

**ANNUAL REPORT  
CALENDAR YEAR 2004  
OF ACTIVITIES UNDER THE ANADROMOUS FISH AGREEMENT  
AND HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN**

**WELLS HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT  
FERC LICENSE NO. 2149**

**Prepared for**

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20426

**Prepared by**

Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.  
1423 Third Avenue, Suite 300  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
and  
Public Utility District No. 1  
of Douglas County, Washington  
1151 Valley Mall Parkway  
East Wenatchee, Washington 98802-4497

**April 2005**

## Table of Contents

---

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	ESTABLISHMENT OF HCP COMMITTEES.....	2
3	PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING NO NET IMPACT.....	3
3.1	Project Operations and Improvements.....	4
3.1.1	Operations .....	4
3.1.2	Assessment of Project Survival .....	5
3.1.3	Maintenance and Improvements .....	7
3.2	Hatchery Compensation.....	7
3.2.1	Hatchery Production Summary .....	8
3.2.2	Hatchery Planning .....	9
3.3	Tributary Habitat Actions .....	9
4	OTHER AGREEMENTS AND DECISIONS .....	11
4.1	FERC Rehearing Request.....	11
4.2	Non-signatories to the HCP and Participation in Committee Meetings .....	11
4.3	Flow Management Agreement for Sockeye Mitigation .....	11
4.4	Grant PUD/Douglas PUD Hatchery Agreement .....	12
4.5	Steelhead Adult Broodstock Collection and Production at Wells and Methow Hatcheries.....	12
4.6	Rearing and Release of High Bacterial Kidney Diseased Fish in the Methow Basin.....	12
4.7	Bypass Operations.....	13

### List of Tables

Table 1	Phase Designations for Wells Dam
Table 2	Adult Conversion Rates for 2004
Table 3	Production Level Objectives for Wells HCP Hatchery Programs

### List of Appendices

Appendix A	Habitat Conservation Plan and Wells Coordinating Committees Meeting Minutes
Appendix B	Habitat Conservation Plan Hatchery Committee Meeting Minutes
Appendix C	Habitat Conservation Plan Tributary Committee Meeting Minutes
Appendix D	List of Committee Members
Appendix E	FERC Order Approving the HCP
Appendix F	Fall-back Summaries
Appendix G	State Auditor Meeting
Appendix H	Grant-Douglas PUD Hatchery Agreement

## Table of Contents

---

- Appendix I Wells Settlement Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes (March 2004)  
Appendix J Bypass Operations Memorandum – September 16, 2004

## 1 INTRODUCTION

On June 21, 2004, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) approved an Anadromous Fish Agreement and Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for the Wells Hydroelectric Project (Wells Dam – FERC License No. 2149) on the Columbia River in Washington State. The Wells Project is owned and operated by the Public Utility District No. 1 of Douglas County (Douglas PUD). The HCP provides a comprehensive and long-term adaptive management plan for species addressed in the HCP (Plan Species) and their habitat. This document is intended to fulfill Section 6.9 of the HCP requiring an Annual Report of progress toward achieving the No Net Impact (NNI) goal described in Section 3 of the HCP, and common understandings based upon completed studies.

## 2 ESTABLISHMENT OF HCP COMMITTEES

The signatories of the Wells, Rocky Reach, and Rock Island HCPs agreed to allow their designated representatives to meet jointly to increase efficiency. As such, the three HCP Coordinating Committees, the three Hatcheries Committees, and the three Tributary Committees each work together to oversee and guide implementation of the three HCPs. In September 2004, the Signatory Parties selected Michael Schiewe as a neutral, third party to chair the Coordinating and Hatchery Committees, and Robert Bugert as a neutral, third party to chair the Tributary Committees. Beginning in October 2004, the HCP Committees began to meet monthly to coordinate implementation. Minutes from the monthly meetings are compiled in Appendices A (Coordinating Committees), B (Hatchery Committees), and C (Tributary Committees); Appendix D provides a list of the designated representatives for each of the Committees. The Coordinating Committees for the Wells Dam HCP oversaw the preparation of the first Wells HCP Annual Report, which covers the period from January 1 to December 31, 2004.

Section 1.1 of the HCP indicates that the HCP became effective on the date FERC issued a final order approving the HCP. As stated in Section 1 of this report, the effective date of the HCP was June 21, 2004. Due to the early implementation aspects of the HCP, the Wells, Rocky Reach, and Rock Island HCP Committees began meeting in January of 2004. However, until the approval date, Douglas PUD was operating under the terms of the Settlement Agreement until FERC approved the HCP. To document the history of the Committees from January to June, this document includes Coordinating Committees meeting minutes from meetings prior to the approval date (see Appendix A). Because no decisions were made in the Hatchery and Tributary Committees prior to the approval date, this document does not include Hatchery or Tributary Committees meeting minutes from meetings prior to this date (see Appendices B and C).

### 3 PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING NO NET IMPACT

The Wells Dam HCP requires preparation of an Annual Report that describes progress toward achieving the performance standard of NNI for each Plan Species. The NNI standard consists of two components: 1) 91 percent combined adult and juvenile project survival achieved by project improvement measures implemented within the geographic area of the project, and 2) 9 percent compensation for unavoidable project mortality provided through hatchery and tributary programs, with 7 percent compensation provided through hatchery and 2 percent through tributary programs (Section 3.1 of the HCP). Section 4.1 of the HCP states that, given the present inability to differentiate between the sources of adult mortality, initial compliance with the combined adult and juvenile survival standard will be based on the measurement of juvenile survival as 93 percent juvenile project survival or 95 percent juvenile dam passage survival (described further in Section 4.1.2 of the HCP).

A major feature of the Wells HCP is what is termed “a phased implementation plan” to achieve the survival standards. Briefly, Phase I consists of implementation of juvenile and adult operating plans and criteria to meet the survival standards, and a monitoring and evaluation program to determine compliance with the survival standards. Following completion of the 3-year monitoring and evaluation program in Phase I, the Coordinating Committees will determine whether the pertinent survival standards have been achieved. Depending upon the results of this determination, the Douglas PUD will either proceed to Phase II (if the applicable survival standard has not been achieved) or Phase III (if the applicable survival standard has been achieved). Under Phase II conditions, the Coordinating Committees have determined that the standard has not been met, and the PUD is responsible for evaluating additional tools to improve survival. Under Phase III conditions, the Coordinating Committees have determined that the survival standards have been achieved, and the PUD is required to re-evaluate survival at 10-year intervals. It should be noted that juvenile survival studies conducted during Phase I may result in different phase designations for each of the Plan Species.

As of the HCP approval date (June 2004), Douglas PUD has met the survival standards for all Plan Species, completed adult fall-back assessments, completed all Phase I testing, and is in Phase III of the phased implementation (Appendix E; Table 1).

**Table 1**  
**Phase Designations for Wells Dam**

Plan Species	Phase Designation	Date
Upper Columbia River steelhead	Phase III (Standard Achieved)	February 22, 2005
UCR spring Chinook	Phase III (Standard Achieved)	February 22, 2005
UCR summer/fall Chinook	Phase III (Additional Juvenile Studies)	February 22, 2005
Okanogan River sockeye	Phase III (Additional Juvenile Studies)	February 22, 2005
Coho*	N/A	N/A

\*A "threshold population" of coho salmon does not yet exist.

The following sections of this report chart progress made in 2004 toward achieving the HCP objectives as they relate to continued implementation of the juvenile and adult passage plans, and project improvements for hatchery programs and tributary programs.

### 3.1 Project Operations and Improvements

This section will summarize project operations and progress toward HCP requirements at Wells Dam in 2004.

#### 3.1.1 Operations

Operation of the juvenile bypass system in 2004 was guided by the Bypass Operating Plan contained within Section 4.3 of the Wells HCP. The bypass initiation date of April 12, 2004 and bypass termination date of August 26, 2004 were implemented per the Pre-season Operating Plan agreed to by the HCP Coordinating Committees in Spring 2004 (Appendix A) and the Wells Settlement Coordinating Committee (Appendix A and I). In September 2004, Douglas PUD prepared a bypass operation summary that described in great detail the operational criteria for the bypass system, as well as the initiation and termination dates for the Wells bypass system. The year 2004 was the first year that the bypass system operations were guided by representatives of the HCP Coordinating Committees (Appendix J).

