



## Meeting Minutes

### Priest Rapids Fish Forum

Wednesday, August 06, 2008

9:00 – 2:00

Grant PUD Natural Resources  
Conference Room A

#### Technical Members

---

Stephen Lewis, USFWS  
Marcie Mangold, WDOE  
Tom Dresser, GCPUD  
Ben Lenz, GCPUD

Bill Tweit, WDFW  
Bob Dach, BIA  
Mike Clement, GCPUD

#### ATTENDEES:

---

Jeff Korth, WDFW  
Bob Dach, BIA (by phone)  
Patrick Verhey, WDFW  
Bob Rose, Yakama Nation  
Mike Clement, GCPUD  
Debbie Williams, GCPUD

Keith Hatch, BIA (by phone)  
Marcie Mangold, WDOE  
Stephen Lewis, USFWS  
Bob Heinith, CRITFIC (by phone)  
Tom Dresser, GCPUD

#### Action Items:

- Dresser will edit meeting protocols.
- Grant PUD will outline tasks and estimate timelines of the Lamprey Management Plan in a draft proposal. The PRFF will be asked to review all draft objective plans and estimated implementation dates.
- Clement will arrange a fishway tour for members of the PRFF.
- Grant PUD will have a draft Sturgeon Management Plan for committee review by October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2008, and a second draft by Feb. 01, 2009.

#### Decisions:

- Priest Rapids Fish Forum (PRFF) attendees agreed that the PRFF would consist of the following members: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Yakama Nation (YN), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Grant

**PUD, Washington Department Of Ecology (WDOE), Columbia River Inter Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC), Wanapum Indians, Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation (Umatilla's) and other non resource management agencies that ask to participate.**

- **PRFF members agreed that meeting protocols be discussed at the October meeting to allow Dresser time to edit them.**

## Final Meeting Minutes

- I. **Welcome and Introductions** – Attendees introduced themselves around the table and on the conference line.
- II. **Agenda Review** – No additions were made to the agenda.
- III. **Approval of Meeting Minutes**
  - July 02, 2008 – Approved
- IV. **Protocols** – Bob Dach asked that the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) be included as a voting member of the Priest Rapids Fish Forum (PRFF). Mangold explained that BIA should be unified with the tribes. BIA represents the federal government, not the tribes, stated Dach. Dresser stated the Wampum's were denied voting rights by Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE), and if BIA is allowed to have voting rights, then voting rights should be extended to a larger group of participants. Mangold explained that BIA would not be excluded from attending meetings, but that voting rights were not discussed with Dach. Korth questioned the purpose of the voting members. The objective of the group is to reach consensus as to how a specific species is managed. BIA has the ability to work through Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), but would rather work through the PRFF forum to have their opinion's heard and included, stated Dach. Neither FERC nor WDOE are voting members, stated Mangold, but noted that voting power isn't needed to be included in the PRFF forum. Attendees agreed that meeting protocols could be modified in the future if need be. Dresser explained that Grant PUD will respond to comments submitted by BIA, just like comments from any other agency. Dach questioned if non members have access to dispute resolution. Management authorities need to be defined, stated Rose. Dresser questioned Mangold as to who the management authorities are, stating his concern that outside entities would go directly to FERC to have issues resolved if they aren't able to bring to them to the PRFF. Mangold explained that management authorities are WDOE and FERC. Because of that, WDOE will not be a voting member. She explained that WDOE relies heavily on WDFW for their fish expertise and since they will be a voting member, WDOE will not. **Priest Rapids Fish Forum (PRFF) attendees agreed that the PRFF would consist of the following members: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), United States Fish and**

**Wildlife Service (USFWS), Yakama Nation (YN), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Grant PUD, Washington Department Of Ecology (WDOE), Columbia River Inter Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC), Wanapum Indians, Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation (Umatilla's) and other non resource management agencies that ask to participate.** Dressed stated the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation (Colville's) don't plan on participating in the PRFF, but could be included at a later date if they want to. The Nez Perce and Warm Springs will be included by CRITFC, stated Dresser. BIA is a management authority agency, just like the YN, stated Dresser. Non resource management agencies would need to go through WDFW to have their issues brought to the table. If other regulatory agencies want to be included, they must petition members of the PRFF in writing. Disputes will be elevated to the WDOE. Fish issues will be addressed by WDFW and 401 Certification (401) Section III issues will be addressed by WDOE, stated Mangold. Dresser explained that comments received from agencies will be responded to in a table attached to the management plan. If Grant PUD agrees with the changes, they will be incorporated into the plan. If Grant PUD doesn't agree with the comments, the PRFF will be the forum to work those issues out. If issues can't be resolved in this forum, the agency should file a formal letter with FERC. WDOE files their comments directly to FERC, stated Mangold. Protocols state that FERC filings will only happen if there is a substantial issue that can't be resolved by members of the PRFF. Once the committee has reached consensus, all comments will be incorporated into the plan and sent to FERC for final approval. Comments can be sent via e-mail or written letter. Lewis questioned the relationship between the PRCC and PRFF. Dresser explained that he typically updates the PRCC on committee activities, but PRFF members could appoint a different representative if they like. Lewis questioned if Grant PUD would be comfortable reverting to the agencies. Dresser stated the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) aren't represented in this forum and they would have a say on most issues. **Dresser will edit meeting protocols to include the following:** Section 9, resource agencies will be allowed to ask Grant PUD to leave the meeting room for purpose of caucus. Section 3, protocol language will be consistent with the Settlement Agreement. Section 3, paragraph 2; If a Member cannot be present for an agenda item to be decided upon, they may notify Grant PUD who upon receipt of such a request, shall delay a decision on the agenda item for up to five (5) business days on the specified issues for which a delay is requested. Language will be changed to reflect ten (10) business days. Rose suggested that the language be changed to thirty (30) business days. Grant PUD is currently working through the contracting process for a facilitator. **PRFF members agreed that meeting protocols be discussed at the October meeting to allow**

