



Meeting Minutes

Fall Chinook Work Group

Tuesday, August 04, 2009
10:00 – 3:00

Grant PUD Natural Resources Division
Conference Room - C

Technical Members

Paul Wagner, NMFS
Robert Heinith, CRITFC
Roger Schiewe, BPA
Keith Truscott, CPUD
Bill Tweit, WDFW
Marcie Mangold, WDOE
Russell Langshaw, GCPUD
Steve Hemstrom, CPUD

Joe Skalicky/Dan Diggs, USFWS
Paul Ward/Bob Rose, YN
Brett Swift, American Rivers
Tom Kahler, DPUD
Paul Hoffarth, WDFW
John Clark, ADFG
Todd Pearsons, GCPUD

ATTENDEES:

John Clark, ADFG
Joe Skalicky, USFWS (on phone)
Marcie Mangold, WDOE (on phone)
Paul Wagoner, NMFS (on phone)
Steve Hays, Chelan PUD
Russell Langshaw, GCPUD
Debbie Williams, GCPUD

Paul Hoffarth, WDFW
Tom Kahler, DPUD
Bob Heinith, CRITFC (on phone)
Scott Bettin, BPA (on phone)
Don Anglin, USFWS (on phone)
Todd Pearsons, GCPUD
Tracy Hillman, Facilitator

Action Items:

- 1. Langshaw will incorporate comments to the Flow Fluctuation Report and redistribute for review.**
- 2. Williams will e-mail and upload the water storage capacity diagram distributed by Hays.**
- 3. Skalicky will distribute the “In Stream Flow Study” written by Beacher and Caldwell to the FCWG.**
- 4. Langshaw will incorporate the chart he created into the Flow Fluctuation Report that shows the proportion of constraints by category during protections for the years 2004-2009.**

5. **Williams will upload Flow Fluctuation Report comments to the FCWG website.**
6. **Grant PUD's constraints will be defined by Langshaw and distributed to members. Chelan PUD (Steve Hays) and Douglas PUD (Tom Kahler) will provide constraints to Williams for distribution. USFWS will start communications with the Bureau of Reclamation regarding their constraints, after coordination with BPA.**

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 – June 02, 2009** – Approved.
 - A **Review of Action Items** – Action items were reviewed and discussed.
- IV. **July 7th Joint Fisheries Managers meeting** – The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Washington Department of Wildlife (WDFW), the Yakama Nation (YN), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC) and Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE) met on July 07, 2009 to share thoughts and coordinate comments on the Flow Fluctuation Report. They also discussed the 401 Certification process and what WDOE intends to get out of the process. Mangold stated that the Fall Chinook Work Group (FCWG) is moving forward, and WDOE is satisfied with the progress made to date.

Members briefly discussed how knowledge of current flow fluctuations will affect the Hanford Reach 2014 reopener, stakeholder expectations, and making sure that all parties have the same understanding of the expectations.
- V. **Flow Fluctuation Report**
 - A **Comment Review and Discussion** – Comments have been received by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), WDFW, USFWS, and the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC) (comments from the Yakama Nation were received the week following the meeting). WDOE will use the Flow Fluctuation Report (FFR) to assist Grant PUD in deciding which studies the PUD will fund, and to determine the FCWG's path forward. Mangold noted the FFR is a 401 Certification requirement and will not be filed with FERC. The FFR doesn't have an approval deadline; a deadline hasn't been determined by the FCWG.
Langshaw will incorporate comments to the Flow Fluctuation Report and redistribute.

The FFR was used to help identify Grant PUD's funding contribution for studies in the Study Plan that are regional issues. Langshaw's impression was that the FFR was going to be used to identify Grant PUD's contribution, and how to adaptively manage for determined impacts. Mangold agreed. She explained that WDOE wanted to know what the big picture looks like regarding flows on the Columbia River. Langshaw noted concern that additional modeling might be required by the FCWG in order to precisely calculate Grant PUD's contribution to impacts. Because models can be worked and reworked and consensus may never be reached, Hillman questioned if studies would be delayed if the FCWG can't reach agreement on the FFR. Members agreed that they need to move on. Mangold suggested that the difficult task of determining Grant PUD's contribution to impacts should be mentioned in the comments to the FFR.

There were several comments about how the unimpounded scenario was unrealistic and that if the Priest Rapids Project was removed from the system, Rock Island Dam would have similar constraints to protect fall Chinook. Hays expressed concern about how little understanding there is of usable storage in the Mid-Columbia and especially in the Rock Island (RI) Reservoir. He distributed a diagram that showed the amount of water that can be stored in reservoirs on the Columbia River, explaining that flows from RI are a limited reflection of what comes out of Grand Coulee, and that RI has no storage to speak of because there is only a few feet of fluctuating range. **Williams will e-mail and upload the water storage capacity diagram distributed by Hays.** Hays explained that RI shouldn't be used as a control point for modeling because the Bonneville Power Administration mandates flows out of Grand Coulee, and RI only reacts to flows coming to it. If RI were given different mandates, it wouldn't change the outcome. Hays stated, "People need to understand where the water comes from and where control lies".

