

MEETING

Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee

Wednesday, February 24, 2010

9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Grant PUD SeaTac Office

PRCC Members

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

Jim Craig, USFWS
Tom Dresser/Curt Dotson, GCPUD
Carl Merkle, CTUIR
Denny Rohr, Facilitator

Attendees: (*Denotes PRCC member)

Bryan Nordlund, NMFS*
Bill Tweit, WDFW* (on phone after 12:30)
Teresa Scott, WDFW* (on phone before 12:30)
Scott Carlon, NMFS*
Tom Scribner, YN (on phone/WR Public Mtg)
George Thompson, GCPUD
Duncan Hay, Oakwood Consulting
Richelle Beck, D.Rohr & Assoc. (on phone)

Jerry Marco, CT*
Bob Rose, YN*
Jim Craig, USFWS*
Curt Dotson, GCPUD*
Dana Jeske, GCPUD
Tom Dresser, GCPUD*
Denny Rohr, Facilitator

Action Items:

1. Rohr to contact Elizabeth McManus regarding attending the next PRCC meeting to provide an update and discuss a white paper on Hatchery SC activities and goals.
2. Dotson will follow up with Duncan Hay and Iowa personnel regarding schedules for PRCC Committee Members travel to Iowa.
3. Rohr will schedule a PRCC WebEx conference for March 15th, 1:30 pm.
4. Committee Members will get back to Dresser regarding their interest and availability for a site visit regarding the PR Tailrace Pumping Plan.
5. Dotson will follow up with the Predator Study Team (WDFW/USGS) about receiving an update report at the March 24th meeting.
6. Rohr will follow up with Marco and Tweit regarding a final decision for using NNI Funds for the White River Nason View and Tall Timber proposals.
7. Dotson will gather more information regarding the subyearling workshop and the subject will be an agenda for further discussion at the March 24th meeting.
8. Dresser will follow up on better defining the term “significant difference” as included in the Fish Ladder Temperature Plan.
9. Rohr will follow up on the information received regarding the PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee “dispute” of the PR Hatchery Design.

10. The January 27th Draft Meeting Minutes will be added to the March 24th meeting agenda for consideration at that time.

Decisions:

- 1. PRCC approved using NNI Funds for the White River Nason View Project and the Tall Timbers Project, subject to final approval to Rohr of Marco and Tweit, and with the requirement that the Tall Timbers proposal must include an acclimation easement.**
- 2. Committee members decided to remove from further consideration the use of NNI Funds for Fall Chinook studies.**

Final Meeting Minutes

- I. **Welcome and Introductions:** Rohr welcomed the PRCC and guests.
- II. **Agenda Review:** The Committee reviewed the agenda and had no further additions or changes.
- III. **Update of Feb 20th White River/Nason Creek Public Meeting:** Tom Dresser provided a report of the White River/Nason Creek public meeting which was held in Leavenworth on February 20th. The purpose of the meeting was to communicate with community leaders in the White River/Nason Creek area. Dresser stated they also took some time at the meeting to walk through Grant PUD's history in the White River/Nason Creek basins so attendees could better understand why the PUD is involved in this program. They discussed supplementation and concepts on how to move forward, scientific review, and Technical Working Group progress. Information was provided on policy level discussions, how the process would involve the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB), and how the process will work in the future. There was discussion of White River activities and how everything they do in the area will be documented. The acclimation activities for the upcoming year were discussed, including details of the 4 planned fish release sites. Dresser stated they are currently conducting an assessment of acclimation sites, coordinated through the PRCC Hatchery SC. The PUD also submitted a Water Rights Application in January, for the site owned by Grant PUD, which Ecology is currently reviewing. They also discussed water research and development at this site, which includes the drilling of wells to see how much water is available. The public seemed supportive of the idea to bring in portable Baker tanks, but Dresser wanted to also be sure they realize there would likely be 20-30 of these tanks on the property during acclimation periods. Lastly, they discussed the need for a cultural resource survey on the Grant property, a Section 106 process, which includes an historic, detailed assessment. The public seemed supportive during the meeting and indicated they felt positive about Grant PUD's open communication and dialog. The public did have some questions about Hatchery Genetic Management Plans (HGMP) and there was indication by some that review of the HGMPs would take place and comments would be provided. At this time, PRCC Committee Members asked questions of Dresser regarding the role and process for the recently formed Technical Working Group. Dresser stated they have formed the group of public stakeholders and many were able to attend the first meeting on February 9th, including Keith Gaynor, Mike Kaputa, George Wilson, Dan Davies, and Dennis Beich. The first meeting included a discussion of their roles and responsibilities. The Technical Working Group's purpose is to look at the options that could occur on the Grant property, where the comfort levels are of the public, the advantages and disadvantages of each idea, and dealing with the habitat potential of the property. The group will be only making recommendations to the Hatchery SC. The Hatchery SC will continue to make the decisions, unless they can't agree and

