners to discuss the potential for natural acclimation sites.**
- **Rohr will draft a letter to the White River and Nason Creek Working Group detailing future meeting locations and dates.**

Decision Summary:

- **PRCC HSC members approved, the 2007 brood will be marked adipose present with a CWT at the base of the adipose tissue.**

Meeting Minutes

I. **Welcome and Introductions** - Rohr welcomed attendees

II. **Agenda Review -** Murdoch noted Yakama Nation hasn't received comments on the 2007 Nason Creek Trapping Report. **PRCC HSC members will submit comments on the Nason Creek and White River 2007 Trapping Reports to Yakama Nation by March 28, 2008.**

III. **Approval of Meeting Minutes** –

- Feb 21, 2008 meeting – WDFW will provide electronic edits to Grant PUD by March 27, 2008. Murdoch noted that a comment in Section V, 1.24 that was accredited to her, was not actually made by her. Members agreed to strike the sentence from the minutes. **Ten working days will be provided to PRCC HSC members for meeting minute review.**

IV. Action Items Review - Action Items were reviewed.

V. **New License BiOp** - Langshaw stated that Scott Carlon, NOAA provided BiOp language clarification at last months PRCC meeting. The intent of the new language is supposed to be consistent with what the PRCC HSC is currently doing, while providing the committee more flexibility. Langshaw noted that the PRCC and HSC interpret the BiOp language as coordination with the UCSRB and local entities should be at the implementation stage, but he feels that they are and will continue to want to be involved in the decision making process. He questions at what stage of implementation of a project the PRCC HSC should involve them, noting that they have called for meetings with NMFS and WDFW to try and affect what happens in the White River. Petersen stated that NMFS interpretation of the language is that PRCC HSC members will continue to coordinate among themselves. Langshaw stated the UCSRB and local entities should continue to be involved from the beginning so the HSC doesn't hit a firewall when trying to get buy off on a project. He suggests the UCSRB and local entities be kept appraised of what is going on as decisions are being made, but not given the right to vote. Ferguson explained the NEPA and SEPA process could be used for public input as it allows them to have a say in what will happen. Truscott stated they have a say in how it's implemented, not what's implemented. Truscott stated PRCC reps need to make a clear distinction as to what policy folks want this committee to do, either follow status quo, or change the process.

VI. Fall Chinook

A **Marking**

- **Otolith results** - Langshaw explained Grant PUD is still waiting on the WDFW Otolith lab to process the results, he will report results back to the HSC upon completion. WDFW thinks they will be able to differentiate Priest Rapids Hatchery fall Chinook from other naturally marked fish. Subsets from other programs that are unmarked will be unclassified, stated Langshaw, which could cause concern. This has implications for determining natural origin brood in broodstock. Even if all Priest Rapids fish are marked, there will be some fish not marked from other programs so we won't know how it will effect broodstock management or the Priest Rapids Hatchery (PRH) program stated Langshaw. Truscott noted that the Umatilla hatchery programs would have large expansion factors and they could provide rearing water data. Reference samples from other populations that have had otolith sampling completed can be added to the 2008 sampling, stated Langshaw. Jeff Grimm is the contact at the otolith lab.

