



Meeting Minutes

Fall Chinook Work Group

Tuesday, January 05, 2010
9:00 – 5:00

NOAA Fisheries
Willamette Conference Room
Portland, OR

Technical Members

Paul Wagner, NMFS
Robert Heinith, CRITFC
Holly Harwood, 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:

Paul Wagner, NMFS
Bob Heinith, CRITFC
Geoff McMichael, Battelle
Russell Langshaw, GCPUD
Debbie Williams, GCPUD

Bob Rose, YN
Rich Domingue, NMFS
Joe Taylor, Mid-C Coordinator
Todd Pearsons, GCPUD (on phone)
Tracy Hillman, Facilitator

Action Items:

- 1. McMichael will bring an egg tube to the next meeting for show-and-tell.**
- 2. Langshaw will give a presentation at the February FCWG meeting on Productivity Studies and what has been done in the region.**
- 3. Hillman has drafted a letter inviting experts to serve on the Productivity Panel. He will send it to Langshaw for review next week. It should be ready for distribution to the panel in February.**
- 4. McMichael will pull pre-Hanford Reach constraints data and send to Langshaw for review. This information will be distributed to the FCWG in February.**

5. Williams will post the Anglin et al. (2006) report to the FCWG website.

Meeting Minutes

- I. **Welcome and Introductions** – Attendees introduced themselves around the table and on the conference line (see list of attendees above).
- II. **Agenda Review** – Heinith asked that 2011-2013 Stranding and Entrapment Studies be added to the agenda.
- III. **Approval of Meeting Minutes**
 - December 10, 2009 – **Approved.**
- IV. **Review of Action Items** - Action items identified during the November meeting were reviewed and discussed.
 - #1 - The PRCC will discuss use of NNI Funds to support Hanford Reach studies at their January 27, 2010 meeting.
 - #2 - No action taken since last meeting: Langshaw and Pearsons will add draft language to the Study Plan describing a framework for crossing the gap between the inconclusive productivity assessment results and Phase II studies.
 - #3 - Hillman explained that internal dialog is ongoing at WDOE regarding Study Plan funding.
 - #4 - After Hoffarth, WDFW, and Turner, Grant PUD, meet to review smolt to adult data sets, a draft report will be distributed in February to FCWG members.
 - #5 - In February or March, McMichael will provide his thoughts on ways to compare egg-fry survival in tubes to those in natural redds. Members with thoughts on this need to share those with Geoff.
 - #6 - Members need to let Hillman know about any data and/or reports they would like to share with the Expert Panel. Williams will add a folder to the FCWG website that will house the reports and data for the Expert Panel.
 - #7 - Hillman has drafted a letter inviting experts to serve on the Productivity Panel. He will send it to Langshaw for review next week. It should be ready for distribution to the panel in February.
 - #8 - Langshaw hasn't received aerial photos of the Wanapum Tailrace yet, but will post them to the website upon receipt.
 - #9 - Langshaw will send the Hanford Reach website link to FCWG members as soon as it is available.

V. Update on Flow Fluctuation Report

- A **Discussion** – Langshaw explained that Battelle continues to work on updating the Flow Fluctuation Report. Issues regarding Daylight Savings time have been resolved. Battelle has the necessary data and is working through the models.

VI. Study Plan

- A **Use of NNI Funds** – The PRCC will discuss use of NNI Funds to support Hanford Reach studies at their January 27, 2010 meeting. Rose asked that FCWG members speak to their PRCC representatives regarding this. Other funds that might be available for fall Chinook studies are the McNary Pool and WASCO PUD (The Dalles, OR) funds. They could possibly be matched with NNI Funds and Grant PUD funding.
- B **Revised Study Plan** – Langshaw is incorporating draft language to include roles for the expert panel. Expect a new draft by January 15, 2010.
- C **Productivity Estimation (CWTs)** – Pearsons explained that Clark, ADFG, provided documents regarding a mark-recapture report conducted by McPhearson, ADFG. Turner has included calculations from Macpherson's report in Grant PUD's spreadsheet. After Hoffarth, WDFW, and Turner, Grant PUD, meet to review smolt to adult data sets; a draft report will be distributed to FCWG members in February to be reviewed at the March FCWG meeting.
- D **Egg-to-Fry Studies** – McMichael explained that pulling egg tubes early won't help the mortality issue. Fungus issue's can be controlled if they come up. Emergence starts to happen at approximately 1000 temperature units (TU's). The tubes will be retrieved at 975. Emergence could take place between the end of February and mid March. Fry will be contained and unable to swim away. **McMichael will bring an egg tube to the next meeting.** Relative to controls, good data can still be gathered. The second group has three controls.
- E **Productivity Study (Expert Panel)** – FCWG members discussed the working logistics of the Expert Panel (EP). It was agreed that the EP should meet remotely to hold smaller in-depth review discussions, and then meet with the FCWG. Wagner explained that he doesn't understand the expectations of the productivity model and what the FCWG expects to get from the information. Wagner asked if someone could provide the FCWG with an introductory class on elementary productivity modeling. Clark suggested David Bernard, a retired Biologist from ADFG.