Grant PUD is forced to make decisions in an effort to meet regulatory deadlines. At this point and after some discussion, Dresser suggested having Elizabeth McManus, PRCC Hatchery SC facilitator, come to the next PRCC meeting to give a report of Hatchery SC activities, their goals, what's working and what isn't, and any other relevant activities specific to the operations of the Hatchery SC. Rose agreed that would be helpful, and he also suggested the development of a Hatchery SC white paper to include detailed plans and activities in the White River Basin. Rohr was asked to contact McManus with the requests.

- IV. **Iowa Model Update:** Duncan Hay discussed the PR Dam fish bypass and the ongoing PR 1:20 sectional Bypass model construction taking place in Iowa. Hay provided the PRCC with a history and refresher review of the Priest Rapids Fish Bypass, noting the objective of meeting 95% dam ("concrete") passage survival or better and how it fits into the design process for the production model of a PR Bypass.
 - A. **Including Discussion of Committee Trip to Iowa:** The PRCC discussed possible dates they could travel to look at the Iowa model. The group is considering the week of May 17 with the week of June 1 as a back-up. They realized in discussion that they would need to check with Iowa and Duncan Hay to confirm which date would be most appropriate.
- V. **POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM: 2010 PR Steelhead and Sockeye Behavior Study Plan – GATE OPERATIONS:** After some discussion and technical difficulties with the presentation equipment, as was experienced during the presentation of four possible options for flows through TG-22 and 21 during the 2010 fish season, the PRCC again asked for more time to review the information and to continue the discussion via a Web EX conference on March 15th. at 1:30 pm.
- VI. **UPDATE: PR Tailrace Pumping Plan, LA 403:** Dresser began this discussion stating the PUD has looked at a series of options and a couple of them are being identified for further discussion. These options include installing two additional pumps in the current (left Bank) pumphouse and adding an Emergency Gravity supply to the right bank. A second option being considered is to install a right bank pump house with a turbine driven pump to supply the right bank fish ladder. Additionally, Dresser suggested it might be a good idea to have PRCC members actually come to the site and see what is being considered. Both options have risks and potential impacts that should be discussed further. Nordlund expressed interest, and Scott (suggested by Tweit) would likely want to be there as well. The timeline for construction is October 2010 so having folks out as soon as possible would be ideal. Committee members agreed to get back to Dresser regarding their interest and schedule availability.
- VII. **Presentation: 1999-Present NPM Fishing/Sampling Data and Detailed Mapping Information:** Dresser presented a PowerPoint giving the history and recent results of Grant County PUD's NPM Removal Program. The presentation provided takes in numbers of both set-lines and beach seining activities. Areas of high CPUE (catch per unit effort) were provided to the PRCC, with explanation why some areas of the river were not "fished" as intensely as others – i.e. flow conditions, topography, etc.
- VIII. **UPDATE: WDFW/USGS NNI Predator Program:** Dotson stated the PUD is working with USGS in hopes of having USGS and WDFW (NNI Predator Study Team) give the PRCC a presentation at the next meeting on March 24th. Year-one of the study has been completed and the goal is to present to the PRCC the first year results and year-two field season plans, which will be narrowing the focus for future work details.
- IX. **Shallow Water Habitat Water Quality Monitoring Plan, LA401(a)(20) – FLIR Flight Discussion:** Dresser briefly touched upon the topic of FLIR flights in the Priest Rapids Project and his discussion of the topic with Bob Rose. Dresser questioned the value of the flights in the PRP.

