



MEETING

Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee

Wednesday, March 25, 2009

9:00 – 3:00

Grant PUD SeaTac Office

PRCC Members

Scott Carlon/Bryan Nordlund, NMFS
Jerry Marco, CCT
Bob Rose, YN
Bill Tweit, WDFW

Jim Craig, USFWS
Tom Dresser, GCPUD
Carl Merkle, CTUIR

Attendees: (*Denotes PRCC member)

Scott Carlon, NMFS*
Jim Craig, USFWS*
Jerry Marco, CCT* (via phone)
Duncan Hay, Oakwood Consulting
Tom Dresser, GCPUD*
Todd Pearsons, GCPUD
George Thompson, GCPUD
Denny Rohr, Facilitator

Bryan Nordlund, NMFS*
Bob Rose, YN*
Bill Tweit, WDFW*
Heather Bartlett, WDFW
Curt Dotson, GCPUD
Dana Jeske, GCPUD
Debbie Williams, GCPUD
Elizabeth McManus, Ross & Assoc.

Action Items:

1. Rohr will distribute an action item list at each PRCC meeting.
2. Dotson will send Williams the 2008 Behavioral Study Plan for uploading to the PRCC web site.
3. Rohr and Dotson will develop a list of plans that require review and action. Hard copies of all plans will be provided to PRCC members in the future.
4. Nordlund will develop PRCC Hatchery Sub-committee operating protocols and facilitator evaluation criteria after contacting HSC members. Both draft documents will then be distributed to the PRCC for review.
5. Williams will send Nordlund a list of HSC members.
6. Williams will upload the Priest Rapids Top-Spill Design Team (Iowa Trip) PowerPoint on the PRCC website.

7. Williams will send a doodle to Design Team members extending Iowa travel dates out to August 01, 2009. After the Design Team's response, Williams will send a doodle to PRCC members.
8. Dotson will add language to SOA 2009-04 reflecting current methodologies available to perform sub-yearling survival studies.
9. Dotson will provide Skalski's PIT-tag survival findings at the next PRCC meeting.
10. Dresser will contact FERC regarding incorporation of the three plans: Downstream Passage Alternative Action Plan, Wanapum "Interim" Alternative Spill Plan, and the Priest Rapids Alternative Spill Plan.
11. Comments on the Downstream Passage Alternative Action Plan, Wanapum "Interim" Alternative Spill Plan, and the Priest Rapids Alternative Spill Plan are due by April 17, 2009. Comments will be incorporated in Track Changes with distribution back to the PRCC by April 29, 2009.
12. PRCC members agreed to delay their review of the draft Habitat Plan until they receive comments on the Plan from the Habitat Subcommittee.
13. PRCC members will discuss the HGMP and APP extension of time letter with their Hatchery Sub-committee representative, then hold a conference call to discuss their decision.
14. Dresser will send an email to the PRCC and HSC on 4/15/09 asking for approval of the FERC extension letter.

Decisions:

1. PRCC members approved SOA 2009-01, agreeing 100% of the Priest Rapids Hatchery Fall Chinook should be marked.
2. PRCC members did not approve SOA 2009-02, regarding the type of mark to be used to mark 100% of the Priest Rapids Hatchery Fall Chinook.
3. PRCC members approved SOA 2009-04 (with modified language) stating that Grant PUD is not required to conduct a 2009 sub-yearling Project survival study.

Final Meeting Minutes

- I. **Welcome and Introductions** – Rohr welcomed attendees.
- II. **Agenda Review**: No additions were made.
- III. **Action Items Review** – Members reviewed and discussed action items from the February 25, 2009 meeting. **Rohr will distribute an action item list at each PRCC meeting. Dotson will send Williams the Draft 2008 Behavioral Study Report for uploading to the PRCC web site. Rohr and Dotson will develop a list of draft**

plans/reports that require review and action. Electronic and hard copies of all draft plans/reports will be provided to PRCC members in the future.

IV. Action Items: 2009 Spill Representatives will be Dotson, Rose and Carlon.

V. Priest Rapids Hatchery Fall Chinook Fish Marking Identification Dispute Resolution Process

Tweit left the meeting at 12:00 p.m. Bartlett spoke on behalf of WDFW.