Flows at Wells Dam during the 2004 juvenile plan outmigration (April to August) were at 86 percent of the 20-year average. Operationally, all five bypass bays were available and were utilized at one time or another during the 2004 outmigration.

The spring bypass started on April 12th at 0000 hours and was operated continuously through June 13th at 2400 hours. The spring bypass operated for a total of 63 days and with a total discharge of 1.1 MAF, or 8.1 percent of total project discharge. During the spring bypass operation, there was forced spill during 3 hours or 0.2 percent of the time.

Summer bypass started on June 14 at 0000 hours and ran until August 26 at 2400 hours, for a total of 74 days. There was 1.1 mean annual flow (MAF) or 6.9 percent of the total discharge dedicated to summer bypass. During the summer bypass operating period, there was no forced spill. All 10 units were ready and available during the most of the bypass operations. The highest hourly discharge at the project occurred on June 29 at 1900 hours with 217,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) flowing through the project.

### **3.1.2 Assessment of Project Survival**

As previously noted, as of the approval of the HCP, Douglas PUD met the Phase I HCP requirements of 91 percent combined adult and juvenile project survival. In 2004, Douglas PUD successfully implemented the juvenile and adult passage plans, successfully established the plan species account for tributary improvements, and made progress toward achieving hatchery improvements covered in the HCP, including documenting adult fall-back conditions and facilities maintenance.

#### **3.1.2.1 Adult Passage Monitoring**

The HCP acknowledges that no scientific methodology currently exists that would allow the Coordinating Committees to assess adult project survival (presumed to be 98 percent). This is because available methodologies are unable to differentiate between mortality caused by the project versus mortality from other sources (natural causes, injuries resulting from passage at downstream projects, injuries sustained by harvest activities, etc.). However, the Coordinating Committees are able to evaluate information to assess whether or not there is a high likelihood that the presumed adult survival rates are being achieved. Table 2 details detections of known origin adult Passive Integrated Transponder (PIT)-tagged steelhead and Chinook salmon at McNary Dam in 2004, the number of adults redetected at Wells Dam, the estimated conversion rate (McNary Dam to Wells Dam), and average per-project (five dams and reservoirs) conversion rates. These conversion rates are best viewed as a



minimum survival estimate between the two detection sites (they contain mortalities from all sources between the two detection sites). They do not include any indirect or delayed mortality that might occur upstream of Wells Dam (the redetection site). Because the per project conversion rate estimates exceeded 98 percent in 2004 for steelhead and spring Chinook salmon (that is, mortalities from all sources averaged less than 2 percent through each project), the Coordinating Committees are confident that project-related mortalities are likely less than 2 percent.

**Table 2  
Adult Conversion Rates for 2004**

Stock Species	McNary Dam	Wells Dam	McNary to Wells Total Conversion Rate	McNary to Wells Average Per Project Conversion Rate*
All Releases <sup>1</sup> Steelhead 2004	705	662	93.9%	98.7%
All Releases <sup>2</sup> Spring Chinook 2004	129	124	96.1%	99.2%

\* Calculated as McNary Dam to Wells Dam Total Conversion Rate to the 5<sup>th</sup> root (five dams and five pools). Any mortality occurring within the 41 mile free-flowing Hanford Reach of the Columbia River is also incorporated into this estimate and evenly distributed among the five dams and reservoirs. Adults detected at Wells Dam that were not also detected at McNary Dam were excluded from the analysis.

Source: Columbia River DART website: [http://www.cqs.washington.edu/dart/pit\\_obs\\_adult\\_conrate.html](http://www.cqs.washington.edu/dart/pit_obs_adult_conrate.html)

<sup>1</sup> Steelhead released into the Okanogan and Methow River Systems – PIT-tag release site designations: CHEWUR, METHR, OKANR, OMAKC, SIMILR, TWIS2P, TWISPR, and WINT.

<sup>2</sup> Spring Chinook salmon released into Methow River System – PIT-tag release site designations: CHEWUP, METH, and WINT.

### 3.1.2.2 Completed Studies 2004

The Wells Dam HCP requires Douglas PUD to identify adult fall-back rates at Wells Dam by the end of Phase I. Studies addressing adult fall-back at Wells Dam were summarized at the December 13, 2004 meeting of the Coordinating Committees (Appendices A and F). Douglas PUD reviewed adult fall-back studies from 1992-2002 at Wells Dam. The Coordinating Committees deferred approval of these rates until early 2005 pending additional analyses of data and a summary of the biological significance of fall-back to Plan Species.

### **3.1.3 Maintenance and Improvements**

Maintenance activities supporting fish survival at Wells Dam in 2004 included the redesign of the Twisp and Chewuch Acclimation Pond weirs and improvements to the Twisp Acclimation Pond intake screen.

#### **3.1.3.1 Twisp and Chewuch Weir**

Additional designs for the Chewuch Adult Collection weir were completed at the start of 2004; however, at the end of 2004, access to the land for the trap was still being negotiated with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). Completion of the Twisp Adult Collection weir work is expected to be complete by April 2005, prior to initiation of hatchery brood collection.

#### **3.1.3.2 Twisp Screen Improvements**

The Twisp Acclimation Pond screen has proven difficult to keep clean during freshet events and as such was re-designed, including a new intake screen and intake structure, burying the pipeline, and an automated screen cleaning system. At the end of 2004, modifications were in progress, and construction is expected to be completed by March 2005 prior to the acclimation of fish at the Twisp Pond.

## **3.2 Hatchery Compensation**

As required by the HCP, Douglas PUD supported hatchery production in 2004 to compensate for unavoidable project mortality. Section 8 of the Wells Dam HCP outlines a Hatchery Compensation Plan with two hatchery objectives for Douglas PUD: 1) to provide hatchery compensation for all of the Plan Species, including spring Chinook salmon, summer/fall Chinook salmon, sockeye salmon, and summer steelhead, and to provide hatchery compensation for coho salmon should they become established under the criteria set forth in HCP Section 8.4.5.1.; and 2) to implement specific elements of the hatchery program consistent with the overall objectives of rebuilding natural populations and achieving NNI.

Hatchery compensation in 2004 included the release of 675,733 smolts from hatcheries associated with Wells Dam. Also, substantial progress was made on developing a 5-year

Hatchery Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan. The M&E Plan for Douglas HCP hatchery facilities is scheduled to be complete by May 2005.

### 3.2.1 Hatchery Production Summary

Table 3 summarizes and compares HCP hatchery production objectives and actual 2004 production levels.

**Table 3**  
**Production Level Objectives for Wells HCP Hatchery Programs**

Species	Program	Facilities Utilized Under Current Program	Production Level Objectives (2004-2013)	Smolt Releases 2004 (# fish)
Spring Chinook	Methow	Methow Fish Hatchery	61,000 <sup>1</sup>	234,347
Summer Chinook	Methow/Okanogan	Wells Fish Hatchery, Eastbank, and Carlton	109,000 <sup>2</sup>	85,451
Summer steelhead		Wells Fish Hatchery	349,000 <sup>3</sup>	355,935
Sockeye	Okanogan	(231,000) This amount is substituted for by 225,000 spring Chinook through brood year 2003. Post-brood year 2003, sockeye mitigation is satisfied through the Water Management Program administered in the British Columbia portion of the Okanogan River Subbasin.		

This table referenced from the Wells HCP.

<sup>1</sup>Production obligation beginning with the 2004 brood year. Releases in 2004 reflect pre-HCP propagation obligations.

<sup>2</sup>Combined with the Rock Island HCP and Rocky Reach HCP, the Methow/Okanogan summer Chinook production at the Carlton Acclimation site totals 400,000 smolts.

<sup>3</sup>Combined with Grant PUD Biological Opinion steelhead production, the steelhead production at Wells Hatchery totals 450,000 smolts.

