



## Meeting Minutes

### Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee

Wednesday, January 23, 2008

9:00 – 4:00

Grant PUD SeaTac Office

#### **PRCC Members**

---

Scott Carlon/Bryan Nordlund, NMFS	Jim Craig, USFWS
Jerry Marco, CCT	Tom Dresser, GCPUD
Bob Rose, YN	Carl Merkle, CTUIR
Carmen Andonaegui, WDFW	Denny Rohr, Facilitator

#### **ATTENDEES: (\*Denotes PRCC member)**

---

Scott Carlon, NMFS*(by phone)	Bryan Nordlund, NMFS*
Carmen Andonaegui, WDFW*	Bob Rose, YN*
Jim Craig, USFWS*	Eric Lauver, GCPUD
Tom Dresser, GCPUD*	Curt Dotson, GCPUD
Jerry Marco, CCT*(by phone)	Keith Garner, GCPUD (by phone)
Mike Clement, GCPUD (by phone)	Denny Rohr, Facilitator
Debbie Williams, GCPUD	Chuck Peven, CPUD

#### **Action Items:**

- **Lauver will schedule PRCC ladder tour and provide ladder outage schedule to PRCC members.**
- **Williams will send to the PRCC Andonaegui comments on the 2008 Northern Pikeminnow Plan and Grant PUD's response to Andonaegui.**
- **Lauver will talk to Stuart Hammond, GCPUD regarding the original Wanapum Fish Station Count location and any problems or issues with that location. He will e-mail PRCC members information gathered on the original site.**
- **Fisher will inquire into an existing M & E report concerning existing Newberry riffles downstream of McIntyre Dam.**
- **Letter of Intent stating \$411,000 will be available on Feb. 15, 2009 for the ORRI project will be sent to Steve Matthews, Ministry of Fisheries and Oceans from Grant PUD.**

- Nordlund will e-mail NNI spreadsheet to Grant PUD.
- PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee tasked to outline three program ideas defining pros and cons, options to facilitate the program they've defined, and where they see the program in 10 years.
- Dotson will write a summary paper outlining the 2008 Sub-yearling Pilot Study concept and e-mail to the PRCC next week.

#### Decision Summary:

- PRCC members approved 2008 Priest Rapids Top-Spill and WFUFB Chinook Behavior Study Plan
- PRCC members approved 30 day extension (until the next PRCC meeting) for review and comment on the 2007 Fish Source Evaluation.
- PRCC members approved 2008 Priest Rapids Project Steelhead Survival Study Plan.
- PRCC members approved 30-day extension (until the next PRCC meeting) for review and comment on the 2007 3-D Priest Rapids Top-Spill Chinook Behavior Study Report.
- PRCC members approved 30 day extension (until the next PRCC meeting) for review and comment on the Analysis of Acoustic-Tagged Yearling Chinook Steelhead and Sockeye Salmon through the Priest Rapids Project in 2007.
- PRCC members approved 30 day extension (until the next PRCC meeting) for review and comment on the 2007 Northern Pikeminnow Report.
- PRCC members approved 30 day extension (until the next PRCC meeting) for review and comment on the 2007 Avian Predation Report.
- PRCC members approved further discussion on the 2008 Northern Pikeminnow Study Plan at the February PRCC meeting.
- PRCC members approved 2008 Avian Predation Study Plan.
- PRCC members approved funding of \$1.7 million for McIntyre Dam project.
- PRCC members approved \$411,000 from NNI Fund for ORRI project.

## Meeting Minutes

- I. Welcome and Introductions - Rohr welcomed attendees.
- II. Agenda Review - Rohr reviewed agenda, Sub-Yearling Pilot Study was added.
- III. Approval of Meeting Minutes
  - Dec. 18 PRCC meeting – Approved with revisions from WDFW and NMFS.