Langshaw agreed to give a presentation at the February FCWG meeting on Productivity Studies and what has been done in the region.

Hillman has drafted a letter inviting experts to serve on the Productivity Panel. He will send it to Langshaw for review next week. It should be ready for distribution to the panel in February.

- VII. 2011-2013 Stranding Studies** - Heinith asked the Workgroup to begin thinking about how to estimate fall Chinook fry entrapment and stranding losses from flow fluctuations in the Hanford Reach. He provided members with a handout quoting the FERC Order Issuing Grant PUD's new License in April 17, 2008, page 32, item number 96 ("this license includes three years of entrapment and stranding monitoring during 2011, 2012, and 2013, for comparison to similar data collected prior to implementation of the Hanford Agreement"). McMichael was tasked with putting together all the information and reports on fry entrapment and stranding studies conducted before the Hanford Reach Agreement. He should have that completed in February. After the FCWG reviews that information, it may be necessary to convene a small group, or subgroup (consisting of at least individuals involved with the earlier studies) to evaluate the information and propose ways to conduct the studies in 2011-2013 so that the information can be compared with the studies conducted before the Agreement.

Thus, it is a two-step process: (1) compile and evaluate entrapment and stranding information before the Agreement and (2) decide how to conduct future studies so the results can be compared with the earlier studies.

Heinith suggests cost sharing ideas be discussed with WDOE. He explained that ADFG and CRITFC could probably provide resources for the study.

Wagner explained that NMFS expects a count in 2011, 2012, and 2013, and an evaluation be conducted to see if the current program is adequate. Langshaw agreed a plan is required, but noted it doesn't specify that a field evaluation be conducted in 2011, 2012, and 2013. He believes that any stranding and entrapment studies that are completed need to be considered as part of a broader monitoring plan, because there are three requirements for monitoring. The Hanford Reach Fall Chinook Protection Program, the 401 Water Quality Certification, and the Priest Rapids Hatchery M&E Plan all require some type of monitoring in the Hanford Reach. Thus, it is important that all three be considered to develop a cohesive and comprehensive approach. Langshaw wants FCWG members to understand that if this is a requirement of the License, members need to agree on how it fits into the Study Plan.

Members discussed the amount of pre-Hanford Reach constraints data that is available and agreed that the method and approach must be agreed upon prior to starting. It was suggested that members focus on areas of disagreement to develop an approach. **McMichael will pull pre-Hanford Reach constraints data and send to Langshaw for review. This information will be distributed to the FCWG in February. Williams will post the Anglin et al. (2006) report to the FCWG website.**

VIII. Hanford Reach Work Group Meeting

Activities – Embryos have achieved 500 TU's and fry began hatching in the zone above 50 kcfs. There have been no problem with flows, but they are expected to drop toward the end of February or early March. Because water supply is expected to be at 80% of normal, it may become a challenge to maintain the Protection Level Flows (60 kcfs).

It has been shown that alevins do move in redds capped below Wanapum Dam during dewatering, and that they also move around a couple of weeks prior to emergence. This is the most critical life stage depending on their development and location. Because fish move away from near-shore areas after they reach 50 mm, their susceptibility mirror emergence timing. Peak stranding and entrapment generally coincides with peak emergence.

IX. HRWG Website - The website should be operational by mid February. It will automatically send updates to FCWG members that the web site has been updated.

X. Mid-Columbia Hourly Coordination Workshop – Joe Taylor, Mid-Columbia Coordinator, explained how hourly coordination works. Setting stranding bands continue to be a challenge for the Mid-Columbia Coordinator. After his presentation, members agreed that how to deal with low flows on weekends needs to be defined. Langshaw explained that this tends to happen on the weekend when operators are working and not the decision makers. Langshaw questioned whether it is better to lower the water flows over a period of days, versus all at once. Discharge decreases over several days may decrease susceptibility but a single decrease early may help reduce the overall magnitude of the drop. Timing influences susceptibility too because fish tend to settle on the substrates or low in the water during hours of darkness. There is no uniform agreement on ramping rates and entrapment.

A follow up meeting for participants at a higher level of management should be scheduled with Taylor to look at issues he deals with. Hillman asked that questions be prepared in advance. Taylor and Langshaw explained that the Hourly Coordination software is real-time and can't be "gamed" in its current format. A new program would need

to be developed to model alternative scenarios. The next Hourly Coordination meeting will likely be held in Portland in March or April.

- XI. Next Meeting:** February 02, 2010, Grant PUD Natural Resources Office, Ephrata, WA