Methow Basin spring Chinook from brood year 2004 exhibit higher than normal prevalence of Bacterial Kidney Disease (BKD). Due to the higher than expected prevalence of BKD, the Hatchery Committees recognized that it will not be possible to meet the combined smolt production goal for the three PUDs (Chelan, Grant, and Douglas) of 550,000; rather 350,000 smolts can be raised. At the December 14, 2004 Hatchery Committees meeting, Chelan, Grant, and Douglas PUD agreed to share the remaining number of smolts in proportion to the originally agreed to allocation at the 550,000 fish level (Appendix B). This includes 38,500 fish (11 percent) for Douglas PUD, 182,000 fish (52 percent) for Chelan PUD, and 129,500 fish (37 percent) for Grant PUD.

### **3.2.2 Hatchery Planning**

Phase I of the HCP requires that Douglas PUD prepare a 5-year monitoring and evaluation program to determine compliance with the survival standards set forth in HCP Section 4.1. Douglas PUD initiated preparation of a Hatchery M&E Plan in 2004, structuring the document to complement and coordinate with the Chelan PUD Hatchery M&E Plan in terms of methods, objectives, and goals. The key objective of the plan is to assess whether hatchery objectives defined by the HCP are being met (Section 3.1 of the HCP). At the October 5, 2004 meeting of the Hatchery Committees, the Committees agreed that a draft Douglas PUD M&E Plan can be evaluated and finalized after the Chelan PUD Hatchery M&E Plan is finalized (see Appendix B). It is anticipated that both plans will be finalized in early 2005.

### **3.3 Tributary Habitat Actions**

As outlined in the Wells HCP, the signatory parties designated one member each to serve on the respective Tributary Committees. The Rock Island, Rocky Reach and Wells Tributary Committees meet on a regularly scheduled basis as a collective group to enhance coordination and minimize meeting dates and schedules. Subject items requiring decision making are voted on in accordance with the terms outlined in the specific HCPs. The Tributary Committees have met monthly since August 2004 (Appendix C). The initial focus of the Tributary Committees was to adopt a set of operating procedures, which provide a mechanism for decision-making on various issues related to the Committees (Appendix C). Subsequently, the Tributary Committees began developing a funding policy for soliciting, reviewing, and approving project proposals, to be funded by the Plan Species account. This funding policy will be completed in 2005 and will provide formal guidance to project sponsors on submission of proposals for projects to protect and restore habitat of Plan Species within the geographic scope of the HCP.

In an effort to coordinate with ongoing funding and implementation programs within the region, the Tributary Committees will use the previously-established technical framework and review process for this area, and are working with the other funding programs to identify cost-sharing procedures. Requests for project proposals are expected to be distributed in Spring 2005, with a due date in Fall 2005, and decision-making in Winter 2006. These timelines apply for larger projects (in general, those totaling greater than

\$25,000). A streamlined version of the large project award and funding process is anticipated for smaller projects (those totaling less than \$25,000). Douglas PUD has solicited a review of these procedures by the state auditor, culminating in an understanding of the status of the fund and ownership of land and assets associated with these potential projects. In addition, the state auditor also provided clarification regarding contractual and bidding requirements for projects funded by the Plan Species account (Appendices C and G).

The Tributary Committees, through the HCP Coordinating Committees, formally invited the Yakama Nation and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Nation to the regular meetings of the Committees, as these two non-signatory Tribes have federally-designated status as fisheries co-managers, and are directly affected by the proceedings. In addition, for regional coordination purposes, the Tributary Committees invited Grant PUD to participate in Committees meetings. The Tributary Committees also invited American Rivers, a party that contributed to the development of the HCP, yet elected not to sign the document. Participation of these parties benefits the Tributary Committees through increased coordination and sharing of expertise; however, these non-signatory parties do not participate in voting.

## 4 OTHER AGREEMENTS AND DECISIONS

### 4.1 FERC Rehearing Request

FERC issued an order on rehearing (Order No. 20041123-3074) on November 23, 2004 denying a request from Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission (CRITFC), the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation (Yakama), and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation for voting status in the HCP Committees. FERC also stated that the obligations of Douglas PUD to participate in the Mid-Columbia Coordinating Committee (MCCC) were terminated to the extent it was still functioning, with respect to Wells Dam, including the provision that the HCP Coordinating Committees are not further required to cross coordinate with the MCCC.

### 4.2 Non-signatories to the HCP and Participation in Committee Meetings

The non-signing parties to the HCP (Yakama, Umatilla and American Rivers) and Grant PUD were invited by letter to participate in Hatchery and Tributary Committees meetings as non-voting members, represented by designees from their respective entities. Agendas and meeting minutes will be provided to the designated point of contact for these parties. A Mid-Columbia Forum is planned as a mechanism for further communication and coordination with the non-signing parties and all other interested parties. In December 2004, the Coordinating Committees discussed these meetings briefly, and the first of these gatherings was scheduled for March 2005 (See Appendix A).

### 4.3 Flow Management Agreement for Sockeye Mitigation

At the October 5, 2004 meeting of the Hatchery Committees and the October 12, 2004 meeting of the Coordinating Committees, both Committees agreed that the flow management program would satisfy Douglas PUD's sockeye mitigation responsibility (see Appendix A and B). According to this agreement, Douglas PUD is funding the input and maintenance of the model, while data collection for the model is jointly funded by Douglas PUD and the Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection (Canada). Future M&E on this project will include annual sockeye and kokanee surveys, acoustic surveys, inflow and water temperature monitoring, and emergence timing data collection. Members of both the Hatchery and Coordinating Committees agreed that the flow management program met Douglas PUD's 7 percent HCP sockeye mitigation responsibility.

#### **4.4 Grant PUD/Douglas PUD Hatchery Agreement**

At the September 2, 2004 meeting of the Hatchery Committees, the Committees agreed upon a framework regarding current and future plans for Douglas PUD to raise mitigation and study fish for Grant PUD. This agreement was based on the Grant-Douglas Hatchery Interlocal Cooperation Agreement and is a 10-year framework document covering the legal, financial, and fish rearing aspects associated with Douglas PUD raising fish for Grant PUD (Appendix H). The Agreement sets HCP committee approval, on a yearly basis, for the various fish rearing programs requested by Grant PUD. The Hatchery Committees approved the Cooperation Agreement and approved the three rearing groups requested by Grant PUD for 2004 provided the Committees would be able to review and, if needed, alter any of the various rearing programs covered by the Cooperation Agreement, on an annual basis. The groups approved for implementation during 2004 included 100,000 steelhead and 201,000 spring Chinook, to be raised as mitigation for losses at the Priest Rapids Project. Additionally, 150,000 steelhead would be raised for use in Grant PUD's scheduled 2006 survival study.

#### **4.5 Steelhead Adult Broodstock Collection and Production at Wells and Methow Hatcheries**

At the September 2, 2004 meeting of the Hatchery Committees, the Committees confirmed with WDFW the numbers and arrangement for entities requesting steelhead and spring Chinook smolts for mitigation and survival study purposes and revised the Wells Dam steelhead broodstock collection goals and production groups to reflect changes in the number of study fish requested by Chelan PUD (see Appendix B).

#### **4.6 Rearing and Release of High Bacterial Kidney Diseased Fish in the Methow Basin**

Results of disease testing for 2004 brood Methow spring Chinook indicated a high prevalence of BKD. The Hatchery Committees agreed on a recommendation from WDFW for the 2004 brood (this recommendation was not intended to set precedence for future broods) to divide these fish into lower density rearing groups to be uniquely marked prior to release. Due to the higher than expected prevalence of BKD, the Hatchery Committees agreed that it will not be possible to meet the HCP goal of 550,000 smolts; rather 350,000 fish can be safely raised to the smolt release age. The Hatchery Committees agreed upon

an allocation for these fish among each of the three PUDs (Chelan, Douglas, and Grant) (see Appendix B).

