

PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Meeting

Meeting Minutes

PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Meeting
Thursday, January 21, 2010
Cedars Inn – Wenatchee, WA

Attendees

Curt Dotson, GCPUD
Bill Gale, USFWS
Jeff Korth, WDFW
Russell Langshaw (alt) GCPUD
Keely Murdoch (alt), YN
Gerry O’Keefe, GCPUD (White River Stakeholder Outreach Discussion Only)
Todd Pearsons, GCPUD
Tom Scribner, YN
Mike Tonseth, WDFW
Elizabeth McManus, Facilitator
Patrick Donovan, Facilitator

Action Items

1. Russell will distribute to the HSC the section of their vessel design study which identifies the pros and cons of each vessel design considered; Grant PUD will hold internal discussions around whether the vessel design study can be released as a draft report and/ or if it can be release for sole review by the HSC.
2. Curt will send Elizabeth for distribution to the HSC historical documents on the Priest Rapids Hatchery design, including the initial WDFW letter.
3. WDFW will send Elizabeth for distribution to the HSC the white paper presented to the PAC on US v Oregon and mass marking.
4. Elizabeth will distribute to the HSC a draft SOA on rearing density prior to their February meeting, for voting in February.
5. Russell will follow up with Tom about mass marking cost and statistics – i.e. power analysis piece.
6. Patrick will confirm that the December meeting summary accurately reflects WDFW’s requested PRH redesign modifications. Patrick will also follow up with Kirk and Kris to determine if they have any final comments on the draft December meeting minutes.
7. Keely will work on scheduling a meeting of the JFP to finalize the Spring Chinook Implementation Plan.
8. Todd, Keely, and Jeff will hold an offline conversation to discuss ideas to improve White River trapping performance and will report back to the HSC.
9. Jeff will follow up with Todd Miller, WDFW on the timing for the Wenatchee PIT Tag array and whether it can be accelerated.

10. Elizabeth and Patrick will outline a decision process for the 2010 captive brood program, what data might be needed, and when the data will be available for HSC consideration.
11. Elizabeth will follow up with Kris and confirm whether NMFS will be conducting an EA or EIS on White River supplementation and the possibility for Grant PUD to adopt it with or without supplemental materials for their work in the White River program.
12. Elizabeth will follow up with Kris regarding the HGMP response letters and will work with the HSC to try to schedule a conference call prior to their February meeting to further discuss NMFS's requested changes to the White River and Nason Creek HGMPs and what the response process will look like moving forward.
13. Elizabeth will work with Todd on the East Bank facility feasibility study plan to ensure updates on the study are brought forward to the HSC with enough time for them to provide feedback and/ or influence its contents.
14. Elizabeth and Patrick will compare the Carton and Dryden SOAs to determine if there are any differences.
15. Elizabeth will check with Kris to determine if Chelan PUD is allowed to opt-out of being a co-operator within the Sockeye HGMP and whether a permit required for the Sockeye program.
16. Bill will send Grant PUD an electro-anesthesia study. (Complete)
17. Elizabeth will coordinate with Denny to update him on the PRH design discussion and the likelihood of it being elevated to the PRCC for dispute resolution.
18. Tom and Jeff will follow up internally on the numbers of fish for Methow acclimation.
19. Elizabeth will work with the YN, Grant PUD, and WDFW on a SOA on Methow acclimation.

Decisions

- 1.

Meeting Summary

- I. Welcome and Agenda Review** – Elizabeth McManus welcomed the Hatchery Subcommittee (HSC) and reviewed the agenda items. Because of schedules, the HSC agreed to defer discussion of the December meeting summary and action items to after the update on outreach activities for the White River program.
- II. Stakeholder Outreach Activities for the White River**
 - A. Update On Grant PUD White River Stakeholder Outreach Activities** – Gerry O'Keefe briefed the HSC on Grant PUD's stakeholder activities for the White River program. Gerry informed the Committee of his recent resignation as Director of Natural Resources for Grant PUD and confirmed that he will remain engaged in White River program outreach activities as the PUD moves through

the public stakeholder process and into final permitting. Gerry highlighted the following key aspects of Grant PUD's outreach activities.

