



MEETING MINUTES

Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee

Wednesday, 28 September 2011

9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Grant PUD SeaTac Office

PRCC Members

Scott Carlon, Bryan Nordlund, NMFS	Jim Craig, USFWS
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes	Bill Tweit, Teresa Scott, WDFW
Bob Rose, Steve Parker, YN	Carl Merkle, CTUIR
Tom Dresser, Curt Dotson, GCPUD	Denny Rohr, Facilitator

Attendees: (*Denotes PRCC member)

Jim Craig, USFWS*	Bob Rose, Yakama Nation*
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes*	Steve Parker, Yakama Nation*
Bryan Nordlund, NMFS*	Teresa Scott, WDFW*
Heather Bartlett, WDFW	Tom Dresser, GCPUD* (via phone)
Curt Dotson, GCPUD*	Debbie Williams, GCPUD (via phone)
Denny Rohr, Facilitator	

Action Items:

1. The HSC will conduct a cost and feasibility assessment of collecting all broodstock out of the OLAFT. The HSC will also be asked to consider a strategy “D” – using a genetic parental-based methodology. Bartlett will update WDFWs Decision Paper and send to Rohr for distribution. Rohr will contact Elizabeth McManus, HSC Facilitator, to let her know that the HSC has been assigned this task, due in November.
2. Dresser will incorporate comments and suggestions to SOA 2011-06, Performance Standards Evaluation Schedule, and redistribute prior to October 07, 2011.

3. **The list of irrigation pumps/in-takes in the PRP will be sent to PRCC members.**
4. **Review SOA 2011-07 – Triggers for Ceasing Supplementation in the White River, and SOA 2011-08 – 2012 White River spring Chinook Acclimation Plan. Provide Rohr comments via e-mail.**

Decisions:

1. **The final NNI Predator Index Study statement of work and budget previously agreed to (April 2011) was affirmed by the PRCC.**

Final Meeting Minutes

- I. **Welcome and Introductions** – Rohr welcomed members and visitors.
- II. **Agenda Review** – Rohr added PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Statements of Agreements (SOA 2011-07 & SOA 2011-08) to the agenda.
- III. **Action Items Review** – Action items identified during the August 24th PRCC meeting were complete, or discussed during today's meeting.
- IV. **Priest Rapids Hatchery Fall Chinook Marking Decision Paper** – On August 31, 2011, Rohr distributed the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) decision paper for fall Chinook marking at the Priest Rapids Hatchery (PRH).

Heather Bartlett (WDFW) explained that the PRH fall Chinook marking decision paper was written in order to provide technical marking options for the PRCC to consider. Two years ago the PRCC approved a Statement of Agreement (SOA) stating 100% of PRH fish should be marked so they can be identified in order to evaluate the hatcheries performance matrix, as outlined in the HGMP submitted to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). At that time, another SOA didn't pass because there was disagreement on the best method of marking (e.g., otolith, coded wire tags [CWT], adipose-clip, etc.). The PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee then worked on marking methods and the applicability of marking methods relative to meeting performance matrix.

WDFW is now asking that the PRCC approve the decision paper so that the HSC can be tasked with evaluating the best technical method of marking, including the following three methods:

1. 100% marking using an internal mark (for example otolith)
2. 100% marking using a visible external mark (for example, adipose clip)
3. 100% marking using an electronically detectable mark (for example, blank wire tag)

The HSC would then make a marking recommendation to the PRCC. WDFW would be open to whatever the HSC recommends.

2011 was the fourth year to utilize otolith marking at the PRH. In 2009 the number of CWT used was increased and a double index tag added, to better evaluate the contribution of PRH fall Chinook to West Coast fisheries. CWT also helps with recovery of Hanford Reach (HR) fish but is used more for contribution than meeting spawning parameters. Adipose fin clipping could have implications to harvest. Parties have been split on the best approach. Bartlett said, "WDFW contends that in order to implement the best management practices with the hatchery program, and integrate HR fall Chinook with PRH fall Chinook, which is the expectation of agencies represented here today, we need to get our hands on known wild fish; which we are currently struggling with a bit."