A. SOA 2009-01 – States that 100% of the Priest Rapids Hatchery Fall Chinook should be marked; externally, or internally. The PRCC Hatchery Sub-committee (HSC) approved this SOA on March 19, 2009. **PRCC members approved SOA 2009-01, agreeing 100% of the Priest Rapids Hatchery Fall Chinook should be marked.**

B. SOA 2009-02 – States that an external (adipose fin clip) be used to mark 100% of the Priest Rapids Hatchery Fall Chinook. The HSC did not approve this SOA because consensus could not be reached. The vote was 4 to 2. USFWS, NMFS, WDFW, and the Colville's voted yes to fully adipose clip Priest Rapids Hatchery Fall Chinook. The Yakama Nation (YN) and Grant PUD opposed. **PRCC members did not approve SOA 2009-02, regarding the type of mark to be used to mark 100% of the Priest Rapids Hatchery Fall Chinook.**

The Colville's support ad-clipping because it allows real time broodstock management. "That is the principal reason WDFW wants the fish marked," stated Bartlett.

Rose suggested that Washington Department of Wildlife (WDFW) defer from taking this issue up to the policy level and continue discussions with the YN. They would like to discuss this further in the U.S. v. Oregon forum. Bartlett explained that US v. Oregon includes footnotes that read, "Upriver brights (Chinook) may at some time be adipose clipped". She believes that the PRCC is the forum to decide this issue. After the decision is reached, it should then be taken to the production advisory committee of US v. Oregon. Bartlett noted that language placed in the US v. Oregon was placed there to hedge against these types of decisions in the future. Members discussed the M&E aspects of external and internal marks. WDFW agreed that WDFW and the YN should take additional time to discuss the type of mark to be used.

VI. Priest Rapids Hatchery Sub-committee Facilitation – Members discussed the new PRCC Hatchery Sub-committee (HSC) facilitator

(Elizabeth McManus) that will take over for Denny Rohr at the April 16, 2009 HSC meeting. Carlon and Rose noted concern that Grant PUD didn't contact either the PRCC or the HSC to be involved with selecting a new facilitator. Dresser explained that facilitation, and the inability of the HSC to move forward with their overall goal to reach mitigation, harvest, or recovery has needed to be addressed for a long time. Nordlund explained that the 2005 protocols developed for the PRCC states that facilitators will be determined by the PRCC.

After discussion, members agreed that the HSC facilitator should undergo a six (6) month performance review by the HSC based on evaluation criteria developed by the PRCC. The PRCC will also draft HSC operating protocols. **Nordlund will develop PRCC Hatchery Sub-committee operating protocols and facilitator evaluation criteria after contacting HSC members. Both draft documents will then be distributed to the PRCC for review. Williams will send Nordlund a list of HSC members.**

Elizabeth McManus, new PRCC Hatchery Sub-committee facilitator, joined the meeting at 1300 hr. She spent many years with the Washington Department of Ecology, and has been a partner with Ross and Associates for the past nine years where she has worked as a facilitator.

VII. Priest Rapids Top-Spill –

A. Design Team update from February Iowa trip – Duncan Hay, Oakwood Consulting presented a PowerPoint presentation to explain modeling results of the Priest Rapids Top Spill Design Team's trip to Iowa in February. **Williams will upload the Priest Rapids Top-Spill Design Team PowerPoint on the PRCC website.** The base case comparison of non-turbine passage was used to show nine modeling scenarios using various lengths (150', 300', and 450') and depths (10', 30', and 50') of the proposed training wall idea. Use of velocity jets placed at a depth of 30' was also modeled.

Of the nine modeled training wall scenarios, Case #8, the 450' wall at a depth of 30' showed the largest benefit of guiding fish away from the powerhouse entrance, and through the top-spill configuration. The Design Team will meet with Andy Goodwin to discuss his Numeric Fish Segregate (NFS modeling). Future modeling will use different configurations (wall degrees) and locations (pier 20/21) to determine if they will make significant differences in non-turbine passage. Modeling did show that use of Spillbay 22's sluice flow does increase the percentage of non-turbine passage.

Due to scheduling conflicts in April, members must select another date to travel to Iowa. Dresser noted that Grant PUD

will reimburse PRCC members for air travel and car rental, and reminded them that all receipts will be required for reimbursement. Grant PUD will distribute a purchase order number that is required for all travel. **Williams will send a doodle to Design Team members extending Iowa travel dates out to August 01, 2009. After the Design Team's response, Williams will send a doodle to PRCC members.**