- Outreach activities are focused on building relationships and seeking guidance from stakeholders and residents, environmental and natural resource organizations (i.e., Chelan Douglas Land Trust and Trout Unlimited), and County Commissions in the White River basin.
- Stakeholders are being engaged via a series of outreach meetings and through a public working group organized by the PUD to advise on habitat development, vessel types, and vessel locations with a focus on the McComas acclimation site. An initial public outreach meeting held on December 2, 2009, focused on receiving stakeholder input and direction on how best to accommodate salmon recovery facilities in the Nason Creek and White River programs. A second public outreach meeting, scheduled for February 20, 2010, will focus on the pros and cons of vessel types being considered.
- A small group of stakeholders has expressed concern about the proposed facilities based on a more general concern about supplementation as a recovery strategy. Grant PUD has made it clear that it is not the decision maker on salmon recovery strategy, but is an implementor, and has suggested that concerns about the overall approach to salmon recovery be discussed by the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB) or another appropriate venue.
- Part of Grant PUD's approach to design of the White River and Nason Creek facilities may be informed by an independent scientific review of proposed facility designs. (This review would be focused solely on Grant PUD's implementation options; it would not address overall regional recovery strategies.)

B. Discussion and Recommendations on Stakeholder Outreach Activities – The HSC discussed Grant PUD's stakeholder outreach activities and provided the following comments, clarifications, and advice.

- The HSC stressed the importance of maintaining Gerry's presence and contact with White River stakeholders to sustain relationships and community trust that were begun at the December outreach meeting.

- The HSC reiterated their concerns with Grant PUD’s plan to present and discuss all rearing vessel options during the February stakeholder outreach meeting. The HSC reminded Grant PUD that Stakeholder comments previously submitted on the White River program and commitments previously made expressly removed consideration of raceways as a rearing vessel option. Grant PUD agreed and will present raceways as a vessel alternative not being considered due to past lack of stakeholder support.
- HSC members expressed interest in meeting or reaching out to some of their contacts in the White River basin. Grant PUD was supportive of this outreach.
- The HSC expressed concern with the idea of an independent scientific review, particularly if that review were to consider supplementation policy. Grant PUD assured the HSC that it is interested in scientific review only of its implementation approaches, e.g., along the lines of: if we are going to build supplementation facilities, what is the best way to build them to be most successful. HSC members agreed to further consider the idea of an independent review group; specifically focusing on what the details of the group (e.g., what the group would be asked to review, who would be asked to participate on the group, etc.).
- The HSC again expressed concern that technical details of evaluations and other materials have the potential to be provided to stakeholders before being discussed with the HSC. HSC members expressed concern that this practice could put both the HSC members and Grant PUD in the difficult position of having to try to defend (or explain) options and approaches that they have not yet had the opportunity to coordinate on. Grant PUD agreed that there should be no surprises as part of this effort and further agreed to provide materials to the HSC in advance of providing them to Stakeholders. In particular, Grant PUD agreed to provide the HSC with the pros and cons evaluation that has been carried out on potential vessel types.
- Overall the HSC expressed support for the Grant PUD stakeholder process. Grant PUD requested that the HSC be flexible/ maintain an open mind as they move through facility design, keeping in mind that it may be necessary to make some design compromises to ensure that Stakeholder concerns are addressed and facilities are acceptable to local residents.

- C. **Path Forward or Next Steps** –Grant PUD will continue efforts to organize a McComas acclimation facility public working group and will hold a second public outreach meeting on February 20, 2010 focused on vessel types and locations being considered for the acclimation site. The permit level design for the McComas acclimation facility is on track to be finished by spring of 2010 with final submittal by the end of the year.