Bartlett explained that the parties in the U.S. vs. Oregon have agreed to a marking method that is different than that outlined in the SOA the PRCC did not approve two years ago. The original PRCC SOA outlined a one year marking protocol to include 600,000 adipose clip + CWT and 600,000 CWT. Those two then form the CWT and double index tag groups. They then agreed to add another 500,000 CWT only; thus the current marking strategy. The 5 million remaining fish Grant PUD produces have an otolith mark. WDFW advocates that the 600,000 adipose clip + CWT and 600,000 CWT stay as they won't undermine the evaluation of the HGMP. WDFW has no time limit to how long a marking strategy would be used. It would be up to all parties to determine that. WDFW wants to have a way of actively identifying fish in season, not passively.

Steve Parker, Yakama Nation (YN) stated that the YN and WDFW are not in agreement on this issue because the PRH has been operating its current program for 30 years and it's proven to be the most productive natural population on the West Coast. Parker noted that WDFW hasn't identified that there is a problem at PRH and questioned why they want to come up with a remedy.

Recent information shows that otolith sampling from the 2010 returns indicates that a high percentage of fish returning to the hatchery are of hatchery origin. Parker said the YN agrees that adding natural original broodstock into the hatchery population would be the prudent thing to do, and that the YN is willing to hear WDFW's case.

Nordlund asked why the YN thinks marking at 100% would be a problem. Parker responded that it's partially about broodstock management, but more fundamentally it's about harvest management and non-treaty access to PRH fish. Parker replied that WDFW needs a large percentage, if not all, PRH fish to be ad-clipped so they can gain access to the non-selective fishery in the lower river. Bartlett noted that WDFW has every intention of moving to a marked selective fishery for fall Chinook in the lower river and that in some years, PRH fish are a valuable contribution. Tule fall Chinook are one reason

fishing methods are being changed in the lower river; not upper river brights. WDFW doesn't have methods in place to commercially catch fall Chinook. This program is the single largest production program in the Columbia River that is not marked. Parker said that Guy Norman, WDFW Vancouver, fears that WDFW is trying to develop selective techniques so that commercial fisherman can harvest hatchery Tullies, but release upriver brights. He went on to say that commercial fishing rights and which fish can be kept or taken are an issue that the tribes are fundamentally opposed to. They worry about allocation issues and poorly documented post release mortalities. Bartlett said the double index tag group will help answer that question. She noted that harvest plays a role in all of this, but how to manage the broodstock needs to also be looked at. CWT information for the HR is a little squishy; it doesn't appear there is a problem, but WDFW isn't sure. WDFW wants the PRH fall Chinook population to be integrated using the best scientific information available.

Teresa Scott (WDFW) expressed concern that the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) goals are not unilaterally agreed upon and questions how the PRCC can have the HSC work on this if everyone doesn't agree that it's important to have the same values. Parker explained that the YN doesn't want to send the message that they don't want the information because they may not like it. Parker said the YN are not opposed to looking at the program options, but at the same time, the YN isn't supporting the program. He doesn't want people to get the impression or spread the word that the YN is supportive of it. Bartlett said that WDFW knows the value of the population and has found creative ways of meeting matrixes without undermining the program. Parker stated that the YN would be comfortable with an M& E program that doesn't presume an outcome. WDFW would like to have an SOA that at a minimum covers what has been done for the past two years.

Bartlett noted that a decision needs to be made by November 2011 in order to develop a new SOA. Funds could then be budgeted for operating the PRH in time to implement whatever method of marking that is approved with broodstock being collected this year.

Discussion focused on the HSC and the alternatives they will be looking at. It was agreed that the HSC be allowed to conduct their analysis and provide a matrix of the options to the PRCC without any constraints being placed on them. Bartlett wants the matrix to be made based strictly on science and without consideration of their agencies policies. The PRCC will then consider matrix options and make a final decision. Parker explained that the YN does not feel obligated to make a management agreement at the end of the process just because they agreed to have the analysis done.