- IV. Action Items Review - Rohr reviewed action items. Rohr questioned if a joint PRCC and PRCC Habitat Subcommittee meeting was still needed since the NNI funding issues have been dealt with. PRCC members agreed that a joint meeting was not necessary at this time.
- V. Ladder Maintenance Update – Left bank at Priest Rapids is down for standard maintenance, it will be watered back up the end of February. Right bank maintenance at Priest Rapids is complete. Left bank at Wanapum is down for standard maintenance. Lauver stated all ladders will be watered up in March. Rose questioned if a ladder tour could be scheduled for PRCC members. Craig requested a ladder outage schedule be provided by Grant PUD. **Lauver will schedule PRCC ladder tour and provide ladder outage schedule to PRCC members.**
- VI. Wanapum Future Unit Bypass Update – Seal replacement is complete. Dotson stated a dry test is scheduled for next week. The WFUFB should be up and running by the end of March.
- VII. Priest Rapids Top-Spill
- A **Action Item:** 2008 Priest Rapids Top-Spill and WFUFB Chinook Behavior Study Plan – approval requested – Grant PUD should anticipate high flow, noted Nordlund. Nordlund questioned how Grant PUD distinguishes what passage is through individual tainter gates. Dotson stated you would know which tainter gate was used based on the forebay detection arrays. If you open adjacent tainter gates on 18 and 21, (either side of the top-spill bulkhead) you will be able to discern which passage route was used – i.e. either gate 18, 19, 20, or 21. Nordlund stated final study results should identify how many fish are passing thru tainter gates, especially 18 and 21, regardless of river flow so that we get useable results from the study. Rose questioned what the settlement agreement said, stating it is apparent that more could be learned about general spill passage vs. top spill. Rose noted the Priest Rapids Top Spill presentation by Duncan Hay (Oakwood Consulting) didn't show more passage was being allowed by top-spill. Dotson stated that what is required for fish passage at the dams is a survival passage of 95%, and not a set FPE (i.e. non-turbine passage) amount. Nordlund stated that he understands that specific behavior in front of top spill bulkheads needs to be looked at for design development, but noted achieving survival standards is the goal. Nordlund stated that after looking at the results of 21 kcfs flow thru a spillway tainter gate vs. 21 kcfs thru the top spill might provide a better understanding of which passage method provides better results – faster passage (potentially reducing forebay predation) and better survival. Top spill survival rates are still better than tainter gate survival rates, stated Dotson, noting top-spill creates

better passage for smolts. Nordlund questioned how additional spill beyond what Grant PUD is planning will be handled in the 2008 evaluation study. Dotson stated high water levels in 2006 vs. 2007 were similar enough not to justify another study. Nordlund questioned why top-spill remains the Priest Rapids passage alternative when better passage/flow efficiency is achieved using tainter gates – i.e. more fish seem to pass through tainter gate flow versus top-spill for the same flow amount. He expressed that was the reason he thought it was important for the 2008 study to identify passage through each spillway passage route – tainter gate and top spill. **PRCC members approved 2008 Priest Rapids Top-Spill and WFUFB Chinook Behavior Study Plan.**

B **Action Item:** 2007 3-D Priest Rapids Top-Spill Chinook Behavior Study Report (HTI) – approval requested. **Rohr suggested that consideration be given to a numbering system similar to SOAs for reports/study plans.** Dresser stated contents of this study will be included in the Grant PUD BiOp annual report due to FERC February 15, 2008. **PRCC members approved 30-day extension (until the next PRCC meeting) for review and comment on the 2007 3-D Priest Rapids Top-Spill Chinook Behavior Study Report.**

VIII. **Action Item:** 2007 Fish Source Evaluation (Skalski) - approval requested – **PRCC members approved 30 day extension (until the next PRCC meeting) for review and comment on the 2007 Fish Source Evaluation.**

IX. **Action Item:** 2008 Priest Rapids Project Steelhead Survival Study Plan – approval requested – At the Dec. 18, 2008 PRCC meeting Nordlund asked Grant PUD to consider how to recalibrate NNI funds in 2009 based on survival studies of steelhead through the Priest Rapids Project. As examples, he suggested that it may be necessary to use 2008 as a one year average, or go to a three-year average by adjusting 2006-2007 results in some fashion because 2007 results lent better understanding as to what may have happened with steelhead survival in 2006. Nordlund stated that per Section 15.7.2, Grant PUD is required to have a new steelhead survival estimate (of three consecutive years) by the end of 2008 and asked how Grant PUD will consider NNI funding recalibration in the Priest Rapids Salmon and Steelhead Settlement Agreement without this three-year average. If the 2008 survival study produced poor results, and is the only year being used to calculate steelhead survival, Grant PUD would be required to substantially increase NNI funds stated Nordlund. Dresser noted the Settlement Agreement allows for changes by the PRCC. Dotson questioned if it's alright for Grant PUD to wait until the 2008 results are gathered. Nordlund thought it would be appropriate for Grant to talk internally and present a proposal as to how NNI funds