#### **4.7 Bypass Operations**

Operation of the bypass system was guided by the Bypass Operating Plan contained within Section 4.3 of the Wells HCP. The bypass initiation date of April 12, 2004 and bypass termination date August 26, 2004 were implemented per the pre-season operating plan agreed to by the HCP Coordinating Committee in Spring 2004 (Appendix A) and the Wells Settlement Coordinating Committee (Appendix A and I). In September 2004, Douglas PUD prepared a bypass operation summary indicating that the initiation and termination of the Wells bypass system in 2004 was guided by the Coordinating Committees (Appendix J).



---

**APPENDIX A**  
**HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN AND WELLS COORDINATING**  
**COMMITTEES MEETING MINUTES**

---

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING  
January 9, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Friday, January 9, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee met in SeaTac. In attendance were the following participants:

Merrill Hathaway, FERC  
Keith, FERC  
Jim Hastreiter, FERC  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Brian Cates, USFWS  
Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Shaun Seaman, CPUD  
Steve Hays, CPUD  
Keith Truscott, CPUD  
Steve Hemstrom, CPUD  
Bob Clubb, DPUD  
Shane Bickford, DPUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

**ACTION ITEMS:**

- Hathaway to check into AV Tech availability and seating accommodations for the speakers
- Rohr to talk with Graves on how to queue up Lohn to provide HCP background info
- Truscott to send out new revised slides by Monday afternoon
- Someone will investigate a block of rooms in DC

Listed below are the agenda items and a summary of the discussion that followed:

**Agenda Review and Approval of Nov. 10 meeting minutes:** The agenda and minutes were approved.

**February 11 meeting with FERC in Washington, D.C.:**

The following parties are planning on being in attendance at the meeting in DC:

Chelan PUD: Charlie Hosken, Tracy Yount, Roger Purdom, Wayne Wright, Keith Truscott, and Andrew Munro  
Douglas PUD: Bill Dobbins, Bob Clubb, Shane Bickford  
WDFW: Jeff Koenings, Rod Woodin  
USFWS: Still unsure  
Colvilles: A Tribal Chair and Natural Resource Committee Chair - most likely Joe Pakotas and Deb Loui, possibly Joe Peone  
NOAA: Bob Lohn, Ritchie Graves  
FERC: Merrill Hathaway, Keith

The draft poster board slides were sent out for the group to consider and comment on. However, Hathaway informed the group again that the audio/visual system in the room is of good quality and he wasn't sure if poster boards would be appropriate. The group expressed their concerns with the time it might take to upload the presentation. Hathaway responded that regardless of

their concerns, this is how it is done. Because of the shape of the room, some might not be able to see the poster boards and it would be more difficult to get them on public record. It is the best way, in his opinion, for all of the commissioners to get good copies of the materials and make it available on the Commission website. Hathaway thought there was an AV tech available to help get the presentation ready for display in a short amount of time. He agreed to look into it and get in touch with Rohr with answers.

Having decided that a Power Point Presentation will be the best way to proceed, Clubb pointed out that they could have more visuals than previously thought. Accordingly, the group went through the slides and made comments and additions. Woodin suggested the PUDs be at the top of the list of Parties to the Agreements, since they will be the parties presenting the information. Hathaway felt that early on there should be pictures of the projects and their location on the river system, showing that these are large, valuable industrial assets that have many benefits, including a huge amount of power production. A map that shows the whole area would be helpful. Woodin agreed that the presentation should include information on the average annual megawatts for each project, as well as average annual salmonid passage at each project. All the ideas were well received and discussion took place over various ways to present the information. The group agreed that several options should be provided before the final decisions can be made. Rohr suggested that all agreed to ideas be incorporated into the presentation and later shaved off to fit the presentation into the time slot. Everyone agreed with that suggestion. Marco suggested that early on, there should be some statement of the purpose of the HCP, a lead-in of sorts, showing the maintenance of the ability to produce power - where and what. Hathaway suggested they make a point that by moving this forward, decades of litigation will be resolved. Both suggestions were agreed to. Graves thought it might be a good idea to have Lohn give background on the purpose of the HCP. Rohr will be in touch with Graves on how to que Lohn up to provide this information.

On the NNI page, the group agreed it would be more appropriate to use a pie chart rather than the triangle. Also, suggestions were made to use summer/fall rather than summer & fall, include language "Planned Species" at the top of the list of fish, and put Steelhead and Spring Chinook at the top of the list, highlighting the endangered species. Woodin also suggested a picture of something like summer chinook spawning in the Wenatchee River with this slide.

For the Assurances information, Graves suggested there be language in this section saying that the signatory parties *believe* the HCP satisfies the Acts. There was some discussion over the word Assurances and whether there may be a more politically correct way to say it. However, the HCP itself includes the word Assurances for this information. Cates suggested it highlight that it satisfies the ESA and mention something about planned species: "For planned species, the HCP satisfies..." Graves said he would think about it further and contact Truscott with ideas. Hathaway thought this might be the appropriate place to show the long-term history of this effort, pointing to the early lawsuits, and depicting the conflict between power and salmon that has resulted in litigation. Graves thought the presentation should be showing the location of the projects, how important they are, their history, the "war", and then what they are asking FERC to do. Somewhere in there, talk about the 10 years of processes and that it replaces the settlement agreements. Woodin agreed, saying that the presentation should be specific on what agreements it will be replacing. Hastreiter said they should drop the sentence that says "satisfies FERC relicensing requirements..." In addition, Graves does not want to highlight that it removes drawdown, saying that in the EIS, they went to great lengths to say that if all this doesn't work, drawdown and dam breaching will be an option again. The group agreed. Truscott will work on turning it into a positive statement, possibly pulling language out of the SEIS.

In the Recent Milestones section, the suggestion was made to highlight the FERC Action Requested block in a different color. Also, Woodin suggested that to avoid confusion, make it clear this is a 50 year agreement to ESA, but may or may not be a 50 year agreement to FERC relicensing. Some felt this should be made clear by Lohn. A suggestion was made to add another slide showing the long history of this process, highlighting FERC involvement as a

cooperating agency. Maybe it should even mention the NEPA process, Hastreiter suggested. Another suggestion was made to show how all the parties have been working together to solve the problem, using the best science, and that many new discoveries and inventions have created improved possibilities for solutions, listing some of the solutions and how they were derived. Also, the FERC request for action as a critical junction should be highlighted. They need to show that if FERC doesn't take action, the HCP cannot be implemented. Hastreiter suggested that the FERC Action Requested be changed to FERC Approval Requested, in an effort to help flag the issue. Also, the suggestion was made to save any mention of the attempts to work with outside parties for questions and staff discussion. Graves suggested that Mainstream Biological Opinions be changed to PUD Project BiOps or HCP Hydro BiOps. Woodin suggested a different photo that shows the whole project.

Truscott thought he could get something out to the group by Monday afternoon. Clubb said he would put some slides together too and circulate them. More photo's of Wells will be provided, as well as some fish counting windows and spill pictures.

Regarding Clubb's presentation, he expressed concerns that it was too lengthy for the time available. He suggested that he rewrite his presentation, if the group wanted him to be the presenter. However, his current presentation could be used as an overview document provided in the pre-package to the Commission. Hathaway agreed, saying that less detail and more conceptual / anecdotal would be helpful to keep attention on the presentation. Clubb's work is a great executive summary.

Logistics of the speakers was discussed. Hathaway suggested that all speakers be up front at the table so that the short speeches flow easily and quickly. He emphasized that you cannot speak from the room. The suggestion was made to rotate between the policy speakers and the technical staff who will answer questions. Hathaway will look into how many chairs and microphones can be accommodated at the front. The group will discuss it further once that question is answered. It will be important that a layout for each person be decided on beforehand, possibly even scripted. Rohr suggested that for now, get the material out to the group and they can decide on the logistics after they have all the material in hand. The final package to the Commission will include the Power Point presentation, an executive summary, and a cover letter. The details of who will be in charge of sending it and exactly what language will be included in the summary and cover letter will be discussed later in the month.