- **CWT Precision Report** - Langshaw sent PRCC HSC members the Precision Calculations for Hatchery Fall Chinook Salmon Adult Returns that was recently finalized by Skalski. The report was based on variability of coded-wire-tag (CWT) recoveries at PRH. The current CWT mark rate can precisely estimate broodstock ratios, SARs and the abundance of PRH origin fish returning to the hatchery. Langshaw stated that looking at data from the last eleven years of CWT returns, the mean percentage of PRH fish in the broodstock is approximately 72.5% +/- 6% and the SAR rate is approximately 0.4% +/- 0.05%, and he thinks this info can be used to adequately address some of the M & E objectives within the hatchery. Ranges of precision are based on number of fish that return to hatchery and the number of marks applied stated Langshaw. **Langshaw will supply the data used for the Precision Calculations for Hatchery Fall Chinook Salmon Adult Returns report.** He noted the data is based on an eleven year average using approximately 11,000 returns. The CWT expansion is based on a 100% sampling rate of the hatchery carcasses recovered, typically 4,000 carcasses are sampled stated Langshaw. Carlson noted that sport harvest typically samples 3,000 to 4,000 fish per year. NOAA doesn't have a high level of confidence as to where fish are ending up, stated Petersen, questioning if the mark rate is high enough to give confidence in those estimates. Langshaw responded that if the current estimates of hatchery origin spawners are correct (5-10%), the low sampling rate would require that most of the fish be CWTed to get precise estimates. However, otolith analysis could efficiently determine the number of hatchery origin spawners stated Langshaw. It is more time consuming to collect and read otoliths vs. CWT, and otoliths don't assess strays, stated Truscott.

B **Priest Rapids Hatchery HSRG review** - Grant PUD expressed concern to Waldo regarding recommendations made by the HSRG to move Ringold fish to PRH. Waldo and the HSRG agreed they were valid concerns. Grant PUD is still waiting to see if HSRG recommendations will be changed, stated Langshaw, noting an acceptable solution could be to recommend that Ringold fix their ability to collect adults and broodstock. The decision to move fish from Ringold to PRH would need to occur in multiple forums including some outside of the PRCC that don't include Grant PUD, noted Langshaw, suggesting all entities be aware of the risk and delays to

hatchery design. If everyone can accept the risk and delays, Grant PUD is open to discussions about moving Ringold fish to PRH stated Langshaw. In the mean time, Grant PUD is continuing with hatchery designs to meet their mitigation needs, stated Langshaw. Well water continues to be a concern as to the amount of fish that can be moved into the PRH program, stated Carlson. He noted the Corp is very interested in having Grant PUD raise their 1.7 million mitigated fish, but that they are trying to free up capital to pay for the program. HSRG has provided biological justification to the Corp for keeping fish at PRH, because it is localized brood, not Bonneville stock, stated Langshaw. Langshaw wants to know which data is being used by HSRG for the upper Columbia evaluations. Preliminary findings for the upper Columbia will be on, April 21-25, 2008. The HSRG will be reviewing the Nason Creek and White River programs. PRCC HSC members questioned the implications to Grant PUDs summer Chinook programs and wondered if PNI might have to be modified. **Langshaw will determine if Grant PUDs summer Chinook programs are included in HSRG evaluations.** Grant & Chelan PUDs need to contact the HSRG committee to determine if they are using existing or projected 2013 data, stated Langshaw. Petersen stated she has been reviewing data and in contact with the HSRG, she doesn't think it should fall upon the PUD to determine if the correct data is being used. Peven stated the PUDs just want information to be correct to insure a clean data set. Langshaw noted some distrust on Grant PUDs part regarding the data being used for the PRH AHA model. There are two datasets relating to broodstock at PRH and WDFW created both of them. The data set currently used for PRH assumes there is only 2% natural origin fish in the broodstock, where as the PRH CWT data indicates PRH origin returns account for 72.5% of the broodstock, stated Langshaw. During the PRH M&E meeting held Tuesday, March, 18, 2008, Appleby (WDFW) explained that Umatilla CWT expansions aren't accurate because RMIS changed the reporting format and the expansion data are not clear. There will be some unmarked fraction from other hatcheries that cannot be accounted for by expanding PRH marks. Because of the low number of tag recoveries from other programs, there will be uncertainty about that estimate, however, to assume that 20 CWT from other programs account for 25.5% of the PRH broodstock is irresponsible stated Langshaw. Depending on what dataset is used, PNI ranges from less than 0.1 to greater than 0.7. Before the PRCC HSC can move forward with decisions about broodstock management and developing an M&E plan for PRH, an accurate set of CWT expansions is needed, stated Langshaw.