could be recalibrated in 2009. Andonaegui questioned if Dotson had spoken to Chelan PUD regarding fish tagger effects pertaining to the Chelan PUD tagged fish used in the 2007 PR survival study. Dotson stated that some suggest you shouldn't see more than a 2% difference between taggers but Grant PUD experienced a 20% difference in survival between groups of steelhead tagged by various taggers. Dotson was notified by Chelan PUD that they wouldn't be able to tag for Grant PUD in 2008. A final decision hasn't been made as to where the fish will be collected, but gateway dipping will most likely be the source noted Dotson. Steve Henstrum (CCPUD) called Dotson stating his concerns about getting enough fish (5,000) for their scheduled survival study. Dotson noted the 2006 fish were possibly in bad shape and asked if gateway dipped fish are compromised by high TDG levels. Nordlund questioned if Chelan's fish would be detected at the Priest Rapids project. Dotson stated he needs permission to get tag codes from Chelan. Nordlund questioned if sockeye and steelhead numbers will be included in the behavioral study, noting it was designed for Chinook, because he sees a benefit of knowing how all species react to the Top-Spill at Priest Rapids. Andonaegui questioned the estimated tag life and different ping rates. Dotson explained that different ping rates for tags are used based on the study design for that particular tag. That a slower ping rate is used in survival studies, so as to conserve battery life and have a tag that lasts longer in the river for migration time. Battery life is an issue with acoustic tags being used for long-term survival studies because the fish can be doing well, but if the tag's battery dies, that fish is assumed to have also died. Dotson stated that great strides have been made in the past few years using studies from all PUDs. Marco noted that in the Chelan proposal, they identified tagging issues; they will have crews tag study fish and also control fish. Marco questioned if some of Chelan's fish will be used as study fish. Dotson stated the Chelan fish would be an added benefit, but Grant would have their own study fish. Dotson stated that Grant added an extra 100 fish to each of the release groups; each group would now contain 650 fish. The study plan is created to have an even mix between treatment and control fish noted Dotson. Dotson explained three people make up a tagging crew. Rose suggested two more people be involved, so if one person wasn't performing, their tagged fish could be thrown out and the other 4 tagged fish could be used for the study. Dotson stated that adding extra fish will help. Rose wanted it clarified that if some of the fish didn't survive, he didn't want them to be the ones thrown out of the study citing tagger issues. Dresser stated that would never be allowed. Dotson noted USGS had an oversight committee reviewing onsite procedures; a report was released 3 to 4 months ago and will be again. Taggers have been sent to the USGS Cook Lab to work on their skills explained Dotson. Nordlund commented that since PIT-tags require less surgical skill than acoustic tags, its not too surprising that an AT tag crew will have

more variability in their skills compared to a PIT-tag crew, and this is an unforeseen consequence of using AT for survival studies. The comparison study that led to the PRCC decision to use AT studies instead of PIT-tag studies probably did not include high variability in AT tagger skills. Since AT studies use far fewer fish than PIT-tag studies, tagger skills (or lack thereof) will have a larger impact on the precision of study results. He questioned whether this issue is significant enough to lead to resumption of using PIT-tags for survival studies. Dotson agreed PIT-tags are easier to use. Dotson also addressed smolt sample size, stating a robust number of smolts are needed downstream to detection PIT-tags. Nordlund commented that with the installation of additional PIT-tag detection at downstream projects, the number of fish required for a PIT-tag survival study is probably less than what was required a few years ago. **PRCC members approved 2008 Priest Rapids Project Steelhead Survival Study Plan.**

- X. **Action Item:** Analysis of Acoustic-Tagged Yearling Chinook, Steelhead and Sockeye Salmon through the Priest Rapids Project in 2007 – approval requested – see discussion above. **PRCC members approved 30 day extension (until the next PRCC meeting) for review and comment on the Analysis of Acoustic-Tagged Yearling Chinook Steelhead and Sockeye Salmon through the Priest Rapids Project in 2007.**
  