III. Action Items Review & Other Committee Updates

- A. **Action Items Review:** Elizabeth reviewed and provided updates to the action items identified during the December HSC meeting. The following items were discussed in substance:

- HCP SOA on Culling vs. Rearing: Elizabeth followed up with Ali and Mike to determine if the HCP had an SOA or other, less formal agreement on rearing density/ELISA level assumptions and whether it could be sued to form a similar agreement by the HSC. Ali confirmed that the HCP does not have an SOA, however they did agree to Chelan PUD’s Wenatchee spring Chinook HGMP, which includes a discussion of BKD management. This will be used as a model for the HSC SOA to support discussion of rearing density for the White River and Nason Creek facilities.
- 2003 PRH Agreement: Patrick was unable to locate an agreement between WDFW and Grant PUD describing the history of PRH program and intent of the hatchery re-design. After discussion, WDFW and Grant PUD determined that the original agreement probably was written in a letter from WDFW to Grant PUD. Curt will send Elizabeth for distribution to the HSC relevant historical documents on the PRH program and intent of the hatchery re-design, including the original WDFW letter.
- HGMP Review and Publication Schedule: Elizabeth confirmed with Kris that NMFS has prepared Federal Register Notices (FRNs) for the Nason Creek and White River HGMPs and will publish them as soon as Grant PUD responds to the latest HGMP letters. The HSC disagreed, stating that NMFS confirmed during the January HCP meeting that the White River and Nason Creek HGMPs would not be published until all of the HGMPs within the basin had been reviewed and were ready for public notice. Elizabeth will follow up with Kris to confirm NMFS’s anticipated HGMP publication timeline.

- December Meeting Summary: The HSC reviewed the December meeting summary and made a small number of corrections and clarifications. Specifically, USFWS and WDFW requested that WDFW’s PRH re-design language articulate the use of anesthetic during adult handling. Patrick will confirm that the December meeting summary accurately reflects WDFW’s requested PRH redesign modifications. The revised summary was then approved by the HSC contingent upon any remaining comments/ revisions from CCT and NMFS. (A redline/strikeout draft showing changes and clarifications made will be posted to the secure HSC website.)

- B. PRCC Updates:** Elizabeth indicated that the next PRCC meeting is Wednesday, January 27, 2010.

- C. PAC Updates:** Tom briefed the HSC on the January meeting of the Production Advisory Committee (PAC). The PRCC’s dispute about mass marking of Grant PUD’s PRH production is being considered as part of the US-v-Oregon process. WDFW developed a white paper on the mass marking issues for the PAC’s consideration. Due to concerns raised by members of the PAC the white paper is under further technical review by the Committee. The PAC also raised concerns with whether a 100% mark of Grant PUD production would be necessary and cost effective. The HSC discussed and agreed that the PAC reconcile costs estimates provided by WDFW and those identified within the US-v-Oregon process. Grant PUD is currently using the same estimates to conduct a power analysis, which may help address the issues raised within the PAC. Russell will follow up with Tom regarding mass marking cost and statistics – i.e. Grant PUD’s power analysis.

IV. White River Spring Chinook Program – Continuing Discussion

- A. Update and review of project status report** – Russell updated the HSC on the White River status report and indicated that the tasks identified within the work and accomplishments matrix remain largely unchanged from the December status report. Activities undertaken by Grant PUD over the past month primarily relate to the White River program public meeting/outreach process. The HSC was made aware that the following documents, relevant to the McComas acclimation site, are now available on the HSC’s secure public website: 1) vegetative screening plan; 2) water quality monitoring report; and 3) wetland delineations.

- B. Update and discussion of pending issues** – Russell provided an update of the pending issues matrix within the White River project status report. The HSC

observed that the due dates identified in the pending issues matrix are largely obsolete and requested that they be updated to reflect the PUD's anticipated completion dates. The HSC discussed the pending issues matrix in more detail and offered the following comments and clarifications.