Woodin inquired whether a formal presentation should be prepared for the staff. Since the FERC staff will have already had the information for two months, the group wondered what kind of information would be useful. Hathaway suggested a presentation that walks them through the HCP chapter by chapter, allowing questions as they go. The staff meeting has been scheduled for two hours so there should be plenty of time for this kind of presentation. Graves and Bickford agreed to work on some kind of strawman presentation and get back to the group with it ASAP. This presentation would not need to be filed with FERC. The technical folks also need to prepare for questions from opposing parties.

One final comment was made to explain how the different documents work together, especially the NEPA process. Graves agreed to put something together. He explained that NOAA Fisheries will be drafting a letter to the Yakama's responding to their request for consultation and should have a BiOp within 135 days.

The group also discussed travel logistics. A block of rooms to get a better rate will be investigated.

**2004 Spill at Rocky Reach:** Chelan PUD is ready to discuss the spring spill at Rocky Reach (RR). Woodin expressed his concerns over having the discussion now before the HCP is signed. Graves believes that they don't have to have the FERC signature to move forward with these discussions as long as nothing in the license would counter the HCP agreement. Seaman said

that it never came up in their discussion regarding procedural questions. Graves said NOAA Fisheries is comfortable with these discussions taking place. Hemstrom and Hays reviewed the tables provided and explained how the final numbers were derived. Based on the analysis the PUD performed, plugging the average spill efficiencies into the HCP, there will be no spring spill this year until the sockeye spill begins. Sockeye spill will be 24%. Summer spill will be 9% with hopes of improving fish passage efficiency through the surface collector. There was much discussion on the variances between the actual radiotelemetry compared to the intent for spill last season. Woodin expressed concerns over giving equal weight to the 1999 sample of 46 summer migrants in only 8 days vs. 500-600 in 2003 over the whole summer spill program. He suggested they throw out the '99 data or include that data as part of a weighted average of all the study fish. Hays explained that it is hard to find a correlation between spill efficiency and the volume of water spilled. In many cases, spill volumes are all over the board and efficiency volumes don't match up. If you have .326 spill efficiency in '99 vs. 1.8 in '03, are they are really off? In many years, including this year, there was deviation from the means. Hays was firm that the numbers used for the analysis were solid. The group also discussed the likelihood of spill for the subyearlings. However, it does not look as if the Sockeye spill will help much with subyearlings. The group agreed that this discussion would meet a final decision but the technical discussion was helpful in understanding the parameters for the upcoming decision that will need to be made. They will have a better idea what is going on this year after the survival studies are completed. The PUD explained that it is their responsibility on what to do if the survival studies show low numbers and they are looking at many angles to find as many answers as possible. Their goal is to increase survival at their projects. If they need 10% increased survival, spill won't provide that. However, if they only need a few tenths of survival increased, spill will meet that need. Woodin suggested another year of 15% spill to collect more data on how effective spill is from year to year. However, Chelan is asking the committee to approve their spill proposal. The group will discuss it again on a conference call scheduled for Feb. 6, 1:30 pm.

(Since Hays and Woodin were very difficult to hear and follow, any help with clarification in this section would be most welcome!)

**Fish Passage Center Tributary Indexing Information:** A few meetings ago, the group showed interest in having access to real time data for the tributary traps operated by WDFW. Peven, Bickford, and Graves have been working on this issue. Peven explained that they spoke with Skalski and Anderson, who came up with a proposal on how to meet everyone's needs and help with management issues. For the trap data, they would set up a portal site on DART, which would include an upper Columbia link, providing map that showed the tributaries and the traps. To glean information, one would click on the trap sites and be able to access daily, weekly, or monthly data. It would include links to project bypass systems, historical data, real-time plots, and link the USGS gaging stations so one could see numbers of fish caught, turbidity of water, and river flows. New traps would be included in future years once efficiency studies have been completed. The information would be accessible to anyone who wants to see it. There is also opportunity for personalized e-mail analysis, which include daily e-mails that provide specific real-time data that meets anyone's specific needs. Peven said that Murdoch was happy with the proposal because it would keep things simple for his office to handle. Graves said it meets his concerns as well. Woodin said he appreciated the sensitivity given to the WDFW field staff but he is in a quandry over why they would develop a separate access format for mid-Columbia data relative to the FPC access, which is pretty much the data homebase for the rest of the basin. Peven explained that FPC would have access to the data and could include it in their site as well. In addition, this proposal provides greater information than what FPC would provide. Woodin expressed his concerns over FPC having to go to DART to get the information rather than just having it sent to them in the first place. He said he would have to consider it further. Peven told the group that they are working on coordinating through the region for both information sharing and cost sharing on this project. They have a month or so before a final decision needs to be made. The group will discuss it again at the Feb. 6 conference call.

The group was reminded of the importance in continuing to share information with the Mid-

Columbia Coordinating Committee (MCCC). Any decisions discussed in the HCPCC needs to be discussed with the MCCC before final decisions are made. The group was also informed that American Rivers, the City of Entiat, and the Yakama's intervened in the HCP.

**Steelhead Survival Study Fish for 2005:** Seaman explained that they are looking at using some of the excess capacity or production of steelhead from Douglas to perform their 2005 steelhead study. They are getting ready to spawn them and the PUD requested discussion among this group regarding whether it would be preferable to use hatchery/hatchery fish or wild/hatchery fish for the study. Bickford explained in the Wells Settlement, they are obligated to produce 480K steelhead, which will be reduced to 350K once they get FERC approval on the HCP. This will leave about 100K that could be used for the 2005 fish survival study. Usually, they send hatchery/hatchery fish to Winthrop and Ringold. However, the question is whether it would be more conducive to keep some of the hatchery/hatchery fish at Wells and send the hatchery/wilds up to the tributaries. Woodin said the biggest question is how the 2004 brood being initiated out of the Wells Settlement Agreement would meet the HCP requirements. Seaman said that would be the risk taken by the PUD. Woodin said he could see WDFW and NOAA Fisheries getting static because it may affect the fishery run. Regardless, the decision needs to be made soon because transfers will start in late January. There was some discussion as to whether this was to appropriate place to make the decision. Most of the group agreed it was the place because it is a Chelan Study Program. Graves and Cates will talk with Peterson regarding her opinion. The final decision will be made on a January 16 conference call. The group reiterated the question at hand: What is the disposition for the '05 survival study? Assuming that they can use the fish for the '05 survival study, would the preference be to use the hatchery/hatchery fish or wild/hatchery fish?

**Update of the HCP Hatchery Committee Activities:** The Hatchery Committee continues to work on the facilities plan and is making good progress. They expect the next draft to be available by the end of January. The M&E Inside component is the current discussions underway. The outside component will be discussed later in the year. Woodin asked how the facilities planning is tying in the relicensing production. Peven said they are keeping that issue in the discussion. They are working on coordinating how it is all going to look. They are even considering the option of a sturgeon hatchery. Woodin said he had been hearing concerns that things are falling through the cracks and there is worry over hatchery space being combined with meeting the HCP requirements. Peven assured Woodin this was not the case. Discussions continue and all proposals are being considered. Most of the discussions are centered around salmon and steelhead right now, not trout and kokanee. However, the resident fish are part of other discussions and analyses are underway.

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
January 16, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Friday, January 16, 2004, the HCP CC met by conference call to continue discussion on the upcoming FERC meeting in Washington, D.C., February 11, 2004. In attendance were the following:

**ACTION ITEMS:**

1. Clubb to work up some alternate slides more to his specifications, including info on what they need from the FERC and the need for speed.
2. Graves will work on some language for Lohn regarding the legal perspective.
3. Clubb or Truscott to look into using "watered down" pictures for slide backgrounds.
4. Graves to send out internal briefing already completed for the HCP as a place to start working from for the technical discussion.
5. Bickford to check on timing of fish transfers to the tributaries. He will also work on getting the Wells Coordinating Committee together to discuss the fish issue before or on Feb. 2<sup>nd</sup>, based on the timing of the transfers.

Listed below are the agenda items and a summary of the discussion that followed.