- VIII. Action Item: Sub-yearling Survival Study SOA 2009-04 Vote –** Nordlund and Dotson drafted Statement of Agreement (SOA) 2009-04. Marco asked that the SOA be reworded to reflect, (in the Statement section of the SOA (not just the Background section) that if methodologies are found to conduct a sub-yearling survival study that Grant PUD will perform a 2010 survival study. **Dotson will add language to SOA 2009-04 reflecting that if methodologies are available to perform sub-yearling survival studies, Grant PUD would conduct one in 2010. PRCC members approved SOA 2009-04 with modified language.** A meeting will be held in June and September between the 3 PUD's (Chelan, Douglas, and Grant) and agencies & Tribes to discuss knowledge and coordination needed to conduct sub-yearling survival studies. Dotson explained that the USGS-WDFW Predator Study will be doing belly analysis on all predators captured during the study. Dotson believes that sub-yearlings will be found in the gut content. Rose would like committee members to be thinking about information that can be gathered during the 2009 season. Nordlund explained that Chelan and Douglas PUD's Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) agreement includes a flow chart matrix that directs dam survival estimates to be used if project survival can not be directly estimated. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) have sub-yearling scale data that will give a life history of over-wintering in the reservoirs.
- IX. Update on Predator Study -** Grant PUD supplied the United States Geological Survey (USGS) with 2000 PIT-tags to be used for predator tagging in the Priest Rapids Project. USGS has asked that spill (bypass) be shut down early in the morning a couple of times during the season to capture and tag predators in the tailraces.
- X. Update on 2008 PIT-tag/Acoustic tag Detection Issue –** Dotson distributed PIT-tag information. Dotson stated that in a 3 yr average, Grant PUD will not make survival performance standards for steelhead based on the preliminary survival estimates of 2008. It is the question of tag failures (observed in tag lots and also the PIT tag detections at McNary) that raised the question for further evaluation of the preliminary 2008 steelhead survival estimates. Dotson also presented information showing that of the 15 different tag lots used in the 2008 study, only 10 of the tag lots were represented in the "tag-life test" Prior to the start of the 2008 studies, HTI didn't have all tags onsite to

be tested. HTI has assured Grant PUD that all tags will be present prior to the start of the 2009 studies. Dotson explained that some of the tag lots saw a 5% to 10% tag failure within the first 24 hours. Two tag lots with the worst tag failure rates were not represented in the “tag-life test”.

Skalski will run five different scenarios using the “new” tag-lot information that has been found and also looking at the McNary PIT tag detections by April 01, 2009 to determine what the survival percentage would have been if tag failure hadn’t happened. **Dotson will provide Skalski’s PIT-tag survival findings at the next PRCC meeting.** Nordlund reminded Dotson that Chelan’s tag test life results required no correction to survival estimates. He also stated that it was not clear why Grant PUD’s Priest Rapids survival study, for which he recalled a 2% tag failure rate, tag failure rate was not used to adjust survival estimates, as indicated in Skalski’s draft report.

Twit wondered if Grant PUD is considering the use of PIT tags instead of acoustic tags. McNary Dam could be a “second detection site” (for the acoustic tag), but on average, they only detect 17.5% of PIT-tags. Use of a PIT-tag and acoustic tag will happen in 2009, but the study doesn’t include methods for analyzing data from both tags.

XI. Fish Surgery – Suture Update – Dotson explained some of the differences between braided and Monocryl sutures. Grant PUD has used braided sutures in the past. It is similar in texture to thread, so it’s easy to work with, and knots hold well. It degrades and decomposes in a couple of weeks. Braided sutures do wick, which could cause infection at the incision site.

Monocryl sutures are similar to monofilament fishing line. Concerns are the practice it takes to tie a triple knot. This type of suture doesn’t wick or dissolve. Due to not dissolving, it could become a cutting factor. Most studies are one week long so a dissolving stitch doesn’t make a difference.

The final version of the Performance Assessment of Suture Type in Juvenile Chinook Salmon Surgically Implanted with Acoustic Transmitters Report was distributed by Rose today. The United States Geological Survey Cook Lab will continue to use braided material. Grant PUD’s fish tagger’s used both types of material in a class held by Michelle Rub of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Science Center. Grant PUD fish tagger’s have told Dotson they feel comfortable using either type of suture material. Dotson did not call out a suture type in the study. PRCC members didn’t have a direction on suture material. Dotson will discuss which type of suture material the surgical team prefers using, and let them make the decision.