- Quantitative Objectives – The quantitative objectives for the White River program are being refined by Grant PUD and will need to be approved by the HSC before they are implemented. Completing this task also depends on finalization of the spring Chinook Management and Implementation plan. Keely indicated that the YN and WDFW are working with the other JFP to finalize the Spring Chinook Implementation Plan as a JFP document and that she is scheduling a meeting of the JFP to determine what is needed to finalize the Plan.
- Data Gathering – Grant PUD provided more detail on the pending issue relative to data collection. They are interested in having a discussion with the HSC about data needs and current data collection activities, to ensure that data gathering is appropriate. The HSC then had a brief discussion of the White and Wenatchee River Juvenile Trapping efforts. The HSC that Grant PUD, YN, and WDFW should hold an offline conversation to discuss ideas to improve Wenatchee River trapping performance. Elizabeth will work with Todd, Keely, and Jeff to schedule a meeting to discuss trapping protocols on the White and Wenatchee Rivers and will add an update on its outcome to the February meeting agenda.
- Captive Brood Program – Elizabeth opened the discussion of Grant PUD's captive brood program. WDFW indicated that the HSC would need to make a decision on 2010 brood year collection no later than July 1, 2010. The HSC discussed and agreed that the issues should be further discussed during their February meeting and that the following information would be desirable to make an informed decision on whether to continue collection: 1) production levels for 2010 with and without brood collection; 2) whether the current Section 10 permit will cover brood collection; 3) release to McNary survival rate; 5) F2 release estimates for 2010 and 2011; 6) WDFW's PIT Tag array timeline for the main-stem Wenatchee. In preparation for a substantive review and discussion of brood collection in February, Jeff will follow up with Todd Miller, WDFW on the timing for the Wenatchee PIT Tag array and will determine if the timeline can be accelerated. Furthermore, Elizabeth and Patrick will lineout the decision

process for the 2010 captive brood program, what data might be needed and when it will be available.

- McComas Acclimation Site Public Working Group – Russell briefed the HSC on the status of a public working group organized by the PUD to advise on habitat development, vessel types, and vessel locations for the McComas acclimation site. Grant PUD is still working to define the scope of the public working group. Grant PUD hopes to convene the working in February. A Doodle request was issued to the following potential working group members: Rollie Schmitt (WDFW commission and Lake Wenatchee resident); George Wilson (Lake Wenatchee resident); Dennis McMahon (Trout Unlimited); Mike Kaputa (Chelan County Natural Resources); Dennis Beich (WDFW); Keely Murdoch (YN); Carol Dull (Nason Creek resident); Paul Gray (White River land owner); and Bob Bugert (Chelan Douglas Land Trust). Grant PUD stressed that the membership of the working group is open and all members of the public are allowed to attend.

- Status of McComas Acclimation Site Vessel Study – Russell briefed the HSC on the status of the McComas acclimation vessel study. The HSC discussed and agreed that at a minimum Grant PUD should distribute components of the report providing general descriptions and the pros and cons for each vessel being considered. The HSC indicated that they would prefer to review the vessel report in its entirety as their role is to advise Grant PUD on the technical aspects of the McComas acclimation facility. Grant PUD agreed to distribute to the HSC components of the vessel study containing general descriptions and pros and cons for each vessel being considered. Furthermore, Todd and Russell will discuss with upper management the feasibility of distributing the entire vessel study in draft form.

- EA vs. EIS – Russell briefed the HSC on the status of the EA vs. EIS assessment and indicated that Grant PUD is exploring whether NMFS will be conducting an EA or EIS on White River supplementation more generally and the possibility for Grant PUD to adopt it with or without supplemental materials for their work in the White River program. Elizabeth will follow up with Kris and confirm whether NMFS will be conducting an EA or EIS for the White River and the possibility for Grant PUD to adopt it with or without supplemental materials.