Truscott noted that sometimes you find things you didn't expect to find and corrections should be incorporated into subsequent evaluations. Petersen stated the tone of distrust Langshaw is projecting isn't warranted, she realizes there are problems with CWT expansions, but those problems need to be solved together. It's not the PUDs responsibility to take care of because they think no one else is looking, stated Petersen. Petersen noted that she was sending an email to Appleby to get more info on the data set. Most of the data used comes from HGMPs, stated Langshaw, noting a lot of them haven't been updated and questioned if the information was accurate to begin with. Petersen provided information to Ron Costello with mixed levels of success, but noted HGMPs are kept up to date. **Petersen will forward data set used for PRH AHA model to PRCC HSC.** PRCC HSC members need to be in agreement as to which data set source will be used, stated Truscott.

C **Priest Rapids Hatchery design/VE study update** - Grant PUD will continue designing the PRH facility for their required mitigation only, stated Carlson, noting the existing hatchery can be fully utilized, except for 700 gpm that will be used for sturgeon. Nichols and Carlson will talk to Jacobs Engineering regarding what is being designed for the Grant PUD program. The addition of a new incubation and office building will be a necessary component as previously identified if the Corp program is moved to the hatchery. Carlson stated the incubation building size has changed, noting both buildings will be incorporated into one. Truscott wants to look at the new PRH engineered drawings at the next meeting. Carlson stated that after coordinating all parties involved in the VE study, it should take two weeks or less to be complete. The PRCC HSC will be given the opportunity to review the study upon completion, stated Carlson. Truscott requests that incubation and office building drawings are ready for review within 30 days. He also would like to see drawings that will provide the opportunity for mass marking, stating that if mass marking isn't required now, in the future it probably will be and now is the time to have it engineered into the design of the facility. **Carlson will provide PRH draft engineering drawings for the incubation and office building to the PRCC HSC at next meeting.** Carlson will talk internally to see if mass marking engineering designs can be completed within 30 days. Truscott questioned what the expected outcome regarding station housing is. Langshaw explained that Dresser is working with Rex Buck Jr. regarding the two houses that WDFW would like to have included in the new hatchery design. Truscott questioned if WDFW could see the proposed house locations on the site plan drawings. **Dresser will contact Heather Bartlett and Bill**

Tweit, WDFW within approximately 2 weeks with a timeline for completing a PRH housing plan proposal

D **HGMP**

- **Objectives** - Members discussed how the PRCC HSC will move forward in reaching objectives for the PRH M&E plan. Marco questioned if the PRH will be an integrated or segregated program. Is this program an integrated harvest program, questioned Ferguson. Grant PUD agrees the PRH is an integrated harvest program, stated Langshaw. Truscott stated the goal of the program is to provide for harvest, that it is integrated by default because of wild fish in the broodstock. The Settlement Agreement states the goal of PRH is to provide mitigation for inundations and operation of the PR project. Langshaw doesn't think detecting impacts in productivity to the Hanford Reach can be done, so he is opposed to including it in the PRH M&E program. Petersen stated that if current data isn't available and a long term data set is needed, that should be acknowledged and written into the M&E plan. Langshaw is not opposed to that concept. Carlson stated that harvest wasn't the original goal of the PRH program and questioned what operational effects could have vs. production for harvest. Petersen stated that identifying the biological objectives was tasked to the JFP and that the PRH goal of releasing 5 million fish was to mitigate for lost production and provide fish for harvest, adding, maybe operational changes could be made that would affect the project. Truscott suggests that the HCP program goals and objectives for harvest based programs be reviewed and adapted to make them consistent with integrated programs that are harvest based as is the case with the PRD fall Chinook program. The PRCC HSC needs to agree on a set of objectives and determine the metrics to reach those objectives, stated Murdoch. Langshaw agreed and stated a straightforward path for development of the M&E plan would be to develop objectives, determine which objectives can or cannot be met, and determine which marks would be required to adequately address each objective. The Analytical Framework for Monitoring and Evaluating PUD Hatchery Programs document that was developed for monitoring the HCP hatchery programs was used to guide development of the following objectives:

- **Objective #1.** Determine if Priest Rapids Hatchery program has decreased abundance and productivity of the Hanford Reach Population.
- **Objective #2.** Determine if the run timing, spawn timing, and spawning distribution of both the natural and Priest Rapids Hatchery components of the Hanford Reach population are similar.
- **Objective #3.** Determine if genetic diversity, population structure, and effective population size have changed in natural spawning populations as a result of the Priest Rapids hatchery program. Additionally, determine if Priest Rapids hatchery programs have caused changes in phenotypic characteristics of the Hanford Reach population**.**
- **Objective #4.** Determine if the Priest Rapids hatchery adult-to-adult survival (i.e., hatchery replacement rate) is greater than the Hanford Reach adult-to-adult survival (i.e., natural replacement rate) and equal to or greater than the program specific HRR expected value based on survival rates listed in the BAMP (1998)**.**
- **Objective #5.** Determine if the stray rate of Priest Rapids hatchery fish is below the acceptable levels to maintain genetic variation between stocks.
- **Objective #6.** Determine if Priest Rapids hatchery fish were released at the programmed size and number**.**
- **Objective #7.** Determine if harvest opportunities have been provided using by Priest Rapids hatchery returning adults.
- **Objective #8.** Determine if Priest Rapids hatchery does not increase disease in the Hanford Reach population.
- **Objective #9.** Determine if Priest Rapids Hatchery has reduced abundance size of non target taxa
- The next step is to identify the metrics and determine how you will evaluate them, stated Murdoch. Langshaw will provide the list of objectives to the Hanford Reach Working Group. After they have identified the metrics Langshaw will email them to PRCC HSC members for discussion at the next meeting.

- **M & E** – See discussion above.

VII. **Summer Chinook**

A **HGMP**

- **Facilities evaluation update -** Ferguson gave a PowerPoint presentation on Dryden Right Bank as a preliminary alternative to Dryden Pond.

VIII. **Spring Chinook**

A **Spring Chinook management in Wenatchee Basin white paper (Yakama Nation-WDFW)** - Truscott stated WDFW hasn't received comments from the Yakama Nation since providing them with the initial document. Pfeifer noted that if key information is provided by the genetic lab, roll out could take place in April 2008.

B **White River**

- **Section 10 Reporting Requirements** - The Annual Report to NOAA for ESA compliance for all permits held by the Yakama Nation includes reporting requirements for the White River and Nason Creek, stated Murdoch, but questioned if the White River should be excluded from the Yakama Nation report. Petersen liked the idea of a comprehensive report specific to ESA compliance, and suggests that because of public interest in projects in the Columbia Basin, the ESA compliance document be introduced early in the project to show it is being conducted under ESA authorization. Langshaw questioned if double reporting will occur because the Yakamas include the White River in their annual activity report. Truscott suggest the White River report reference the Yakama Nation report, but instead of an elaborate explanation, note the permit is meeting ESA compliance. Murdoch stated the Yakamas can take the White River out of their report, but noted Nason Creek is under a BPA permit and needs to remain in the report. Truscott stated the smolt trap should be included in the Section 10 White River Annual Report. **Lenz will work with Truscott to ensure the White River Section 10 reporting requirements are included in the annual captive brood report.**