- X. **ACTION ITEM: Follow Up Discussion of White River Nason View Property Proposal:** Rohr began the discussion with a review for the PRCC of the recommendation that had previously come from the Habitat SC (HSC) to use 50% of the costs from the NNI Fund and the other 50% from the Habitat Supplemental Fund for the purchase of the White River Nason View Property. PRCC did not approve that recommendation and had asked for a more clear understanding of coordination between the hatchery and habitat groups regarding property in the White River Basin. Dresser stated that in the meantime, other things have occurred. HSC Member Bambrick recently looked further into the existing Tall Timbers Property Conservation Easement proposal and has determined the property may have more possibilities than was originally thought. Accordingly, Bambrick discussed a funding proposal for the Tall Timbers proposal and White River Nason View proposal at the HSC meeting on February 11th. The funding request for the White River Nason View Property was \$388,790. The funding request for the Tall Timbers proposal was up to \$55,000. Therefore, Bambrick proposed taking up to \$55K out of the NNI fund and using that for the Tall Timbers proposal. Additionally, Bambrick proposed taking up to \$139,395 from the NNI Fund and adding it to funds from the Habitat Supplemental Fund of up to \$249,395, for a total of \$388,790, for the purchase of the White River Nason View Property. The HSC had approved the funding proposal as presented by Bambrick at the HSC meeting on February 11th, and therefore Rohr was bring the NNI Funding question before the PRCC as they needed to approve the use of NNI funds. Accordingly, Rohr informed the PRCC they were being asked to consider approving funds from the NNI Fund in the amount of \$139,395 to be applied to the White River Nason View proposal, and \$55,000 to be applied to the Tall Timbers proposal. Rohr asked the PRCC for comments. After much discussion, members agreed it would work for them, but Marco had not yet made contact with his HSC representative and wanted to talk with him prior to making a final decision as his representative may have some concerns with this funding proposal. Tweit stated he would like to hear what the Colville's HSC members concerns might be before making his final decision as well. Therefore, the PRCC gave approval to use the NNI funding as presented for a total of \$194,395 (\$55,000 + \$139,395) with the clarification that an acclimation easement must also be included for the Tall Timber's proposal, and nothing is final until Marco and Tweit provide a final answer to Rohr on their position.
- XI. **Review of Sub-Yearling Chinook:** Dotson stated that since the write-up of the sub-yearling workshop of Nov. 24, 2009 was discussed at the HCP meeting the prior day on February 23rd with the HCP committee (the HCP committee has many of the same representatives as the PRCC committee), and since he was waiting to hear the results from that HCP discussion, no additional steps had been taken towards further write-ups of a subyearling white paper with the two other PUDs since the last PRCC meeting. Dotson has been waiting for the workshop write-up where various ideas on how to study upper Columbia subyearlings took place before making contact with the other PUDs to discuss their ideas. Committee members stated the HCP reviewed/discussed the draft minutes from the workshop that had been sent out a week ago. Further, committee members stated the discussion that took place in the HCP forum resulted in no formal / "hard" conclusions at this time. Committee members stated in the HCP discussion they did agree there is a way to do the study, but nobody is prepared to do one yet, mainly due to "study assumptions" violations that would take place. And the bigger question of what the purpose of the study would be kept any conclusions from being made. If they do decide to do a survival study, it would have to meet the statistical rigor of the HCP and GCPUD Settlement Agreement, all three PUDs would have to agree on it, and the results would lead to what? More predation control? Dotson stated his impression from the conversation was that there isn't much interest in doing a white paper on the issue. Scott suggested it may not be a priority right now and maybe the idea should be shelved. Nordlund suggested before they shelve the issue, maybe Grant PUD should put together a white paper summarizing the workshop discussion, a section on each potential technology and how the study could be conducted, and what would be

needed that is not out there yet to make a good potential study. The PRCC agreed that might be a good idea. Dotson agreed to gather more information from the workshop minutes and discussions with the PUDs before the idea is shelved. The PRCC will discuss this issue again at the next meeting.