- XI. Northern Pikeminnow and Avian Predation Programs Presentation
  - A **Action Item:** 2007 Northern Pikeminnow Report – approval requested – see discussion below – **PRCC members approved 30 day extension (until the next PRCC meeting) for review and comment on the 2007 Northern Pikeminnow Report.**
  
  - B **Action Item:** 2007 Avian Predation Report – approval requested – see discussion below - **PRCC members approved 30 day extension (until the next PRCC meeting) for review and comment on the 2007 Avian Predation Report.**
  
  - C **Action Item:** 2008 Northern Pikeminnow Study Plan – approval requested – Andonaegui noted that in the past, northern pikeminnow removal for the Priest Rapids project was approximately 45,000/year. Study of population estimates done in 2006 resulted in lower removal efforts, as the intent was mark/recapture not removal. Andonaegui would like to have a discussion after her edits have been reviewed by Grant PUD regarding the study. She would like to see Grant PUD implement a full scale removal program, consistent with the effort in earlier studies. She noted fishing should take place in reaches where juvenile salmonid survival rates appeared lower. Dresser stated fishing efforts would be expanded to include

those areas where juvenile survival appeared low. Dresser also noted that Grant PUD has applied for a collection permit, which would allow Grant PUD to utilize beach seining to collect and remove young-of-year and sub-adult pikeminnow. Dresser also noted that permitting concerns would likely be related to ESA listed fish such as; bull trout, Chinook and summer steelhead. Craig noted that nighttime beach seining might be more effective. Dresser responded that based on relicensing studies concentrations of northern pikeminnow were observed in the tributary mouths, where water temperatures were warmer.

**Williams will send Andonaegui comments on the 2008 Northern Pikeminnow Plan and Grant PUDs response to Andonaegui to the PRCC.** A draft plan with revisions and edits by PRCC members will be brought to the PRCC at the next meeting. Nordlund questioned why Grant PUD doesn't do northern pikeminnow removal further down Priest Rapids tailrace. Dresser noted the Bonneville Power Association (BPA) has implemented a sports reward program in that area already. Nordlund questioned why Grant PUD is reluctant to embrace the concept of northern pikeminnow removal to the Priest Rapids FERC project boundaries. Dresser stated Grant PUD does not believe it is necessary to expand removal programs to the Hanford Reach. Dresser also noted that it is extremely difficult to effectively fish the tailrace of Priest Rapids, due to holding setlines. Nordlund questioned if the powerhouse forebay could be used to hold the set lines. Andonaegui noted Grants obligation is to meet a 93% Project survival rate. She noted that as long as Grant is meeting the survival standards without fishing for northern pikeminnow in the Priest Rapids tailrace, Grant PUD can choose to not fish the Priest Rapids tailrace. Dresser stated that if northern pikeminnow concentrations are identified below Priest Rapids tailrace, within the Priest Rapids Project Area, then fishing efforts would be expanded to include that area. **PRCC members approved further discussion on the 2008 Northern Pikeminnow Study Plan at the February PRCC meeting.**

- D **Action Item:** 2008 Avian Predation Study Plan – approval requested – Nordlund questioned which wire array would be used. Dresser stated a criss cross pattern would be utilized in the Priest Rapids tailrace. Nordlund stated his approval of the pattern, with the assumption that it was the criss cross pattern distributed at an earlier PRCC meeting. Dresser went onto state that avian concentrations and feeding behavior information gathered during operation of the Wanapum Future Unit Bypass would be used to develop/design avian arrays in that area. Langshaw questioned how you determine if mortality is caused by direct avian predation? Andonaegui stated she isn't sure if it

can be done or not. Langshaw noted, maybe you can look for tags that just disappear from the array. **PRCC members approved 2008 Avian Predation Study Plan.**