Parker noted that he's troubled by the purpose and need of 100% marking and questioned if there is a problem with hatchery origin spawners on the HR. Bartlett replied that there isn't a problem at this time and that CWT have been used to mark fish. She went onto say that 200,000 CWT are an insufficient

number for a program of this size. Scott reviewed M&E criteria that the HSC will be providing to them. Bartlett suggested changing that criteria because the program could be at a maximum of 30% pHOS, which is fine for a well-integrated program. As seen from otolith marking and increased carcass recoveries on the HR, pHOS is around 15%, well below HSRG guidelines for a primary integrated population. If it starts to exceed 30%, all managers would be trying to find the problem, Bartlett said. At this time, a PNI integration of .67% can't be assured. Wild fish would need to be integrated into the broodstock in order to do so. Wild fish are not as easily collected in the Off Ladder Adult Fish Trap (OLAFT) as previously thought because fish do not have an external mark.

Parker suggested that the HSC conduct a cost and feasibility assessment of collecting all broodstock out of the OLAFT. Parker asked if there are simpler solutions to consider before going to more contentious solutions. Marco stated that he thought the Colville Tribe might have a problem with that because some of those fish could be part of their harvest allocation. He noted that if you don't know the origin of a fish, it can't be considered natural origin. Some of these fish could be headed for other mainstem spawning populations. What happens to fish returning to the volunteer trap at PRH? Parker thought that most agencies would want to keep the trap open to remove most of the hatchery returns and not direct them to the spawning grounds.

It was agreed that the following will be added to the WDFW Decision Paper as Item #7: **The HSC will conduct a cost and feasibility assessment of collecting all broodstock out of the OLAFT. The HSC will also be asked to consider a strategy "D" – using a genetic parental-based methodology. Bartlett will update WDFW's Decision Paper and send to Rohr for distribution. Rohr will contact Elizabeth McManus, HSC Facilitator, to let her know that the HSC has been assigned this task, due in November.** They will also be asked to give an update on their progress with the NNI Recalculation at that time.

A. Review of Assignment to PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee - See above.

V. Performance Standards Evaluation Schedule

A. Draft Statement of Agreement (SOA) 2011-06 review and discussion

PRCC members reviewed draft SOA 2011-06 that was distributed electronically by Rohr. Dresser explained that within the Priest Rapids Salmon and Steelhead Settlement Agreement (SSSA) parties agreed that once performance standards are met, a survival evaluation check-in schedule would be initiated every five years for all species with the exception of sub-yearling Chinook. This SOA addresses the five year check-in periods.

Rose asked if 2016 would be the start date on item #3 in order to allow Grant PUD to conduct studies on the other two species in 2015. Dresser

explained that he wants to spread things out because it's not possible with the facilities and infrastructure in place to test three or four species at the same time.

The other reason Dresser made the proposal to push back check-ins in 2014 and 2015 is because Grant PUD will have by-pass infrastructure (Wanapum turbines will be complete, Priest Rapids Bypass) in place and that should help provide a better baseline in the future. Priest Rapids turbines will not be finished by the first check in. All permitting documentation list 2015 as the Priest Rapids Bypass completion date, but Grant PUD hopes to have it completed by 2014. This SOA does not account for what the PRCC will do in 2012 and 2013. Nordlund suggested editing item #1 as follows: Moving the survival evaluation check in date to 2014 with the ability to move it out to 2015 if the Priest Rapids Top-Spill is not completed and operational by April 2014. Members agreed to Nordlund's suggested edits.

Nordlund asked what happens with the re-check numbers for steelhead because they have not met their performance standards yet, and what happens if survival numbers aren't validated or current survival standards come out less than the original number with only one year of data. He asked if No Net Impact (NNI) Funds would then be recalibrated based on the one year? The committee has had no previous discussion on this topic. Dresser doesn't think the SSSA discuss' this because the existing survival schedule goes out to 2011 with a modification to NNI in 2012. The SSSA doesn't say anything about what happens if survival standards aren't met at the five year check-in. Dresser thought that the NNI would probably be based on one year check-ins. He suggests handling NNI under a separate SOA that discusses how NNI is calculated, or an addendum to this SOA. Nordlund said there is some value in looking at the four year average with the previous numbers, but it's complicated by having different passage facilities. Nordlund encouraged everyone to start thinking about how to resolve this.