- XII. **Review of Fall Chinook - NNI Funding for Fall Chinook Studies:** A discussion was held at the January 27th PRCC meeting to consider using NNI Funds for Fall Chinook studies. Further discussion regarding this subject was scheduled to occur at the February 24th PRCC meeting. However, Jerry Marco informed the PRCC Committee Members by email dated February 16th that after further consideration and discussion with other CCT staff/policy representatives, his current position is to not support the use of NNI funds for this purpose. Accordingly, after discussion of the subject by PRCC Committee Members, there was agreement to remove this subject from further consideration.
- XIII. **Potholes Reservoir Caspian Tern Breeding Colony - AFS Document Regarding Impact on Outmigrating Juvenile Salmonids in the Mid Columbia River:** Dotson brought this issue to the group and provided a recent article printed by the Transaction American Fishery Society regarding the article's suggestion of possible relocation of East Sand Island Caspian Terns to the Potholes area, and its stated "minimal" impacts to the salmonid out-migration in the Columbia River. Grant PUD has concerns over the possibility of having the problem from East Sand Island, which is a lower Columbia River problem, becoming Grant's problem and their responsibility, particularly because there would be a dramatic increase in the tern population, and that particular tern population has been shown to prey on salmonid smolts from the Priest Rapids Project, where Grant is striving to meet salmonid smolt survival goals. The PUD presented the idea of the PRCC consideration of sending a letter stating the concerns with this idea. However, the PRCC thought the idea of relocation of the ESI tern colony to the Potholes is unlikely to actually occur and suggested the issue be closely monitored. If action is needed down line, further discussion and consideration can then take place.
- XIV. **Follow Up to Fish Mode Operations Request from K. Nordt, Director of Power Management, GPUD (C. Dotson) :** Still on-going
- XV. **UPDATES:**
- A. Record of the PRCC Studies and Reports:** The Shallow Water Habitat, Aquatic Invasive Species, and Fish Ladder Temperature Plan are all documents under review and in the process of being finalized. The Shallow Water Habitat paper is due to FERC by March 31. The Fish Ladder Temperature Plan is still receiving comments and undergoing some clean-up and clarification. Regarding the Fish Ladder Temperature Plan, Tweit suggested that better defining of the term "significant difference" of temperature changes within the fish ladder was needed. WDFW thinks it might mean "one degree centigrade difference" but wasn't sure if that was the right number. Dresser agreed to look into it.
- B. Committee Reports:** Rohr stated he received an email notice of "dispute" from the Hatchery SC facilitator, Elizabeth McManus that needs PRCC involvement. He had received the notice the end of the prior day and stated the process (SSSA – part VI) allows 5 days to refer it to the appropriate committee. His intention at this meeting was to notify the PRCC of the information that he had received, and that he would pass it on to them within the 5 day time period. However, before passing the information to the PRCC, he asked committee members for an interpretation of section 6.2 of the SSSA, and if there needs to be a disputing Party identified. With the information received, a disputing Party was not identified. Marco stated there needs to be a disputing Party identified, and he requested Rohr talk with McManus further about this. Tweit also agreed that does need to happen,

and he also asked to discuss the issue offline with Dresser and Rohr before taking this on, and before a formal dispute is filed.

- C. **PR Left Bank Fish Ladder Maintenance:** Dotson stated things are looking good. Prior to March 31, the ladders will be up and in criteria. Earlier in the year, the PUD had informed the PRCC that due to the additional work taking place in the fish ladders (i.e. installing of structures for lamprey passage), the ladders may not be fully functional until the first week of April, but this will not now be the case.
- D. **Investigation of Wanapum Northern Pikeminnow Fishing Derby:** Rohr was able to track down the name and phone number for the lead contact of the East Wenatchee Rotary Club who is in charge of their Pikeminnow Fishing Derby fund-raiser. Rohr had left a voicemail but was still waiting for his response. Dotson also stated additional information has been discovered in the past month. The prizes given at the derby come partly from contributions made by Chelan and Douglas PUDs. In 2009, Chelan PUD donated \$10K (down from \$20K donated in previous years) to the event and that is likely what they will be donating this year as well. Last year, the derby removed 3,814 pikeminnow. At this point, the PRCC discussed the likelihood of making something like this happen in the Wanapum reservoir this year and what would be needed to move forward with a plan. Rohr suggested before they move forward with this, he would like to talk with the East Wenatchee Rotary contact and perhaps other involved parties, then develop a plan within the PRCC prior to consideration of approaching possible other Grant County Rotary Clubs in the areas with the idea. Ultimately, the derby would be a fund raiser for the Rotary Club but the benefits would potentially be great for the PUD's obligation to predator control. Committee Members agreed with this plan.
- E. **Extension of Time for Current PR Hatchery Fish Marking Dispute:** Rohr informed the Committee that WDFW has requested an extension of time for the issue of mass marking of hatchery fish at PR Hatchery. The current deadline for the resolution of this dispute is March 12th, and the requested extension of time would result in a new deadline of May 31, 2010. Rohr is currently in the process of polling Policy Committee Members for their decision regarding the request.

XVI. **Approval of Meeting Minutes**

- A. **January 27, 2010 minutes** – The PRCC asked for more time before finalizing the minutes; Rohr will add to agenda of next meeting.

XVII. Next Meeting: March 24, 2010; Grant PUD SeaTac Office.

(Submitted by D.Rohr & Associates)