- XII. Wanapum Fish Station Video Count Presentation (Lauver) – Eric Lauver, GCPUD presented a PowerPoint presentation on the Wanapum Fish Station Video Count move. Rose questioned if sturgeon would be able to pass through the new design. Nordlund stated he sees potential problems with the new design citing potential for lamprey passage and counting problems, potential for delay problems for salmon/steelhead because of the extent of vertical crowding of the passage corridor caused by elevation of the count window and because of the hydraulics that result from installation at a corner of the ladder. The inability to clean the lower horizontal louvers is also a problem. Additional head loss through the count station louvers will result from debris accumulation, which in turn leads to increased head loss through the count window slot, which will in turn lead to increased velocity and turbulence through the slot, which can lead to passage issues. Lauver stated the new design will be experimented with this year, with modifications to be made the following year during down time. Rose questioned if manual counting would be an option this year, in conjunction with video counting. Two redundant systems could not be justified stated Dresser. Dresser stated depth perception has been an issue since Grant PUD was directed to build the counting station. Nordlund stated that the PRCC was asked by Grant PUD to approve the design for the video count system originally, as opposed to NMFS or the PRCC directing Grant PUD to build the count station. Lauver stated installation would take place mid-April 2008. Lauver stated lamprey passage and louver cleaning would be similar to count boards at Priest Rapids. Louver cleaning will be done with garden rakes and lamprey can pass through the pickets; noted Lauver. Dresser stated Grant PUD will not be able to have accurate counts at Wanapum for lamprey during the testing period. Andonaegui stated accurate counts are difficult to achieve with lamprey. Nordlund stated that salmonid passage counts should show numbers tracking up the river. Andonaegui agreed that there is room for improvement with video counting, she's not aware that there is another design that is better. She's glad Nordlund will be looking at the current design proposed by Grant PUD. Andonaegui suggest Nordlund participate in the final Video Count design. Coho identification problems have been a count issue also noted Andonaegui. Lauver stated that this new system will greatly improve the accuracy of species identification. Rose questioned if fish would be hesitant to swim near the surface. Lauver stated they might be a little spooked, but would swim through quickly. Nordlund questioned if there was any way to collect data regarding this issue, to strive not to slow fish down at a count station. Radio telemetry might be an evaluation tool to track fish passage through the ladder noted

Nordlund. Rose questioned what the difference of water velocity is in the new location vs. the old. More than 4 ft/s at the current location vs. 2 ft/s at the new location would be Nordlund's guesstimate. Rose observed that if overhead light is to be used, maybe the scale (ruler) should be placed on the floor of the counting tunnel instead of or in conjunction with the scale on the back of the tunnel. Rose noted laser light systems are also available to count fish. Lauver was concerned with the flashing light vs. natural light that fish are use to in any stream. Nordlund questioned if Lauver had looked at any data the Bureau of Reclamation has on video count station lighting on the Yakima River. Lauver stated no adverse conditions have been noted with the lighting currently used. Nordlund asked if window cleaning frequency was less in 2006 because of using an algae buster. Lauver noted that the algae buster initially worked, but then was found to be unplugged and window cleaning continued manually on a weekly basis. Rose questioned how far the engineering was on the new system. Lauver stated the design is currently at 50%. Craig questioned how the success of the new system will be evaluated. Lauver would like to see PR and Wanapum counts closer for each species, and comparison with Rock Island will also be used as an evaluation tool to validate counts. Rose stated Yakama Nation wants an evaluation using visual counts, stating there is no need to count from April to December using non-recorded counting, but wants to have visual counts represented during the other time frames. Nordlund questioned if Grant PUD has a DIDSON Camera (Sonar video) explaining the underwater imagery is excellent regardless of lighting. This could be used to assess if fish are accumulating below the count station, which could in turn point to design improvements for the permanent system. Dresser stated an extra burden would be placed on Grant PUD to place visual counts at Wanapum. Rose stated the Yakamas are looking for a good evaluation tool. Nordlund added that some level of evaluation is needed before a permanent solution is implemented. Committee will continue discussion at the next PRCC meeting. **Lauver will talk to Stuart Hammond, GCPUD regarding the original Wanapum Fish Station Count location and any problems or issues with that location. He will e-mail PRCC members information gathered on the original site.**

XIII. Predation Study Update. Dotson stated the contract process is proceeding.

XIV. NNI Funding – Chris Fisher joins meeting via conference line.

A McIntyre Dam – Rohr noted three contingencies placed by the PRCC before approval of \$1.7 million to fund the McIntyre Dam have been met. #1. Okanagan Nation Alliance (ONA) will be the contractor on the project. #2. Installation and maintenance