- White River Water Right Support Letter – Todd briefly updated the HSC on Grant PUD’s water right application. Grant PUD submitted the water rights application today and encouraged the HSC to send their letters of support (if they so choose) as soon as possible. WDFW, YN, and USFWS indicated they had yet to send letters, but intended to do so.

- Rearing Density SOA – Elizabeth briefly updated the HSC on the status of the rearing density SOA. Ali Wick confirmed that the HCP recently agreed to Chelan PUD’s Wenatchee spring Chinook HGMP, which includes a discussion of BKD management including culling practices and rearing density for Chelan PUD’s programs. Elizabeth will draft an SOA based on the language provided in the Chelan PUD Wenatchee spring Chinook HGMP for the HSC to consider and vote on at their February meeting.

- Acclimation For The White River Spring Chinook BY 2008 – Russell updated the HSC on White River acclimation activities for spring Chinook and indicated that Grant PUD is working on a contract with WDFWS to renew the net pen leases. Furthermore, Grant PUD is working on permitting both remote sites, which will require permits from both USFWS and the Army Corps of Engineers.

- Section 10 Permit Path Forward – The HSC discussed the Section 10 Permit coverage agreed that more follow up was need with NMFS to clarify permit coverage while the HGMPs are under consultation. Elizabeth will follow up with Kris to confirm whether the Section 10 permit coverage will continue through the consultation process and when pre-consultation and consultation officially commence.

- NMFS’s HGMP Response Letter Process – Todd briefed the HSC on NFMS’s HGMP response letters for the White River and Nason Creek programs. NMFS requested changes to the take tables and facility construction details. Grant PUD responded to NMFS with a request for additional time to allow the HSC to review the requested changes. The HSC discussed and agreed that further discussion of the requested HGMP revisions would be necessary and that a conference call with NMFS prior to their February meeting would help to bring clarity to a discussion/ decision on the Nason Creek and White River HGMP revisions in February. Elizabeth will try to schedule a conference call with NMFS and the HSC to discuss changes to the White River and Nason Creek HGMP

take tables and will re-distribute both of NMFS's HGMP response letters to the Committee.

- Addition to the Pending Issue List – Future discussion of how best to define program success for the White River program (and what program success might mean) will be added to the pending issues list.

V. Nason Creek Spring Chinook Program – Continuing Discussion

A. Update and Review of Project Status Report – Todd briefed the HSC on the Nason Creek project status report and indicated that the work and accomplishments task list largely overlapped with that of the White River program, previously discussed.

B. Update and Discussion of Pending Issues:

- Locating Capacity at Other Facilities – Todd briefed the HSC on Grant PUD's progress towards finding capacity and/or locating facilities that could be expanded or retrofitted to get the Nason Creek program up and running sooner than the current implementation schedule contemplates. Grant PUD is discussing the possibility of funding Chelan PUD to complete a feasibility study at the East Bank facility, to determine whether excess capacity exists and/or if capacity might be added for adult holding, incubation and rearing of spring and summer Chinook. The feasibility study would also determine whether enough water exists for a single and/or multi pass system or if the facility would need to be retrofitted with a recirculation water system. The HSC expressed concerns with the operating cost and fish health implication associated with a re-circ water system and recommend that at a minimum spring Chinook be reared on single pass water with summer Chinook potentially on double-pass or re-circ. Todd indicated that many of the HSC's concerns would be answered by a re-circ water study being conducted at the East Bank and Chiwawa facilities, which also includes pilots to evaluate fish health concerns. The HSC agreed that in light of the costs associated with improving the East Bank facility, Grant PUD should also consider building out the Nason Creek site to accommodate rearing, and acclimation (instead of just acclimation). The HSC strongly supports Grant PUD moving forward with the feasibility study of the East Bank facility, however requested that they have an opportunity to discuss and provide input on the scope of the study to ensure that it will address their questions (and thereby streamline

HSC review of any eventual facility proposal). Elizabeth will work with Todd to clarify the schedule the East Bank facility feasibility study schedule to ensure updates are brought forward to the HSC with enough time for them to provide feedback and/ or influence its contents.