**Dresser time to edit them.** Heinith questioned if meetings could be held at the SeaTac office in the future.

## V. Management Plans

A **Lamprey** – Grant PUD received management comments from USFWS and WDOE. Grant PUD will rewrite the draft to clean up any contradictions regarding lamprey population declines over the last 10 yrs. Dresser asked that WDOE assure that language in the management plans is consistent with language found in the 401. Amendments to the 401 could happen if something is found to be missing after the study plans have been developed and implemented, stated Mangold. Biological objectives, invasive species and predators are an example of topics that might cause the 401 to be amended, Mangold explained. Section 4, Rose questioned if adaptive management will be used to achieve the goals and requested that Grant PUD have a collection site on the project. Dresser questioned who would pay for a collection site, stating this topic should be addressed outside the PRFF forum. Translocation (collecting adult lamprey to expedite passage around the dams to repopulate lamprey in specific basins) was discussed. Dresser stated that WDFW needs to be involved in any translocation decisions. Grant PUD's management plan doesn't address adult lamprey collection other than for telemetry passage evaluations in future years. Successful collection methods include: dewatering of fishways and placement of in-water traps below the fishway overflow weir. Rose would like Grant to acknowledge the importance and need to resolve this issue. YN will be distributing and asking for comments shortly for their Lamprey Management Plan. Translocation could have a back lash, if lampreys aren't being placed in the right location, stated Lewis. The Umatilla's and Nez Perce have been translocating for the last 4 to 5 years with a high level of success, stated Rose. Dresser stated Grant PUD would not agree to translocation cost and facilitation being their sole responsibility. Mangold and Rose agreed translocation cost should be equally assumed by all parties. Dach would like the management plans to include dates and implementation timelines. The 401 has specific timelines that Grant PUD must meet, and in addition, final management plans must be sent to FERC by April 01, 2009. Management plans must be approved by FERC before implementation begins. Dach would like to see implementation strategies outlined for each sub component. **Grant PUD will outline tasks and estimate timelines of the Lamprey Management Plan in a draft proposal. The PRFF will be asked to review all draft objective plans and estimated implementation dates.** Some objectives don't have the

technology to move forward (juveniles) yet. Dach asked that the Grant PUD proposal describe how the PRFF will move forward with the next steps. He would like to have subsequent pieces dated. Mangold stated it would be hard to lock in a date because of changes. It was left vague because it needs to be sent to FERC. Heinith explained that the U.S. Corp is doing a lot of work with adult lamprey passage. They will be implementing plans to reduce diffuser grating size, and rounding corners. He questioned if Grant PUD would be willing to move forward with these plans without having to do further studies. Lamprey passage relative to the PR Project is based on sound scientific data, stated Dresser, noting that Grant PUD will continue to go slow and ask questions before implementing any changes to what is currently being done. Dresser questioned why the Corp has been allowed to use traveling screens on the mainstem Columbia when they are known to cause impacts to juvenile lamprey. Mangold stated that plans need to be studied before implementation. Grant PUD is proposing to install a 16" wide plating to all diffusion grating at Priest Rapids prior to the next telemetry evaluation to reduce upwelling velocities from the auxiliary water supply via the diffusion grating, stated Clement. **Clement will arrange a fishway tour for members of the PRFF.** Mary Mosier and Chris Peary should be invited, stated Heinith. Their opinions should be included in this management plan, Heinith suggested. Rose didn't agree. Lewis noted that fishway modifications may be less expensive than conducting a study for five years. Rose explained that Tribal Component Plans include many of the same actions discussed. Rose stated his comfort with the management plan.