of the Newberry Riffles will be provided by Brian Symonds, Department of Ministry. #3. Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) mandates the Town of Oliver to place a permanent fish screen above McIntyre Dam. Andonaegui questioned if the project would have any habitat evaluation done regarding benefits to fish production. Fisher stated the Ministry of the Environment will complete an M & E. ONA will monitor fish (sockeye and Chinook) and redd distribution. Fisher noted a rotary screw trap is presently placed downstream of Skaha Lake. Fisher has not seen the monitoring plan but stated they will include fish upstream of McIntyre Dam, red construction locations, and evaluation of in stream structures (Newberry Riffles). ONA will also look at the influence of adult fish migration and any adverse effects to fish because of the structures noted Fisher. Brian Symonds, Department of the Ministry will be responsible for correct installation and maintenance of the structures stated Fisher. Fisher noted that in 2001 a series of Newberry Riffles installed downstream of structure 13 were immediately utilized by fish, noting no bank erosion or movement of material in the structure has been reported to date. Andonaegui requested that monitoring of habitat parameters be included in an M & E plan and capture this in writing. Marco questioned if an M & E report has been compiled concerning the Newberry Riffles. **Fisher will inquire into an existing M & E report concerning existing Newberry riffles downstream of McIntyre Dam.** Andonaegui questioned whether funding of the project should move forward until the fish screen is complete. Fisher noted a conversation with Tom Szalay, Town of Oliver, this morning, he questioned if money was available yet. Irrigators have put up \$359,000 to date for the project noted Fisher. If the project is not done by April 1, 2010, DFO would shut down the irrigation canal. Preliminary designs need to be complete to get permitting done within the time frame outlined by Kari Long, ONA. Long explained to Fisher that August is the only window of opportunity to complete the project and everything can not be in place by August 2008. Project gates will not be installed until 2009 and out migration will not take place until 2011 noted Fisher. Andonaegui, Craig, Rose, Dresser, Nordlund and Marco approved McIntyre Dam funding. **PRCC members approved funding of \$1.7 million for McIntyre Dam project.**

- B Okanogan River Restoration Initiative (ORRI) – Rohr stated the NNI fund will reflect a shortage if the ORRI project is approved today. Dresser noted funds would be subtracted from the NNI fund at contract signing, not upon committee approval. Nordlund questioned, if the lower half of the proposal is completed by itself, will its benefits be compromised because

the upper half will not be completed? Fisher stated flood control structures are installed on every lake including McIntyre Dam. 70% of Okanagan River flow originates from the Similkameen River Basin noted Fisher. The amount of water energy passing through this area can be manipulated, barring a 150 year event. Any reconnected channels in the lower reach will not be destroyed or diminished by water energy noted Fisher. Nordlund's concern is that by completing only 500 meters of the project, (half of the area), you still have the same flow energy to dissipate thru the lower reach, and will this reduce the benefits (spawning area, holding area, migration etc.) of the lower project. Rose questioned if unnecessary risk is involved by completing only the lower half of project. Will a channel head cut situation become an issue if only the lower half of the reach is completed questioned Rose. The DFO has articulated utilization of natural channels vs. channelized reaches stated Fisher. Historically, that kind of energy is found because of high water flood controls noted Fisher. Meanders located above and below McIntyre Dam, where most of the sockeye spawn now has had a lot of time to correct itself naturally stated Marco. Andonaegui stated the ORRI project is a perfect project to utilize the Habitat Fund. She proposes splitting funding between the NNI Fund and Habitat Fund because of the short fall in the NNI Fund. Fisher stated if funding is approved construction engineers thought October would not be a good time to start the project because of winter conditions. Final engineering, contracting and outreach would be complete with construction to start in 2009 noted Fisher. Fisher proposes using \$407,000 from the HCP to start project engineering and permitting, and utilizing NNI funds for construction dollars next summer. Fisher is reluctant to spend Habitat Funds because of PRCC Habitat Subcommittee plans for proposed projects. Andonaegui stated the PRCC also has future projects that would utilize NNI Funds. Permitting will not be sought until funding is approved stated Fisher. Andonaegui stated the study is approved in concept, but there are still questions regarding funding. Nordlund pointed out that NNI funding will be adjusted annually for inflation, and this will likely increase the contributed NNI amount in 2008. Marco proposes HCP funds be used for initial permitting and engineering, and a letter of intent from Grant for \$411,000 could be used for contract placement in 2009. Fisher contacted Steve Matthews, Ministry of Fisheries and Oceans; Mathews stated he would accept a letter of intent from Grant approving the ORRI project. **PRCC members approved \$411,000 from NNI Fund for ORRI project. Letter of Intent stating, \$411,000 will be available on Feb. 15, 2009 for the ORRI project will be sent to Steve Matthews, Ministry of Fisheries and Oceans from**

