



Meeting Minutes

Priest Rapids Fish Forum

Wednesday, February 03, 2010

10:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Conference Call/WebEx

Technical Members

Stephen Lewis, USFWS
Bob Rose, Yakama Nation
Bob Heinith, CRITFC
Tom Dresser, GCPUD
Ben Lenz, GCPUD

Patrick Verhey, WDFW
Keith Hatch, BIA
Marcie Mangold, WDOE
Mike Clement, GCPUD

ATTENDEES: (*Denotes PRFF Technical member)

Patrick Verhey, WDFW*
Molly Hallock, WDFW
Steve Lewis, USFWS*
Bryan Nass, LGL
Alyssa Buck, Wanapum
Mike Clement, GCPUD*
Keith Garner, GCPUD
Kevin Malone, Facilitator

Chad Jackson, WDFW
Brad James, WDFW
Bob Rose, Yakama Nation*
Emily Anderson, Longview Assoc.
Ross Hendrick, GCPUD
Ben Lenz, GCPUD*
Debbie Williams, GCPUD

Action Items:

1. Pacific Lamprey Comprehensive Passage Evaluation Report comments are due by February 28, 2010.
2. Williams will send the Pacific Lamprey Comprehensive Passage Evaluation Report in Word format to all PRFF members.
3. Malone will send an email to Heinith asking for his approval of the Aquatic Invasive Species Plan.
4. Malone will request an email vote of approval for the Shallow Water Monitoring Plan from Heinith.
5. Williams will send Grant PUD Natural Resources Annual and Non-Annual Reports to PRCC members.
6. Malone will request an email vote of approval for the Priest Rapids Fish Ladder Temperature Modeling Plan.

7. Lenz, Clement, and Garner will determine if aquaculture practices are covered by Grant PUD's Section 10 permit, bull trout BiOp, or file with the Corp and USFWS.

Decisions:

1. PRFF members in attendance approved the Aquatic Invasive Species Plan.

Meeting Minutes

- I. **Welcome and Introductions** – Attendees provided self introductions.
- II. **Agenda Review** – No additions were made to the agenda.
- III. **Action Item Review** - Action items were reviewed. A brief summary of each action follows:

#1 - Currently, the Priest Rapids Hatchery (PRH) is undergoing design modifications for future expansion. The existing National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) for PRH is currently being reviewed by Grant PUD regulatory staff. It will be updated by June 2010. Because there will be a mutual point of discharge, the sturgeon hatchery that will be built at Priest Rapids hatchery will use the existing NPDES.

#2 - Lenz recommends use of sonic tags instead of JSAT tags because they have a 10 yr. tag life versus the JSAT's less than one year life.

- IV. **Pacific Lamprey Comprehensive Passage Evaluation Report** - Emily Anderson, Longview Associates, and Bryan Nass, LGL presented a PowerPoint presentation on the Pacific Lamprey Comprehensive Passage Evaluation Report. They explained that the report was written to be easily updated, and that new information will be easily identified in the future. Because the report was written, using all available basin wide lamprey literature, and communication with leaders in the field, it is the most complete, comprehensive lamprey document for the Priest Rapids Project (PRP), explained Nass.

Malone noted that cost effectiveness hasn't been defined by PRFF members yet, but needs to be. For this report, cost effectiveness was defined as "If the objective is applicable and reasonable at the PRP, then it was given a yes." If current technology isn't available to complete a project, "It was considered not cost effective", but Grant PUD is open to reevaluating technology/processes in the future. Clement stated "Grant PUD will evaluate the objective or issue from a common sense approach. If an idea makes sense and will help lamprey survival and passage, is reasonable and feasible, and is cost-effective, we'll likely implement it. Cost effectiveness will address particular components of the Pacific Lamprey Management Plan