- FWI's Nason Creek Water Assessment - Todd briefed the HSC on the status of the Freshwater Institute's (FWI's) Nason Creek water source assessment. The FWI's assessment is focused on Ozone and UV as the two primary methods of water treatment. FWI currently believes that variation in water transparency will be one of the primary factors in determining which water treatment method is used. Grant PUD indicated that the final water source assessment is 50% complete and currently recommends the use of UV treatment with sand treatment prior. Grant PUD is working with FWI to provide comments on the draft study and request further information including a breakdown of both the cost and efficiency of each treatment method being considered.

VI. Carlton Pond SOA – Todd briefed the HSC on the status of the draft Carlton Pond SOA and indicated that the latest draft incorporates comments received from Douglas PUD. The HSC questioned whether the draft Carlton SOA included similar language as the Dryden SOA. The draft Carlton SOA is basically identical to the Dryden SOA, but Elizabeth and Patrick will do a side by side comparison of the draft Carlton SOA and Dryden SOA to ensure that any differences can be highlighted. The HSC further requested a status update on the HCP's approval of both the Dryden and Carlton SOA during their February meeting. Elizabeth and Patrick will follow up with Ali and Mike to determine the HCP's approval status of the Carlton SOA.

VII. Sockeye HGMP

- A. Remaining Issues and Discussion** – Todd briefed the HSC on the status of the Sockeye HGMP and indicated that Chelan PUD relinquished their right to be listed as co-operators (co-permit holder) throughout “Section 1” of the HGMP. Grant PUD indicated they are willing to be the sole permit holder. Elizabeth will confirm with NMFS whether a co-operator – specifically Chelan PUD for the Sockeye HGMP – is allowed to waive the right to be identified as such within an HGMP.

VIII. 2010 Work Planning

- A. Proposal for 2010 Meeting/Work Plan** – Elizabeth opened discussion of a yearly HSC meeting/work plan and calendar to help ensure that items are raised in a timely way and make meeting agendas and meeting preparation more predictable. Furthermore a meeting/work plan would help the HSC be to be more effective and efficient at identifying information needs necessary to make informed and on-time decisions. Similar to the HSC calendar Ross & Associates developed for 2009 – which identified HGMP, APP, and M&E review and approval dates – the HSC could create a calendar to incorporate key agenda topics such as pending issues, captive brood, and facility design and review timelines and how they will fit within the remaining meetings in 2010. The HSC supported creating a master HSC meeting/work plan and thought that it would be useful to set objectives for the year and would provide the ability to keep HSC on task. Elizabeth and Patrick will work with Grant PUD to bring a proposal forward to the HSC during their February meeting. The HSC identified the following as top priorities to include in the first draft of the meeting/work plan: White River program transition; White River facility design and permitting; Nason Creek facility design; moving the Nason Creek facility to Chelan PUD’s East Bank facility; and the White River captive brood transition.
- B. Approach to review of design documents** – Elizabeth briefed the HSC on an approach to review future facility design documents for Grant PUD facilities. The recommended approach involves a five step review process where as a group the HSC would determine and agree to key aspects of a facility’s design (i.e., level of mechanization; how standards set within the HGMP will be met; site location; kinds of vessels; water source; fish handling approach; etc.) early in the process, e.g., at the conceptual design phase. Future check ins could then simply update against the initial directional design agreements as more detailed design documents are prepared. The intent is to decrease the amount of time associated with the review and design process and increase the predictability of design directions (or at least reduce surprises). The HSC agreed that the five step process would help clearly establish what the key facility design elements are and pinpoint more effectively where potential areas of conflict are so they can be resolved sooner. Grant PUD is working with their engineers to assign internal review and completion dates in a method consistent with the five step review process.