**Grant PUD.** There was additional committee discussion regarding the format of the Habitat Funds/NNI Funds reporting spreadsheet. Nordlund created a spreadsheet that he has used to ballpark available funds, and will forward the spreadsheet to Grant PUD. **Nordlund will e-mail his fund spreadsheet to Grant PUD.**

- XV. BiOp Update – (Scott Carlon) – Carlon participated by phone in this portion of the meeting, which was moved up on the agenda and discussed after Action Items Review. (He left the meeting after this discussion). Carlon stated Yakama Nation will not be asking for government to government review of the BiOp. NMFS is editing the BiOp document and expect it to be distributed next week.
- XVI. PRCC Hatchery SC Report – Langshaw gave a PRCC Hatchery update.
- Priest Rapids Hatchery marking - BY07 fall Chinook are currently being intentionally marked with a schedule of temperature changes to band their otoliths, and thermal marking will continue until the Priest Rapids (PR) Hatchery M & E is finalized. PRCC HSC was concerned that Grant PUD was otolith marking without prior approval. After discussion, PRCC HSC did approve otolith marking.
  - Priest Rapids Hatchery remodel designs are 90% complete and under review by WDFW and facility operators. A value engineering design review will be completed by an independent engineering group
  - Grant PUD sent a letter to the Corp stating that the 1.7 million John Day fish previously reared at Priest Rapids Hatchery would not be accepted because of disease concerns and concerns about impact the Grant PUD program.
  - HSRG visited the Priest Rapids Hatchery on Jan. 16, 2008. He noted their recommendations were given on Jan. 18, 2008.
  - Section 10 reporting requirement protocols are being developed.
  - Nason Creek screw trap maintenance is being conducted by Yakama Nation.
  - Net pen – Lake Wenatchee State Park beach site will be the first option for launching net pens noted Langshaw. The boat launch will be second and helicopter launching third.
  - White River spring Chinook tagging protocol; adipose present with snout tags will provide a unique mark among

- Wenatchee basin spring Chinook and is the preferred option because of reduced handling stress and cost.
- White River spring Chinook genetics contract is still being developed.
- Transfer protocol for transfer of White River spring Chinook from Aquaseed to Little White Salmon Nation Fish Hatchery (LWSNFH) has been developed and approved by PRCC HSC.
- White River and Nason Creek January newsletter was sent out. PRCC HSC stated concern with not being able to review it prior to distribution. Andonaegui stated previous meeting minutes would show the PRCC HSC had been given PRCC approved to review, edit and authorize the newsletter prior to distribution. Dresser stated Langshaw had been misquoted in the Leavenworth Echo regarding the White River and he felt it was imperative that the newsletter be distributed quickly. Andonaegui stated that if the PRCC HSC wants to have final approval on documents related to their committee, they should. Rose suggested in the effort to facilitate information distribution in a timely manner, items such as the newsletter should be presented to the hatchery committee one week and brought before the PRCC the following week for approval. Dresser stated if committee approval takes too long, the newsletter will be distributed as a Grant document, noting this was not his first option. Rose stated the PRCC should decide where the newsletter should originate from and what should be covered.
- Okanogan spring Chinook SOA was approved.
- Langshaw expressed Grant PUDs concern at the amount of time it is taking to resolve spring Chinook HGMP issues and was concerned Grant PUD would be held accountable for not meeting the spring Chinook HGMP deadline. Langshaw suggested that Grant submit what they think is appropriate and incorporate JFP comments could be incorporated in the review process. Kris Peterson stated is wouldn't speed the process up. Langshaw stated the current Section 10 expires in 2010, noting it will be a couple of years before another Section 10 permit will be provided for Grant. Andonaegui stated the Settlement Agreement establishes a resolution conflict process that Grant can follow if matters are not settled in a timely manner. Dresser stated that Grant has had to meet time lines in the past and is trying to honor timelines in the Settlement Agreement. Langshaw stated his concern that the JFP is working with two different