- **Net Pens** – Yearling White River spring Chinook, totaling 142,000, were released directly into the White River on March 18 and 20, 2008 at two locations, the 6500 Rd Bridge and the Sears Creek Bridge, stated Langshaw. Each ELISA group was differentially marked with CWT and a subset with PIT-tags. Members discussed Chelan Counties permit processing timeline. Langshaw noted the net pen permit was submitted on Nov. 24, 2007. Net pen installation could start on March 29, 2008, stated Langshaw, noting all necessary permits for net pen installation for the next five years have been submitted, and unless appealed, will be permitted. **Langshaw will provide PRCC HSC members with Chelan County net**

pen permit process timeline. The Yakama Nation requests Grant PUD make finding acclimation sites in the White River or Wenatchee basin a priority next year, stated Murdoch. The short-term, three year, Section 10 permit covers temporary acclimation sites (i.e., net pens) noted, Truscott, stating Grant PUD is currently in their second year, and should have permanent acclimation facilities developed by the time that permit expires. Langshaw responded that Grant PUD is working towards completing designs to begin the permitting process for the McComas property in 2008. Jacobs Engineering should completed designs for the surface water intake in May 2008 but Grant PUD will not have anything on the ground next spring because of permitting timelines, stated Langshaw. Truscott suggests Grant PUD look at short and long term acclimation sites to ensure the process is proceeding, but not forgo temporary acclimation sites because they might not be applicable to long term acclimation. Murdoch suggests Napeequa River be used for a temporary acclimation site until more a long term acclimation sites can be developed. Truscott stated his concern with large numbers of fish returning back to the Napeequa. Langshaw stated there is an oxbow on Napeequa Creek that could likely be used for an acclimation site right away for a small number of fish. This approach would give the PRCC HSC a chance to see if it would work, stated Murdoch. Net pens may not be the best scenario, but spring Chinook do get White River water to home in on, stated Truscott. **Ferguson and Langshaw will discuss potential acclimation sites at Napeequa River. Grant PUD will contact White River and Napeequa River landowners to discuss the potential for natural acclimation sites, stated Langshaw.** Truscott believes tribal participation would be beneficial when speaking to White River land owners.

- **Water quality meeting – March 29, 2008** - A Lake Wenatchee water quality meeting will be held on March 29, 2008 at the Lake Wenatchee Recreation Center. The meeting will cover topics such as: general water quality, water quality monitoring, and the net pen program. Mike Kaputa, Chelan County, will distribute a PowerPoint presentation template, asking Grant PUD to supply information they would like addressed. Dresser and Langshaw will attend. **Rohr will forward the Water Quality Meeting announcement to PRCC HSC**

members. Members discussed the effects nutrients entering the lake through residential septic systems and the nutrient capacity of the lake. Langshaw noted his concern that Lake Wenatchee was intentionally excluded from the 2006 baseline studies for development of the Wenatchee River TDML. Denise Mills (WADOE) indicated none of Grant PUD's Wenatchee Basin programs were considered as part of the baseline so they will need to undergo anti-degradation analysis. It's the responsibility of the applicant to fund the studies and will likely need to include Lake Wenatchee, the White River, and Nason Creek. Truscott questioned if this is only our (PRCC HSC) responsibility, or if all residents installing septic systems have to follow the same guidelines. Langshaw explained that previously existing regulations are now being enforced and changes can occur to activities that were part of the 2006 baseline as long as their contribution doesn't increase from their levels in 2006. Langshaw expressed concern that regulations are being driven by water quality in the lower river, noting the Clean Water Act and ESA contradict each other. Nutrients are likely limiting productivity in the upper basin where the listed species are rearing and restrictions are being created because of conditions in the lower river. Truscott asked if existing septic systems could be converted to tight line pressure systems, thus allowing for phosphorus credits be traded. Will the Department of Ecology (DOE) allow nutrient trading questioned Truscott? Langshaw stated WDOE's position is that the Wenatchee Watershed Planning Unit Water Quality Subcommittee will be able to make decisions about how best to meet criteria. Pyper noted data on water quality of the lake is being supplied by Chelan PUD. WADOE does not have the resources to pay for an analysis stated Pyper. Peven noted Chelan PUD had a diagnostic study in 1980 when the net pens were installed. Marco stated the Colville's contracted with Washington State University to conduct a nutrient analysis in Twin Lakes.