Nordlund said he and Scott Carlon agree that steelhead should be at three years because it's not a recheck of survival standards that were achieved. It's still an effort to try to achieve the survival standard. Based on that, a steelhead check-in would occur in 2014, 2015, and 2016. Dresser asked what happens in 2012 and 2013 as it relates to the Biological Opinion. Rose felt that the sockeye and steelhead studies should be at two years. He suggests copy and pasting information that we already have that summarizes where we are right now, as "back ground" information within the SOA, and why it's taken us a while to get to this point, so that when this SOA is looked at in 2014 or 2015, the intent and rational of the SOA is shown. Rose said he would be ok deferring a third year of study if the PRCC felt that they were significantly above standard after identifying survival criteria.

Marco suggests separating steelhead from Item #1 so they stand alone. PRCC members agreed with Marco's suggestion. **Dresser will incorporate comments and suggestions and redistribute prior to October 07, 2011.** Rohr asked members to review the document and send Dresser any comments. Approval of this SOA will be asked for at the October 26, 2011 PRCC meeting.

VI. Review and Discussion of Fish Screens in the Upper Columbia River Watersheds

Teresa Scott and Bryan Nordlund reported that they have been working on an irrigation in-take screen proposal but that it isn't quite ready yet. The proposal will ask for funding from the No-Net Impact Fund (NNI) in order to fund a screen maintenance inspector for WDFW for the upper Columbia Basin. Scott said that she has talked to Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE) regarding co-support for the inspector position. Capital construction funding would be for repair of existing screens, or new screens in diversion structures. Nordlund said that Dale Bambrick, NOAA, suggested that diverted flow levels be included as a duty of the inspector. There is currently a device that can read flow levels but it doesn't take actual flow measurements. As part of the compliance aspect of the proposal, owners of the new or enhanced screens would make a commitment to the fact that the amount of water they are diverting is accurate.

Another part of the proposal will address diversions that need screens or repairs in the Priest Rapids Project (PRP). **The list of irrigation pumps/in-takes in the PRP will be sent to PRCC members.** This could potentially enlarge the scope of the project if screens need to be repaired or replaced in the PRP. Nordlund noted that if a screen is built to standards at the time of installation, it is considered to be grandfathered in and wouldn't have to be updated. He also said that if no observable take is observed by a screen that doesn't meet National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) criteria, it probably wouldn't be required to be updated.

Rose asked if a standard amount of money would be requested annually from NNI for the inspector position and new screen projects. Nordlund stated the initial request is for less than \$500,000 to cover 11 diversions sites and 10 years for the inspector position. Capital funding would be variable. Additional funds could be requested in the future.

Rose suggests that this project be handed over to the PRCC Habitat Subcommittee upon PRCC approval. The Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board has a prioritized list of these kinds of projects.

VII. PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Statements of Agreement - Rohr distributed two Statements of Agreement (SOA) he received from the PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee (HSC) electronically on September 27, 2011. He explained that the first SOA 2011-07 – Triggers for Ceasing Supplementation in the White River, and SOA 2011-08 – 2012 White River spring Chinook

Acclimation Plan were both approved by the HSC. **Rohr asked members to review the documents and provide comments to him via e-mail.** An official vote will be taken at the next PRCC meeting.

Dresser explained that the HSC developed SOA 2011-07 – Triggers for Ceasing Supplementation in the White River because it is a question that Grant PUD anticipates they will be asked during the public process as it relates to this program. The HSC worked extremely hard to develop and approve language in the SOA.

VIII. Updates:

- A. NNI Predator Index Study** – Rohr reported that USGS/WDFW and Blue Leaf Environmental (BLE) were asked to deliver their 2011 draft reports to the PRCC by October 14th. The reports will be distributed to members so they have time to review them before the October 26th PRCC meeting. Additionally, Rohr asked PRCC members if after the HCP meeting the morning of October 25th, they could meet in the afternoon so USGS/WDFW and BLE could present their 2011 findings. October 26th would then be used primarily as a PRCC workshop. PRCC members agreed to meet on October 25th.

Rohr explained that Tim Counihan, USGS, had recently contacted him stating he hadn't received a hard copy of the PRCC's statement of work for 2011.