management philosophies on this issue of how to proceed with Wenatchee River spring Chinook supplementation. Andonaegui stated WDFW and the Yakama Nation are still working on developing a white paper for this issue. Langshaw noted this is the first of many hard decisions that will be brought up, and it hasn't been dealt with in a timely manner which has created frustration for Grant PUD because of timelines they are expected to meet. Decisions need to be made in a timely manner stated Langshaw. The PRCC tasked the PRCC Hatchery and Habitat subcommittees to offer technical recommendations to the PRCC. The PRCC is then responsible with considering policy needs and then making final recommendations on an issue, noted Andonaegui. She suggested anything that isn't moving along should be bounced out of the subcommittees back up to the PRCC to facilitate timely recommendations. Rose questioned if this is a dispute resolution issue. Langshaw stated Grant isn't ready to use that alternative yet because movement is slowly forthcoming. Andonaegui stated that before Grant PUD considers going to a unilateral decision, issues should be elevated to the PRCC by Grant PUD if Grant PUD feels, for example, a PRCC subcommittee is making inappropriate recommendations or not making timely decisions. Rose stated the current BiOp establishes the direction the PRCC can take when consensus and decisions can not be reached by PRCC subcommittees. Rose also noted his frustration with the process. Langshaw stated that broodstock management and how the program will be operated is the only outstanding item to be resolved by the PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee, noting the HGMP is 98% complete. One example is that there will likely be no wild by wild redds available in 2009 to continue the captive brood program noted Langshaw. A large return of hatchery fish is expected next year and Langshaw questioned if hatchery fish will be incorporated in the captive brood program. Langshaw questions how will this be resolved? **PRCC HSC be tasked to outline three program ideas defining pros and cons, options to facilitate the program they've defined, and where they see the program in 10 years.** Rose doesn't believe the PRCC HSC has made these kinds of decisions as a collective group. Langshaw stated that WDFW and the Yakamas have come up with a conception of how the programs will be run. Rose stated the Yakamas ideas are completely different than WDFW,

but as a committee they are moving forward with the white paper. Rose stated that as the Yakama PRCC representative, he would like to see the PRCC recommend to the PRCC Hatchery subcommittee that they get their ideas on the same page, and the PRCC should be willing to help them get there. Langshaw stated that in this case it is tied up at the policy level. Langshaw noted it would help to have the PRCC say to the PRCC Hatchery subcommittee, here is the fundamental answer to the question; provide three technical reasons as to how it will be helpful. Andonaegui stated that the dispute resolution process needs to be utilized if an issue can not be resolved by a subcommittee in a timely manner. How do we get back to the PRCC making the decisions to move forward, questioned Dresser. Andonaegui will relay to Tweit Grant PUDs frustration with a lack of timely, forward progress and agency direction regarding the Wenatchee River spring Chinook supplementation program. Langshaw stated Grant and the PRCC HSC is still working on incorporating comments in the summer Chinook HGMP. Grant is being pushed to complete the Priest Rapids HGMP and M & E development, but objectives haven't been clearly defined noted Langshaw. Grant feels they are again in the situation to meet or exceed deadlines and fundamental questions haven't been answered yet by agencies, stated Langshaw.

- XVII. PRCC Habitat SC Report – Lenz noted Morgan has proposed a large woody debris project on Blackbird Island to the Icicle Chapter of Trout Unlimited. Lenz proposed a large woody debris project on Nason Creek. Parsons and Lenz are working on transfer of the Godwin property from Grant to USFS. Rose and Lenz will meet with Joseph Jones regarding LiDAR mapping. Next Habitat meeting is Feb. 8, 2008.
- XVIII. Sub-Yearling Pilot Study – Dotson proposed a sub-yearling pilot study. **Dotson will write a summary paper outlining the Sub Yearling Pilot Study concept and e-mail to the PRCC next week.** Dotson would like the PRCC committee to review this paper and be ready to make a recommendation at the next PRCC meeting in February.
- XIX. Nordlund questioned if a FTP site would ever be available for PRCC document management, i.e. archive documents on the FTP site so that they are readily available to the PRCC for decision making purposes per adaptive management. Dotson stated Steve Brown is considering the issue. Andonaegui stated the Chelan HCPs CC has a site for document retrieval. Rose stated Wells HCP CC also has a site.

XX. Next Meeting: Wednesday, Feb 27, 2008 @ Grant PUD SeaTac Office. Dresser stated the Hanford Reach Working Group meeting will be held at the Grant PUD Ephrata office on Feb. 01, 2008.