- **Genetics** - Langshaw noted the captive brood genetics report has not been received, but expects the final report by April 1, 2008. Fish that are not of wild by wild origin will be released the first week of April 2008. It is not known what the proportion of different crossing are in the broodstock so after the genetics report is received the PRCC HSC will need to decide what fish are kept in the program, stated Langshaw. There are approximately

1100 PIT-tagged fish that have been segregated by collection that were genetically tested, stated Langshaw. It is not known what the proportions of wild by wild or wild by hatchery are, noted Langshaw, but we do know the F2 males have wild by wild parents. **Williams will set up a conference call for April 7, 2008 @ 3:00 pm to discuss the results of the genetics testing and decide which fish will be retained for the captive brood program.**

- **HGMP** - Truscott questioned what the status of the White River HGMP is. Ferguson noted outstanding sections are broodstock management and the M&E Plan. All other sections have been reviewed and approved by PRCC HSC members. Truscott requested that the draft be sent out for review again. **Ferguson will resend a full draft of the White River HGMP to PRCC HSC members. He will highlight previously approved sections that could change with the spring Chinook management paper or the final review. PRCC HSC members will be given two weeks to review each section of the White River HGMP.** Per instruction by Rob Jones, NOAA, Petersen suggests that if the PRCC HSC members can't reach consensus on the White River HGMP, Grant PUD submit the draft HGMP to NMFS and work together with NMFS to finalize it. Truscott stated he doesn't like the idea of Grant submitting a HGMP without input by WDFW. **Ferguson will contact USFWS regarding the section of the White River HGMP that relates to non-NMFS related ESA listed species.**

- **Marking** - Two papers evaluating wand detection efficiency were sent to members by Langshaw. The papers support the proposal for the 2007 brood to be marked ad-present with snout wire because of the detection efficiency, stated Langshaw. Scanning over the head and in the mouth results in essentially 100% detection of CWTs. Coho are all CWT ad present stated Murdoch, she suggests taking scale samples of fish that aren't CWT to see if they're wild vs. hatchery. The BY06 that will be directly released are marked with CWTs in the base of the adipose tissue, stated Langshaw. Truscott suggests marking a couple of broodyears to gather more data relating to straying and homing. Marking fish with this method will require that each fish be handled and increase the cost by three times, stated Langshaw. Marco agreed that more information would be nice to

have. BY07 will be the third year with adipose tagged fish and this years returns should give the first indications of straying. Approximately 65,000 were released in 2007 and 142,000 will be released this year and approximately 150,000 will be release next year, stated Langshaw. **PRCC HSC members agreed the 2007 White River brood will be marked ad-present with ad-wire.**

C **Precocial Maturation Study** - Grant PUD will not sample precocial spring Chinook this year, stated Langshaw, but will determined what the potential is to sample them in the future.

D **Nason Creek HGMP development** - PRCC HSC members determined that the White River HGMP would be developed prior to the Nason Creek HGMP.

IX. **Sockeye**

A **NMFS Letter** - Petersen stated she has no update on the sockeye letter. Langshaw stated this issue needs to be resolved. The Settlement Agreement states the PRCC will determine if a propagation program is required. If a program is required, Grant PUD questions if the 12-year study plan can be used as a propagation plan. If NMFS determines an ESA permit is required, Grant PUD questions whether the 12-year study plan would provide sufficient information for consultation and substitute for an HGMP. The final step would be for Grant PUD to work with the PRCC HSC to develop an M&E plan. Langshaw questioned if the 12-year study plan would be an adequate M&E plan.

X. **PRCC Hatchery Working Group meeting schedule changes** - To allow the PRCC HSC more time for a working meeting, the White River and Nason Creek Public working group meetings will be moved to 4:00 p.m. on the day of PRCC HSC meetings. This will allow continued public involvement. **Rohr will draft a letter to the White River and Nason Creek Working Group detailing future meeting locations and dates.**

XI. **Next Meetin**g: Thursday, April 17, 2008 @ Grant PUD SeaTac office.