(PLMP). If it's inconsistent with the PLMP, isn't reasonable, feasible, or not cost effective, then Grant PUD will object to doing it." Malone reminded PRFF members that in order to take an issue to dispute resolution, why something is, or is not cost effective must be explained. The 401 Certification discusses "cost effectiveness" in plans written for Grant, Chelan and Douglas PUD's. Members reviewed examples of how cost effectiveness was evaluated in the plan. Nass explained that at no time was a dollar value assessed to a project in order to determine cost effectiveness. PRFF members noted their approval of the plan so far. **Comments are due by February 28, 2010.** Received comments will be responded to and placed in the document prior to being sent to FERC on, or before March 31, 2010. **Williams will send the report in Word format to all PRFF members.**

V. **Pacific Lamprey Modifications s Update Presentation** - Clement showed pictures of modifications completed to date. Traps, orifice closure devices and ramps have been installed. Crowders will be installed by February 08, 2010. Members participating in the ladder modification tour should meet at Grant PUD HED @ 9:30 on Monday, February 8th. Left bank ladders will be watered after the tours and right bank ladders will then be taken out of service.

VI. **Aquatic Invasive Species Plan (AIS)**

A **Vote to Approve** - Hendrick joined the meeting at 1:17 p.m. Comments were received from WDFW and WDOE. WDFW was happy with changes made to the plan. Hendrick explained that additional educational and monitoring, and more adaptive management was added to the draft plan. A motion to approve was made by Verhey, and seconded by Lewis. **Malone will send an email to Heinith asking for his approval. PRFF members in attendance approved the Aquatic Invasive Species Plan.**

VII. **Shallow Water Monitoring Plan** - Rose approves the plan.

A **Vote to Approve** - Comments are due tomorrow. PRCC members want the PRFF to approve this plan prior to PRCC approval. If they have no issues, the PRCC will also approve it. Rose requested that FLIR flights be conducted to gather temperature data. Grant PUD agreed to draft a Statement of Agreement authorizing the contractor conducting the PRCC Predator Index Study to conduct FLIR flights, thus removing the request of FLIR flights from the SWMP. USFWS, WDFW, and Wanapum approve the plan as written. **Malone will request an email vote of approval from Heinith.**

VIII. **Priest Rapids Fish Ladder Temperature Modeling Plan**

A **Vote to Approve Plan** - Interpretations as to what is required in the 401 Certification 6.6.2 were discussed at the January PRCC meeting. It was explained that PRCC members questioned why

Wanapum Dam fish ladder monitoring was not included in the study plan. Grant PUD staff explained that baseline fish ladder temperature data was collected from 2002-2004 at Priest Rapids and Wanapum Dams. Because significant increases in water temperatures from upstream to downstream were not found in the ladders, and because modifications have not, and are not being made to fish ladders at Wanapum Dam, Grant PUD felt there was no need to include it in the study plan. Grant PUD's interpretation of the requirement was to verify that changes made to fish ladders at Priest Rapids Dam do not impact water temperatures as compared to the baseline data. Grant PUD's draft plan included no additional monitoring after the initial testing.

PRCC members interpretation of the study plan was that temperature monitoring should take place above, below and in the middle of the fish ladders at both dams. They also believe monitoring should occur on a periodic (5-10 year) basis. PRCC members anticipated a monitoring plan, not a study plan. Based on the discussion with the PRCC and comments received to date, Grant PUD intends on modifying the plan to include monitoring at both dams on a more periodic (e.g. every 5 years) basis.

Because the 401 Certification mandates that Grant PUD consult with both the PRCC and the PRFF, PRCC members requested that future plans that require coordination between the two committees have more review time allotted them. How future coordination takes place needs to be addressed. It was suggested that meeting minutes be shared between the two committees on issues that overlap.

Rose does not plan to send comments, as Bryan Nordlund, the NMFS PRCC representative will be sending comments that cover his concerns. **Williams will send Grant PUD Natural Resources Annual and Non-Annual Reports to PRCC members. Malone will request an email vote of approval.**

IX. **White Sturgeon Update:**

- A **Facility Construction Schedule** - Mike Nicholls will be the engineer in charge of construction. Because the intake siphon at Priest Rapids Hatchery feeds fall Chinook production and will need to be tied into for the sturgeon hatchery, the construction window of opportunity will be limited to late summer for the supply line to the sturgeon facility.