Langshaw explained that Phase 1 of the Study Plan is to develop a new internet-based model that will allow members to enter their own data and see the affects of the entry. The new model will be developed to integrate and house all of the current Hanford Reach models (MASS1, entrapment, fall Chinook susceptibility) in one location.

Langshaw asked questions and received answers regarding FFR comments received to date. The following topics were discussed:

- Constraints during protection flows.
- Data sets used for comparisons (Langshaw and Hoffarth will compare data sets).

- Regression analysis.
- WA State ramping rate guidelines (**Skalicky will distribute the “In Stream Flow Study” written by Beacher and Caldwell to the FCWG**).
- Provisions for day and nighttime flows.
- Timing of fluctuations at specific gauge site locations (**USFWS will provide Langshaw will gauge data from gauging stations**).
- Bias of the MASS1 model (**Battelle will look at bias issues**).

Langshaw will incorporate the chart he created into the Flow Fluctuation Report that shows the proportion of constraints by category during protections for the years 2004-2009.

Members voiced their opinions that this report doesn't hold a lot of weight in the Study Plan, but that the word “contribution” will continue to hinder the progression of this committee's ability to resolve a plan to protect fall Chinook. It would be beneficial for the FCWG to decide and agree upon a method to determine what is meant by “contribution”. Members agreed in concept that the FFR be relevant to 2004 thru 2006, and that generalized language regarding the applicability towards other years is used in an effort to move on.

WDOE, WDFW and Grant PUD have scheduled a meeting to discuss FFR comments as they relate to the 401. After Langshaw addresses comments, the FFR will be sent to WDOE. They will determine if comments have been sufficiently addressed and if the report meets their objectives. Mangold stated “It is still undetermined if WDOE has final approval of this report”.

Mangold and Skalicky noted that they are ok with the finer-scale analysis. Hoffarth explained that some of the finer-detail data are listed, but others aren't. Langshaw agreed to include a paragraph regarding finer-scale detail data.

Langshaw agreed with comments about maximum protection and will modify the language in the FFR to reflect the balance of protections for fall Chinook with other power and non-power needs.

The group agreed that a table depicting daily fluctuations will be added to the appendix.

The group agreed a 24-hour hydrograph (requested in the WDOE comment letter) is not required but that the current 7-day hydrograph in the report will be updated to include RI data and be scaled to better visualize fluctuations.

Grant PUD is waiting for official CRITFC authorization in order for Henry Franzoni to complete the entrapment modeling as requested in the WDOE comment letter. Grant PUD isn't concerned about a conflict of interest. The model takes the elevation and location of entrapments, and then uses MASS1 to determine how many entrapments are created. Members agreed that the model should still be completed and that it will be summarized in a separate report using the same scales and intervals of analyses as the FFR.

Langshaw intends to provide the final Flow Fluctuation Report by August 25, 2009. If he cannot meet that deadline, he will inform the group. The group agreed the deadline was not critical and that the deadline could be extended if necessary. WDOE's tentative review deadline is September 15, 2009. **Williams will upload Flow Fluctuation Report comments to the FCWG website.**

- VI. **Policy and Procedures** – Hillman did not receive any comments on FCWG protocols, they are considered approved.
- VII. **Study Plan** –
 - A **Comment Deadline** – Comments are due by August 31, 2009. If members have questions, they are to contact Langshaw.
 - B **Hourly Coordination** – The group discussed having hourly coordination training. Because of the FFR, FCWG members are more aware of how the Mid-Columbia is affected by hydro operations. However, other issues such as cultural resources and recreation must be considered during operations because they create additional constraints on the system. The FCWG needs to develop a better understanding of what happens if focus is placed on only one operational issue (such as fish) and not on all considerations.
 - C **Model Development** – Power Management staff is determining if a simplistic model is available. Langshaw asked FCWG members to think about the types of variables they would like to include and manipulate in the model, how far upstream the model should be applied, and who should be involved. **Grant PUD's constraints will be defined by Langshaw and distributed to members. Chelan PUD (Steve Hays) and Douglas PUD (Tom Kahler) will provide constraints to Williams for distribution. USFWS will start communications with the Bureau of Reclamation regarding their constraints, after coordination with BPA.**
- VIII. **Hanford Reach Work Group Meeting**
 - A **2009 Operations** – The Hanford Reach Operations Report will be submitted to FERC by September 01, 2009. It will include an evaluation of 2009 operations. The next HRWG meeting date will follow the FCWG meeting on October 06, 2009.

B Website Development – Grant PUD IT Staff are working on development of a website that will show such things as constraints, daily delta's, accumulative temperature units and graphs that show performance by fluctuation range similar to TMT. It will take approximately one month for IT staff to format, then additional time to automate. It should be complete by February 2010.

IX. Next Meeting: September 01, 2009 at the Grant PUD SeaTac office.