- B Sturgeon** – The introduction section of the Sturgeon Management Plan will be reviewed to assure consistency with the 401. Biological relevance will be reviewed in Section 1.1. Section 2.1, development of a baseline population status study plan for one field season will be included. More fish have been introduced to the plan. If the plan is approved, implementation will start in the summer of 2009. Information from other studies regarding, growth, survival, and a list of assumptions will be included. Stocking targets of a proposed sturgeon facility at PR Hatchery need to be determined. Other populations will be updated in Section 2.2. Section 3 will be reviewed to assure it is consistent with the 401. Objectives will be modified based on the best available information. Section 3.1, areas identified that are inconsistent regarding broodstock sources will be re-written. M & E plans will be outlined. Section 3.2, Grant PUD has identified that supplementation monitoring, methodology, and tagging need a little more work. Section 3.3, carrying capacity should be linked to the monitoring program. Outline what has

been done, what hasn't been done, and information collected. Section 3.4, discuss long term objectives, potential research activities, and update literature review for natural reproduction potential. **Grant PUD will have a draft Sturgeon Management Plan for committee review by October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2008, and a second draft by Feb. 01, 2009.** Dresser stated that fishways are achieving sturgeon passage in the Priest Rapids Project. Grant PUD will review issues regarding sturgeon genetics. Dach requested that a timeline for planning purposes be incorporated into the plan. Water requirements for a hatchery have been addressed. Broodstock holding facilities are dictated by water needs. Chelan and Douglas PUD's have expressed interest in Grant PUD's proposed sturgeon facility. Engineers are currently looking at the existing PR Hatchery facility. Canadian facilities have also been looked at. Douglas is more interested, Chelan continues to assess the plan. Harvest goals of the plan were questioned by Rose. The goal in the plan talks about getting populations commiserate with available habitat. It can be argued that fish populations aren't at habitat he stated, and believes the wording has been mistaken. Fish populations should be at a higher level than what is commiserate with habitat, Rose stated. NNI should be addressed at this point in the plan. The FERC license doesn't state that habitat conditions be taken back to pre-project conditions, stated Dresser. Rose questioned the definition of harvestable goal. Grant PUD wants to make sure that project impact mitigation has boundaries, and that unlimited fish will not be placed in the river from here to eternity. The size of the proposed sturgeon facility needs to be determined, budgeted, designed and the path forward defined, stated Dresser. Rose would like harvest to be used as a tool to push capacity. He wants to make sure language is in the plan that will allow for harvest by the tribes and public for years to come. Section 3.1, Objective 1, clearly define biological objectives. Harvest is included in the objective of the 401, so Rose's concerns are mute. Heinith questioned the rough hatchery schedule? Consultants are looking at water concerns for 10,000 juveniles. Grant PUD will commit to looking at alternative rearing facilities if need be, Dresser stated. Use of re-circulated water and use of second pass water from the fall Chinook facility is being looked at. UC Davis and Kootenai are being consulted.

- C **Bull Trout** – USFWS commented on all three plans. Section 4.1, fish counts will be updated. Dresser explained that one ladder is operational during winter outages. Page 15, Lewis questioned what happens after year five. Insert that counting will continue for all life stages. Section 2.2, A plan can't be developed until the committee determines that there is a

sufficient sample size. It needs to be determined how many fish are passing the project so adaptive management can be utilized. Grant PUD will assess passage at Wanapum and Priest Rapids. Strike consider from language. Sufficient sample size is when there are enough fish to be doing more good than harm. It will be determined by consensus of the committee. Section 2.7, Lewis suggested that because there are so few bull trout, a tool is needed to assess take. He stated that mortality, harassment, and fish passing a fish ladder are viewed as take. Cumulative stress can be considered lethal or sub-lethal take. If a trend is seen, the USFWS can look at bull trout take by Grant PUD, stated Lewis. Grant PUD will document incidental encounters of bull trout as a secondary tool to assess take. Section 2.8, Lewis explained that Chelan PUD looks at specific areas that are vulnerable to incidental bull trout juvenile take on an annual basis. Dresser noted that Grant PUD hasn't encountered large numbers of bull trout juveniles with ladder counts or gateway dipping, and questioned why index sites would be needed throughout the reservoir to count juveniles that aren't seen now. Lewis agreed with Clement that if increased numbers of juveniles are seen in the project, Grant PUD use that as a trigger to evaluate increased numbers of bull trout in the Project area. If incidental collection of bull trout is observed, USFWS would require Grant PUD to take a deeper look at populations within the Project area. Page 15, sufficient sample size needs to be defined. Issues with adults being collected at Rock Island are a concern because 25% of the population died during earlier studies conducted by the three mid-C PUDS'. It needs to be questioned if more harm than good is being done. Grant PUD needs to capitalize on studies being conducted by others. Clement suggested that Grant PUD would be willing to install telemetry equipment at Wanapum Dam to monitor tagged fish from upstream studies being conducted by Chelan PUD or Douglas PUD.

D **Native resident fish** – Columbia Basin hatchery upgrades are being discussed between Grant PUD and WDFW. Grant PUD is in the process of developing a resident fish plan.

VI. **Next Meeting:** September 03, 2008, 1:00 to 5:00, USFWS Office, 215 Melody Lane, Wenatchee, WA, 98801-8121.