- IX. Status and Pending Issues Reports** – Elizabeth briefed the HSC on Grant PUD status reports produced for all of their programs. All program status reports are uploaded to the

HSC's secure website monthly shortly before the HSC meeting. In an effort to better ensure the HSC has easy access to status information, Elizabeth and Patrick will begin distributing the status reports along with the monthly meeting materials, making sure to identify areas where changes have been made.

X. Priest Rapids Hatchery Redesign

A. Update on Path Forward and Dispute Resolution Process – Elizabeth briefed the HSC on the status of moving the PRH re-design dispute resolution process forward to the PRCC. Jeff has been working to determine whether WDFW intends to seek formal dispute resolution on the issue. He indicated official decision making is still pending, but the signals are that the issue will be elevated. If the dispute is elevated, the PRCC will need a summary of the issue and the HSC's efforts to resolve it. Elizabeth will draft this for consideration by the HSC. Grant PUD distributed an overview of the PRH issue from their perspective and requested that a copy be append the January meeting minutes. Grant PUD indicated that after a reassessment by their engineers, the extended time period associated with the changes requested by WDFW for the PRH re-design has been reduced from 9-months to 6-months. The USFWS expressed concern over the characterization of electro-anesthetic and handling on the second page of Grant PUD's draft overview of the PRH re-design issue. Bill will send Grant PUD the document concerning the use of electro-anesthetics at Carson hatchery. HSC members were encouraged to give their respective PRCC representatives a heads-up that the PRH re-design issue may be coming forward for dispute resolution within in the next few months.

XI. Fall Chinook Working Group (Russell) – Russell briefed the HSC on the Fall Chinook Working Group and indicated that they had finalized their flow fluctuation study. The Workgroup, specifically Joe Taylor gave a presentation on January 5, 2010 on hourly coordination and how the mid-Columbia coordinates its hydro systems.

XII. Acclimation sites in the Upper Methow – Tom briefed the HSC on the status of the YN's efforts to locate acclimations site in the Methow and indicated that they were currently working with Grant PUD to secure funding for two potential acclimation site (i.e. Sitts Property (Goat Wall pond), depending on water conditions, and Biddle's Pond), located above the hatcheries at the main-stem Methow River. WDFW raised concerns with the potential for avian and mammalian predation, especially at the Goat Wall Pond. The YN assured that part of their plan would be to be onsite daily to combat the predation issues, and if needed to engage in nighttime hazing. WDFW expressed additional concerns regarding the number of fish that would be included in the acclimation. The

YN's and WDFW agreed to engage in discussions about fish numbers (it will not be more than 200,000 fish and may be as few as 50,000). The HSC supports the YN and Grant PUD acclimation activities within the Methow and encouraged them to move forward with acclimating fish in both ponds in 2010. Grant PUD requested that an SOA be developed which generally describes the Methow acclimation activities and documents the HSC's support. Elizabeth and Patrick will draft an SOA for 2010 acclimation in the Upper Methow identifying the number of fish being acclimated and where they are going to be located. The HSC also had a brief discussion of the need to update Douglas PUD on the Methow acclimation efforts. Tom will contact Douglas PUD and give them an update.

XIII. Status of the YKFP's 1.7-Million egg proposal –Tom will follow up with the YKFP to determine the status of their 1.7-million egg proposal and associated design change specifications for the PRH.

XIV. State of the Salmon Conference Update: Todd updated the HSC on an ecological conference titled, "State of the Salmon for Ecological Interactions between Wild & Hatchery Salmon", taking place in May 2010 in Portland, Oregon. The HETT is supportive of Todd presenting the NTTOC study process at the conference. The HSC also agreed that an NTTOC presentation is appropriate.

XV. Wrap-Up / Next Steps

A. Next Meeting: Thursday, February 18th, 2010 – Cedars Inn, East Wenatchee

B. Potential February Meeting Agenda Items

- Vote on the Methow SOA
- Decision process related to the Captive Brood
- Vote on the Carlton SOA
- White River and Nason Creek Status Report Updates
- Vote on the rearing density SOA