- **Review Slides, Room Set-up, and List of Commentors:** Truscott thanked the group for their comments and stated that he had done his best to conform the slides to the specifications requested. He asked for any further comments. Clubb responded that he had looked them over and was having trouble understanding who would be doing what during the presentation. Also, he felt that there was too much information on one slide, for example the HCP Purpose slide. This slide should say two things: 1) The purpose of the HCP is to avoid listings, and 2) if there are listings, the HCP allows the dams to operate. He also didn't care for the yellow / black presentation (too mundane) and felt that some of the info should provide graphics rather than just letters and numbers. He offered to put something together and maybe it could be combined with what Chelan has done, rather than submitting his substantial changes.

The group discussed logistics on who's doing what. Graves was thinking Lohn would pitch the purpose and need slide, the locations of the projects and why they are important (incl. megawatt info), and follow with the list of signatory parties. At that point the signatory parties would introduce themselves and make a few short comments (30-60 seconds each). The signatory parties would finish with Douglas PUD, who would hand off the presentation to Clubb. He would include historic information, assurances, timeline, and the next steps, emphasizing

the need for speed. Hastreiter suggested that Lohn say something about what the HCP does from a legal perspective. Graves said he would work something up. Brooks said the secretary would introduce Bob Lohn to the Commission. The other speakers would have to introduce themselves. Someone mentioned that name placards out in front of the speakers would be useful. Lohn and Clubb will advance the slides themselves and need only to find a way to pass off the remote.

Hathaway suggested that the listing of laws the HCP meets is weak and felt it would be better to specify what the HCP complies with, turning the statement into something that proposes a positive solution. Explain *how* it satisfies the laws, not just that it does satisfy them. He suggested that the presentation no be legalistic.

The presentation should include a slide that lists the agreements replaced by the HCP. There was discussion again about whether Assurances was a proper title. Graves suggested “Summary of Benefits” instead. The group was pleased with the pie chart for the NNI slide. At this point, the presentation should talk about how the HCP will achieve its goals. Hathaway suggested they stress that this is a migrating issue and show how the HCP will benefit migrants. Graves listed the BiOps that were completed in August. Woodin asked if there would be reference to the final EIS and that it was completed by NOAA Fisheries. Graves said Lohn could note that.

Woodin commented on the milestones slide, suggesting that there be more clarity on what they are asking the commission to do. Clubb said he would work something up, including a Need for Speed slide.

Graves informed the group that NOAA Fisheries sent a letter to FERC (with respect to their request for consultation) explaining their intent to provide BiOps on FERCs action of amending the licenses, in some form or another, by March 8, 90 days after they received the request. Their intent is to say that the proposed action is identical to the consultation they already did.

The official order of the speakers was discussed. The group agreed on the following order: NOAA Fisheries, USFWS, WDFW, Colvilles, Chelan, Douglas, and Clubb. Woodin mentioned that WDFW may not be able to attend but would send a letter stating their support to the HCP. Lohn would read it to ensure its placement into the record. The following policy level parties will be speaking for their respective organizations:

NOAA Fisheries: Bob Lohn  
USFWS: Dr. Benjamin Tuggle  
Colvilles: Either Joe Pakotas or Deb Louie  
Chelan PUD: Charlie Hosken  
Douglas PUD: Bill Dobbins

The slide will be rearranged accordingly.

Graves suggested they use “watered down” pictures for backgrounds on these slides (like IPC does for their presentations). Either Truscott or Clubb will look into that idea.

The group also discussed the possibility of doing a dry run beforehand. Brooks said he would look into the availability of that. The group agreed that a



tight script would be necessary in order to accomplish all that needs to be said in the time-frame allowed.

There were three substantial interveners: American Rivers, CRITFC, and the Yakama Indian Nation. The group discussed whether the intervener's points should be argued in the presentation. Hathaway said no. He felt that the presentation should address the issues in a positive way and that the group should not seem defensive or come off as having to defend their product. They should wait until the Commission brings it up, or someone in the room, during the technical presentation. Hathaway suggested that legal council be there for addressing the legal questions.

Diane Berneir (SP?) is the secretary who should receive the presentation prior to the meeting date. She will make sure it fits the standards for broadcast. No one will have the presentation beforehand. The presentation will be sent along with an executive summary.

- **Technical Presentation:** Graves and Bickford have been working on the technical presentation. The goal is to do a brief outline of the HCP, raising the largest points, and then ask for questions about each section as they go through it. The focus will be on what the HCP is about. They will prepare for the negative questions, just in case they are asked. Graves has an internal briefing already completed. It will need to be stripped down, particularly the hatchery section, but will be a good place to start. He agreed to send it out ASAP to the group so they could start reviewing it. Woodin mentioned the importance of stressing that implementation of the solutions will be conducted in a timely manner. The region has been dealing with these problems for 20 years and here is the chance to finally make significant and timely progress with long-term solutions. The group agreed.
- **Survival Study Fish:** The group discussed the disposition of the fish for the 05 Study Plan: Hatchery/hatchery or wild/hatchery. Cates and Graves both spoke with Petersen and there was agreement that the wild/hatchery fish should go to the tributaries, including Winthrop. If the survival study does not move forward, something else will be done with those fish – most like they will be released into the tributaries, not the mainstem. There was agreement among the committee. The group also agreed that this should be discussed among the Wells Coordinating Committee as well. It is especially important at this time to be cognizant of the standing committee's and confer with them before final decisions are made. Bickford agreed to check further into the timing of when the discussion needs to take place by. If Feb. 2<sup>nd</sup> (the date for the next Wells CC meeting) is too late, a conference call will be set-up.
- **The next HCP CC Conference Call is scheduled for Friday, January 23, 8:00 am.**

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
January 23, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Friday, January 23, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee met by conference call to discuss the upcoming FERC Commission briefing, scheduled for Wednesday, February 11, 2004.

In Attendance were:

Merrill Hathaway, FERC  
Keith Brooks, FERC  
Jim Hastreiter, FERC  
Mark Miller, USFWS  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Bob Clubb, Douglas PUD  
Shane Bickford, Douglas PUD  
Shaun Seaman, Chelan PUD  
Keith Truscott, Chelan PUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Clubb to make changes to the slide presentation and send out by Monday
  2. Group to send out final names and titles of meeting participants
  3. Graves, Bickford, Peven, and Hays to work on technical conference presentation
  4. Next HCP conference call schedule for Thursday, January 29, 8:00 am.
- 
- **Review of Power Point Slide Presentation:** The group began by reviewing the slides that were put together by Clubb and Truscott. Overall, the group was pleased with the pictures and graphics of the presentation.
    1. **Front Slide:** On the first slide, it was recommended to put borders around the three pictures.
    2. **Map:** Hathaway commented that the maps were good. He added that the individual project slides should highlight each project on the map. Clubb agreed to put them in yellow. There was discussion over providing additional information on the project benefits but the group decided that there would not be enough time to fit that in.
    3. **Need for HCP:** On “Ensure stable power...” the sentence should read “Ensure stable local and regional power supplies and pricing.” This provides the big picture.
    4. **Purpose for HCP:** Hathaway had several suggestions for this slide. He suggested changing the phrase “Avoid ESA listings” to “Avoids

Additional ESA Listings.” Clubb agreed. He also suggested changing “Terminates” to “Replaces”, “Ends” to “Resolves”, and that “If listed” be removed altogether. Clubb agreed with those suggestions as well.

5. **Parties to the Agreements:** No changes.
6. **History of Fish Protection Proceedings:** Clubb explained that he wanted to add into this slide when the SEIS was published in 2002 but he wasn't sure if it would raise questions since it was completed after the HCP was signed. Hathaway thought it should be there because it was part of the case and a lot of work went into the NEPA analysis. The group agreed.
7. **NNI:** No changes
8. **Summary of Benefits:** Again, Hathaway suggested keeping the wording positive. He suggested there be more language explaining how the HCP meets the requirements in the Acts. Section 10(a) is for comprehensive planning which protects, mitigates, and enhances fish runs. It encompasses the power benefits as well. Section 10(j) does essentially the same thing for Fish and Wildlife but includes spawning grounds and habitat. Section 18 addresses fishways and provides suitable fish passage. The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Action provides coordination between the Federal and State Agencies. This would be a good place to point out that these agencies are intimately involved in the process. The Magnuson-Stevens Act is protection of habitat. Title 77 and the NW Public Power Coordination Agreement requires a comprehensive regional plan. Clubb asked if this is information that should be listed or could he just explain it to the Commission as he goes along. Hathaway said yes but there should be some positive, affirmative statements in the presentation for later review. He also suggested simplifying the first two lines by saying “Plan Species Protection By” or “Protects Listed Plan Species”. In addition, he pointed out that ESA and FPA are widely used and known acronyms. Clubb agreed to those changes.
9. **Expedited Approval:** The “Support Permits...” sentence will be moved to the bottom of the list. The title line will be moved to the left of the page.
10. **End of Presentation:** This should read “Conclusion” rather than “End...”