Rohr reviewed with the PRCC the history of how the new 2011 budget and statement of work had been developed. He explained that the last statement of work and budget that was submitted in April, 2011 by USGS/WDFW received five PRCC member approvals, but that Grant PUD voted no and asked that the statement of work be revised, even though Grant PUD's stated intent at the time was approval of the submitted budget amount. Rohr explained that after review and discussion, a new and revised statement of work was approved by the PRCC in April, 2011 via conference call, but because Grant PUD originally voted no to the 'coupled statement of work and budget submitted by USGS/WDFW, their approval wasn't officially given for the budget that had been submitted and approved by all but Grant PUD. For the record, Rohr asked the PRCC to affirm their approval of the NNI Predator Index Study statement of work as revised and budget as submitted by USGS/WDFW. Dotson reported that the contract currently in place has the additional funds that were included last fall, from the first contractual Change Order, for one additional year of study and \$766,000. Also, USGS/WDFW received the new and revised statement of work on May 1, 2011, but it didn't include the additional funding amount of \$70,971. **Therefore, the final new and revised NNI Predator Index Study statement of work and budget amount**

of \$836,971 (\$766,000 plus \$70,971) previously agreed to (April 2011) was affirmed by the PRCC.

- B. Priest Rapids Bypass** – Dotson reported that component installation continues and Grant PUD is working through contract submittals.
- C. 2013 Hatchery Production Recalculation** – Dresser reported that the Implementation Plan has been shared with the Joint Fisheries Party (JFP).
- D. Quincy Valley Tourism Northern Pikeminnow Derby** – Dresser reported that the fishing derby went well. There were 139 participants. 980 northern pikeminnow (NPM) were removed. Most were in the 9-11” range with the largest weighing just over two pounds. Cash prizes were worth \$30,000. Twenty fish were tagged and released in Wanapum Reservoir by Grant PUD staff; no tagged fish were re-caught during the derby. One fish was tagged at \$10,000 and four were tagged at \$5,000. Gift certificates or prizes were associated with another 15 tagged fish. The top 20 fish, based on weight were put into a bucket and randomly drew out names for prize winners. Several people won between \$250.00 and \$500.00. A 13 year old girl caught the largest fish in both the youth and adult division.

Quincy Valley Tourism (QVT) wants to hold the event again. To improve turn out next year, QVT plans to advertise earlier, and make sure their on-line registration is working. They would like to hold the event in mid-June. Dresser suggested they conduct the event in conjunction with or close to the time the East Wenatchee Rotary holds their NPM derby.

Dresser stated that QVT did a good job of giving recognition to all members of the PRCC.

E. White River Acclimation Permits

The Chelan County comment period ended on September 22, 2011. Letters of support were received from WDFW and the YN. Grant PUD is addressing comments received from Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE) stating that the proposal for the White River Acclimation facility is inconsistent with the Chelan County Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) in three areas: 1) in a natural environment there is no dredge, 2) no fill, and 3) no aquaculture. Dresser believes Grant PUD’s response as it relates to aquaculture is good and because dredging won’t take place in navigable waters, this should be handled fairly easy. Grant PUD staff will be working with the Yakima WDOE office to address the fill issue because fill material will be brought in to build up the facility.

Grant PUD has until the mid-November to work through these issues. It will then be sent to the public hearing examiner for Chelan County. A

ruling to issue or deny a conditional use permit would then be made. If it's declined, Grant PUD would most likely appeal the decision, at which time it would then go to the Pollution Control Hearing Board. If they also deny it, the request would have to go through a litigation process. It was planned to break ground next year but permitting delays will push back the proposal construction schedule. Dresser doesn't think Chelan County will have an answer until the first quarter of 2012.

- F. Committee Reports** – Rohr has distributed electronically, noting there were no Habitat Subcommittee or Hanford Reach Fall Chinook Working Group meetings in September and therefore no reports.
 - G. NNI and Habitat Funds Report** – Rohr distributed electronically earlier in the month.
- IX. Next Month's Topics**
- A. NNI Predator Index Study**
 - B. 2011 Steelhead Evaluation - Results**
- X. Approval of Meeting Minutes**
- A. July 27, 2011** – Teresa Scott affirmed her approval
 - B. August 24, 2011** – An email vote will be conducted by Rohr.
- XI. Next meeting:** October 25-26, 2011, 9:00 – 3:00 Grant PUD SeaTac Office.