Nicholls hopes to have permitting level designs ready by the second quarter. The National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) deadline for fall Chinook permitting at the Priest Rapids Hatchery is June 2010. The target completion date is for 2011, with operations starting in 2012. Verhey questioned who

will run the hatchery, and if plans for a residence are included. Lenz overheard that one of the three proposed residences at Priest Rapids Hatchery will be used for the sturgeon facility. The operator of the sturgeon facility could be determined by a Request for Proposal (RFP) based on sturgeon culture expertise. The contract will be awarded to the contractor who meets criteria outlined in the RFP.

Verhey questioned who will run the hatchery, and if plans for a residence are included. Lenz explained that one of the three proposed residences at Priest Rapids Hatchery will be used for the sturgeon facility. The operator of the sturgeon facility could be determined by a Request for Proposal (RFP) based on sturgeon culture expertise. The contract will be awarded to the contractor who meets criteria outlined in the RFP.

- B January 7th Marion Drain Tour Review** - PRFF members toured the Yakama Nation (YN) Marion Drain Sturgeon Facility (MDSF) on January 07, 2010. Clement explained that Tom Dresser, Grant PUD and Paul Ward, YN have agreed that the MDSF will meet Grant PUD's sturgeon production needs until the Priest Rapids Sturgeon Hatchery is complete. If for some reason the YN can't meet Grant PUD's production timeline at the MDSF Grant PUD's intends to obtain fish from Cranbrook, B.C. Clement expects that WDFW and the YN will support that plan, otherwise, it would be unlikely that Grant PUD could meet its' goal of releasing 6500 yearlings into the Project reservoirs. A lot of construction and tasks remain: placing tanks, covers, incubation stacks, and staffing.

Lenz explained that Grant PUD and the YN have talked about what it will take to make it this happen, and are developing a scope of work that will be shared with the PRFF when it's fully developed. The timeline to moving this forward is critical. Broodstock collection is a large piece of the puzzle. Questions that remain to be answered include: Priest Rapids broodstock collection by Golder & Associates, Outline McNary broodstock collection efforts by the YN. WDFW is concerned that because these populations are small, they could easily be over mined. They requested that agencies collecting broodstock work in coordination with each other.

Clement noted that Chelan PUD will be working with the YN to collect broodstock from McNary and/or Priest Rapids Project reservoirs. Grant PUD will be targeting 8 ripe females, and an equal number of males, and might possibly collect milt regionally. James asked to have each program recognize the other, and maybe share male or females. Not have two completely separate programs. Chelan PUD might take their fish off site to either the

Ringold or Chelan Falls facility, noted Clement. Late October is when a final decision is necessary about using surplus juveniles from the Kootenay (Cranbrook) facility in British Columbia. The Lake Roosevelt Trans Boundary (LRTB) team would have to authorize something like that first, if MDSF doesn't come through. Ideally, MDSF would be working as early as possible. Lenz has provided genetics information to the LRTB team. WDFW must be in full support of LRTB fish, stated Lenz.

Lewis questioned when Grant PUD will get a request of concurrence for ESA and permitting processes. Lewis explained that sturgeon weren't covered in the Biological Opinion, and because fish are being added to an eco system that bull trout exist, Grant PUD will have to consult with the USFWS. Grant PUD possibly needs to do a Biological Assessment and submit it to USFWS. Lewis thought they would most likely give a concurrence. The question was raised as to whether or not there is a provision in the Section 10 permit for aquaculture practices? That's frowned upon stated Lewis. Lenz, Clement, and Garner will determine if releasing juvenile sturgeon, the action of concern to bull trout, in the Priest Rapids Project is covered by Grant PUD's Section 10 permit, bull trout BiOp, and if it is necessary to file with USFWS. It could be as simple as responding to the Corps for the Section 10 permit, stated Lewis. USFWS have a series of public meetings regarding BT critical habitat, noted Lewis.

- X. **Next Meeting:** A place holder for the next meeting will be held for March 03, 2010. It will be determined at a later date if a conference call or meeting will be held.