Clubb said he could have revisions out to the group by Monday at the latest. The group agreed to meet again by conference call on Thursday, January 29, 8:00 am.

- **Mid-Columbia Coordinating Committee:** Bickford explained that they will be providing the MCCC with information on their 2004 studies plan.
- **Discussion and review of FERC Meeting Outline:** Rohr requested that everyone e-mail a final list of meeting participants and their titles. Brooks spoke with external affairs and they will be providing a schematic of the room. Name plates will be provided with name, title, and who they represent. There is a reserved section behind the presenters for technical folks to answer questions. (Rohr suggested that the HCP group remind their policy folks that they only get one minute to talk.) The secretary will introduce Lohn and he will introduce the

presenters. There is an AV person available to run the slides if that is preferred. The room will be available at 8:00 am for a dry run. If possible, everyone is to meet at the guard's desk before heading up. The address is 888 First Street (right next to Union Station). The actual Commission Meeting starts at 10:00 am and everyone will need to be in position at the beginning of the meeting. The presentation will be towards the front of the agenda.

For the technical meeting, the notice provides the time and room number. It is scheduled to start at 1:00 pm. Someone will be writing abbreviated notes and any handouts provided will be included in the record. Any material being provided needs to be given to the Commission and they will put everything together. The group agreed that Clubbs briefing would be a good Executive Summary to provide. However, Hathaway suggested it be provided after the meeting in an effort to keep the attention on the slide presentation. If they do file the Summary beforehand, be sure to wait until after the official notice has been released. There will need to be three different types of presenters available at the technical meeting: Policy, technical, and legal representation. Who will be doing what can be discussed offline. Rohr suggested that someone be tagged as the specific note taker. Graves, Bickford, Peven, and Hays will be working together on the refining the technical conference. Several sets will need to be prepared for Fletcher.

- **2005 Steelhead Study Timing:** Seaman explained to the group that the Wells hatchery will be conducting the Steelhead incubation this year so final decisions on where to send which type of fish does not need to be made until late March/early April. It is an issue that will remain on the agenda for discussion.

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
January 29, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Thursday, January 29, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee met by conference call. Parties in attendance were as follows:

Brian Cates, USFWS  
Mark Miller, USFWS  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Merrill Hathaway, FERC  
Keith Brooks, FERC  
Jim Hastreiter, FERC  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Tracy Yount, Chelan PUD  
Bob Clubb, Douglas PUD  
Shane Bickford, Douglas PUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Bickford to send out revised technical presentation and list of who will be presenting which chapter or section of the presentation.
2. Rohr to inform the group what his discussion with Lohn entailed.
3. Brooks to look into a conference line for the policy and technical presentations.
4. Rohr to look into how many copies of the technical presentation will be needed.

The purpose of this call was to further discuss and finalize plans for the presentation to FERC Commissioners scheduled for February 11, 2004, in Washington DC. Listed below are the agenda items and a summary of the discussion that followed.

- **FERC Technical Meeting:** Bickford explained the product he and Graves had been working on for the past week. He reviewed the Power Point Presentation slide by slide, asking for comments and/or additions. The presentation will include an overview with the opportunity to present supporting documents and the application itself, go through some of the attachments to the application, go through the HCP chapter by chapter with time for questions, conclude by addressing the need for expedited approval from FERC, and then summarize. Ritchie Graves, Shane Bickford, and Steve Hays will be performing the presentation. They plan to have a logical breakout of which sections each of them would present. The slides will include a map of the Columbia River system and actual pictures of documentation sent to FERC. Since Fletcher had questions

about the tributary plan and habitat aquatic species plan, they will highlight that these are important pieces of the document. They will also express the importance of the BiOp's, EIS, and (missed this part – feel free to fill this in). Graves will take over with the plan species slides, introduce the species and review chapters 1-4. Hays will pickup with review of chapter 5 through ESA, and then Graves will take over from ESA. Bickford will wrap it up with the “need for speed” speech. Comments on the slide presentation should be sent to either Bickford or Graves.

Bickford walked through the document.

- \* He explained that since there are some differences in sections between Chelan and Douglas, they will point out the subtleties so that FERC knows where they are at. Bullets were placed in the presentation as reminders to expand on certain points.

- \* He explained that they will be addressing the non-signatory parties in the presentation by saying that people can be invited to the HCP meetings (they are not open to the public) but if you don't sign the HCP, you don't get to vote. Yount suggested that coordination with regional efforts be pointed out. The projects should be prioritized, include the criteria, then explain that non-voting participation on the committee could include local and private watershed groups, as well as State and Federal agencies.

- \* Marco suggested that during the first tributary plan slide (re: \$), they explain that the plan allows for frontloading of some work, providing funds (more than what annually will be provided) early in the process.

- \* Hastreiter suggested that the acronyms be removed, spelling out the full names instead, for those in the room who are not familiar with the terms.

- \* The presentation will also address questions on accountability for funds being spent.

- \* Bickford will be speaking on the need for expedited approval, keeping in the same theme as the earlier presentation, per Clubbs suggestion. Bickford will talk about the need for immediate action to help implement measures for this springs outmigration, hatchery improvement, tributary funding for habitat improvement, and that it supports permits issued by NOAA Fisheries to move quickly toward recovering ESA listed stocks. The relicensing issue will be avoided.

- \* The suggestion was made that the hatchery production slide includes a list summation of the total number of hatchery output.

- \* The group also agreed that rather than summarizing at the end, open the discussion up for technical questions, policy questions, and legal questions. In an effort to keeping the presentation positive, Hathaway suggested that they have answers ready to go for the questions they know will come up or questions that are controversial. Show that the plan will remain continuous. Bickford said that would be no problem.

Bickford will incorporate everyone's suggestions into the presentation and send it out the group hopefully by Friday. Once discussions have concluded between Graves and Hays, Bickford will send an e-mail listing who is covering what

chapters. Since this presentation does not have to be provided to FERC beforehand, minor changes can be made up to the last minute.

(At this point I stepped out to use the restroom and walked back into the room hearing that Rohr will check on something. Can you remember what that was?)

Hathaway suggested that the presentation be left with the staff to be used later. Rohr will follow-up with how many copies will be needed.

- **FERC Commission Meeting:** The group agreed the presentation looks good and addresses everyone's comments. FERC expressed their pleasure with how well the presentation was put together. Clubb will call Graves to double check that his comments are in. After that, the presentation is considered final. Rohr will be meeting with Lohn in the afternoon and will let everyone know what the discussion entailed.
- **FERC Meeting Discussion Outline:** The outline was again walked through. Rohr needs final names and titles of who will be attending. Brooks explained that the name plates will only have the name and organization on them. As for logistics, Brooks is still working on getting some kind of drawing or schematic of the room. Rohr reminded the group again to tell their policy folks they only have 1 minute to speak. Hathaway suggested that the speakers compare notes for their speech in an effort to avoid duplicity. Also, Brooks will check to see if a conference line is available.
- **Next Meeting/Conference Call:** Rohr asked if the presenters need to get-together on a conference call prior to the meeting or will the dry run in DC be enough to organize them. The group had planned to meet at the FERC offices at 9:00 am to do a dry run. However, the group would like to meet at 8:30 instead, if possible, to allow more time for practice. Even if they have to meet at a different place.