- XII. Discussion/Comment on Downstream Passage Alternative Action Plan** – Dresser asked members if the Downstream Passage Alternative Action Plan (DPAP), Wanapum “Interim” Alternative Spill Plan (WASP), and the Priest Rapids Alternative Spill Plan (PRASP) can be combined into one plan. **Dresser will contact FERC regarding incorporation of the three plans.** The plans were sent to PRCC members for review on March 6, 2009. Grant PUD has asked the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to extend the plans deadline to May 15, 2009. The DPAP focus’s on achieving standards of juvenile salmonid passage. The DPAP and PRASP are annual plans dues by February 15th of each year. The WASP is a one time plan due by February, 15, 2009. 2009 study plans are reflected in each of the plans. Nordlund suggested that the Fish Passage Plan also be incorporated into the combined plan. **Comments on the Downstream Passage Alternative Action Plan, Wanapum “Interim” Alternative Spill Plan, and the Priest Rapids Alternative Spill Plan are due by April 17, 2009. Comments will be incorporated in Track Changes with distribution back to the PRCC by April 29, 2009.**
- XIII. Discussion/Comment on Wanapum “Interim” Alternative Spill Plan** – See above.
- XIV. Discussion/Comment on Priest Rapids Alternative Spill Plan** – See above.
- XV. Discussion/Comment on PRCC Habitat Plan** – Rohr commented on his recent email to PRCC members to delay their review of the draft Habitat Plan, except for the No Net Impact (NNI) Fund portion, in order to allow the Habitat Sub-committee (HSC) time to review and provide the PRCC with their comments to the Plan. The WDFW HSC member would like to take additional time to review the plan. Grant PUD drafted and distributed a list of projects to be reviewed for consideration of payment out of the NNI Fund. Nordlund also thought the NNI list of projects should include tributary projects, and Rohr commented that HSC members are reviewing the plan with consideration to include tributary projects as well. Rohr explained that the HSC members are discussing asking FERC for an extension of time for submittal of the Habitat Plan until July 01, 2009. **PRCC members agreed to delay their review of the draft Habitat Plan until they receive comments on the Plan from the Habitat Subcommittee.**
- XVI. Discussion on Extension of Time Requests** – Dresser distributed the FERC License Activities Report and updated members on plan status. Once approvals are provided, a new column listing the approval date will be added to the report.
- A. HGMPs** – Grant PUD developed a FERC extension letter for Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans (HGMPs), and Artificial Propagation Plans (APPs) when they realized they

wouldn't be able to meet their April 17, 2009 submittal date. APPs are being submitted for programs that have other entities writing the HGMP. The letter was submitted to the Hatchery Sub-committee (HASC) in January for approval prior to sending it to FERC.

The HASC would like to include an implementation schedule for all HGMPs and APPs in the extension letter. Dresser doesn't want to include the schedule because HGMPs are still being developed and there is no way to accurately estimate how long consultation, permitting, or what other agencies need to complete prior to submission will take. Carlon explained that the implementation schedule the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) would like to see explains when fish will be put in the water. Rose suggested that Grant PUD ask the entities that will be consulting on the HGMPs and APPs to provide a timeline of how long their consultation will take. FERC wants to see NMFS approval and Section 10 permits prior to Grant PUD plan submittal. It's unknown what the turn around time will be for plans submitted to FERC. PRCC members stated that they can see Grant PUD's "side of the issue" regarding this letter to FERC requesting an extension of time. PRCC members mentioned that they may touch base with their respective PRCC HSC representative about the letter. Dresser said that it was Grant PUD's intention to have one-on-one discussions with the agency or tribe PRCC representative regarding this letter in the next couple of weeks. Grant PUD needs to send a letter requesting a time extension to FERC by April 16th, no matter what.

Dresser will send an email to the PRCC and HSC on 4/15/09 asking for approval of the FERC extension letter.

Dresser distributed the White River implementation schedule and explained that each program will have an implementation schedule built. Dresser stated that Grant PUD will not implement any programs until FERC has approved the HGMPs and APPs.

Priest Rapids Hatchery renovations will require a FERC amendment to Grant PUD's new license. Dresser explained that Grant PUD has purchased land for project development, drilled water wells, and that conceptual designs for each project are being completed. APPs are being submitted for programs that have other entities writing the HGMP.

B. Aquatic Invasive Species – An extension will be filed.

XVII. PRCC Hatchery SC Report – See discussion above under V.

XVIII. PRCC Habitat SC Report – Rohr distributed the Habitat Fund spreadsheet. Annual deposits were made by Grant PUD on February 15, 2009.

XIX. Approval of Meeting Minutes

- **December 12, 2009 Predator Study CC** – Approved
- **January 20, 2009 Predator Study CC** – Approved
- **January 28, 2009 meeting** – Approved
- **February 25, 2009 meeting** - Approved

XX. Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 29, 2009, 9:00 – 3:00 at the Grant PUD SeaTac office.