The reception on February 10 was discussed. Doc Hastings, Norm Dicks, Patty Murray, and Maria Cantwell will be in attendance at the reception for the signing parties. Yount said he would provide details to Rohr, who will send it out to the group. The group expressed their desire to have Hathaway and Hastreiter attend the reception as well.

The next HCPCC conference call is scheduled for Friday, February 6, 1:30 pm.

Yount gave the group a heads up that either February 12 or 13, they will need to roll out the 2004 spill plan to the Mid-Columbia Coordinating Committee. The issue will be discussed on the next HCPCC call.

HCP COORINDATING COMMITTEE MEETING  
February 6, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Friday, February 6, 2004, at 3:00 pm, the HCP Coordinating Committee met to discuss final arrangements for the FERC presentation in Washington, DC, on Wednesday, February 11, 2004. Attending parties are listed as follows:

Merrill Hathaway, FERC  
Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Mark Miller, USFWS  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Bob Clubb, DPUD  
Shane Bickford, DPUD  
Keith Truscott, CPUD  
Tracy Yount, CPUD  
Steve Hays, CPUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Truscott to e-mail Bernier (and cc Rohr) with the slide presentation, a list of attendees, a number of how many reserved seats behind the table will be needed, and the names/organizations of the parties sitting at the table.
2. Hathaway to look into access of the commission room beforehand.
3. Bickford to send the final technical presentation to the group by Monday at noon.
4. Hathaway and/or Vasile to provide copies of the technical presentation to folks at the meeting.
5. Rohr to check with Fletcher on the possibility of getting a phone line in the room at the technical conference. He will let the group know what he finds out.
6. Rohr to work directly with Fletcher on last minutes details on Tuesday.

Listed below are the agenda items and a summary of the discussion that followed.

- **FERC Commission Meeting:** Graves had sent out a final presentation to the group, having cut the slides down to nine. There were no additional comments made for changes to the slides. Graves informed the committee that he had doctored up an internal slide sheet for Lohn to assist him in his speech. Lohn will need to make the final decision whether he will advance the slides or have the FERC tech do it for him. In addition to his presentation, he will also be introducing the presenters and those sitting at the table. Truscott will be sending the slides to Bernier (the FERC secretary), along with a list of participants who



will need access into the building, and a list of the parties sitting at the table who will need name plates. He will also let Bernier know how many reserved seats will be needed behind the table. Truscott will cc Rohr in his e-mail to Bernier. The group expressed interest in getting into the room beforehand. Hathaway agreed to look into that again.

The short speeches that will be presented by WDFW and the Colvilles have been under discussion. Marco reviewed their message at the last conference call. Everyone seemed comfortable with it. Yount has been working directly with Koenings on his speech. They have written a one minute speech and a three minute speech. These short speeches do not need to be provided to FERC in advance.

Graves said his sources indicated that CRITFC, Yakama Nation, Umatilla Tribe, and American Rivers representatives will be in attendance at the conference. American Rivers has not yet made up their mind to sign the HCP and Graves suggested to them that they say this at the meeting.

Graves asked if the FERC staff would be doing a presentation on this issue beforehand. Hathaway said it was possible but doubtful. There will be staff near or at the table but since there is no proposal pending by the staff to the commission, he thought it unlikely.

- **FERC Staff Technical Meeting:** Bickford had a long discussion with Kris Petersen, NOAA Fisheries, and she made some revisions to the section 8 portion of the technical presentation. Her main point will be that the HCP does not substantially reduce fish production. A conference call between Bickford, Hays, and Petersen will be held on Monday, Feb. 9, at 9:30 am to make final improvements to the presentation. They hope to have the final revisions out to the group by Monday at noon. Vasile and Hathaway will help print copies for the meeting.

Woodin asked about the possibility of having a phone line in the room for those not in attendance. Hathaway wasn't sure and thought it might be a problem because the notice didn't mention it. Rohr will check with Fletcher on the possibility. Once he finds out, he will send the information out to the group. Rohr will also be taking notes at both presentations.

- **Logistics:** A fact sheet with details of the reception, FERC Commission meeting, and Technical presentation was provided to the group by e-mail. Rohr reviewed the schedule. All parties are to meet in the lobby of the FERC building by 8:30 am. Badges will be available from there. Escorts will be necessary to move around inside the building. Rohr expressed the importance of being on time. However, if anyone is late, they can call up to the room or call Hathaway's cell phone, which he provided to the group. Lunch will be taken inside the building so that they can eat and return in a timely manner.

Hathaway explained how the Commission meeting would go, starting with a pledge of allegiance, consent items are briefly addressed, and then the first case is called out. This case is H5, and it is the number to remember. All attendees need to be in the room at 10:00 am, before the meeting starts. Rohr will be in DC by Tuesday and will take care of last minutes details with Fletcher.

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
February 17, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Tuesday, February 17, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee met by conference call. Those in attendance are listed below:

Shaun Seaman, Chelan PUD  
Chuck Peven, Chelan PUD  
Keith Truscott, Chelan PUD  
Bob Clubb, Douglas PUD  
Shane Bickford, Douglas PUD  
Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Seaman to send an e-mail as to when the spill plan proposal would be completed.
2. Rohr to contact Marco and Cates to provide info on the 2004 spill plan.
3. Rohr to get the final proposal to the MCCC
4. Seaman to send out a list of issues they will be addressing in the letter to FERC.
5. Rohr to talk to Fletcher regarding FERC expectations of the BO from NOAA and USFWS
6. Bickford to touch base with Miller regarding the BO – whether a final or draft should be sent – based on the response Rohr gets from Fletcher.

The purpose of the call was to discuss the 2004 spill program and review the February 11 FERC meeting.

Seaman began the meeting by reviewing the Chelan PUD spill scenario for 2004. They propose that for the first part of the season, there would be no spill for steelhead. Sockeye spill will start within 2.5% of the run. 24% spill will occur for 95% of the run, dropping down to 9% for (how long?). The hope is that some of the 24% spill will rollover in the subyearlings run. This proposal is based on the language in section 5.4 of the HCP.

Graves expressed his concerns over cutting things too closely but agreed that it was up to Chelan PUD to take that risk. He questioned how they would accomplish the steelhead/spring Chinook survival studies prior to sockeye spill. Peven responded that they will be able to see if there is a difference but they can't physically get the fish in the river during the short amount of time with zero spill. Graves said it seemed to him the HCP asks them to reach a different set of survival criteria for each species. He asked

what they would do if in three years, the PUD wanted to reduce sockeye spill to 15%. This action would certainly raise doubts about the validity of the data. Seaman replied that they may want to do another year of studies to validate the data. He said they would look into Graves point. Woodin agreed with Graves concerns and thought they were cutting it too close considering the survival studies will dictate the program. He thought it would be better if they spilled at least 10% for subyearlings and 25% for sockeye. Seaman replied that they do recognize the risk, and weighed all the scenarios out before presenting the information to the committee.

Rohr reminded the group that they would still need to touch base with Marco and Cates, as well as the MCCC. Seaman suggested Rohr take care of this ASAP. Seaman also stated they would be submitting the plan with documentation on how they propose to determine the start and end date. He agreed to send an e-mail ASAP as to when the plan would be out for review. Once the whole package is completed, and Marco and Cates have had a chance to add their point of view, they will take the package to the MCCC. The committee agreed.

Regarding the FERC Meeting review, Rohr asked the group if they wanted to respond to any of the questions or comments that were presented to the group at the FERC meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup>. If so, this would need to be done by March 1. Clubb replied that they would like to respond to some of Heineth's issues to keep the record clean, particularly on the Vernita Bar arguments. Seaman agreed that would be beneficial. The committee agreed as well. However, Graves did mention that Lohn had lunch with Robinson after the meeting and it does not appear that FERC was sympathetic to CRITFC's issues. Woodin and Graves were comfortable with just the PUDs commenting on the issues. Graves suggested they address the issue of the Lamprey on the screens, explaining that this issue was a one-time event due to complications at the project. He also suggested that the PUDs send out a list of points they plan on making before they send it out. Seaman agreed to do that.

Rohr said that Fletcher had sent an e-mail regarding the status of the NOAA Fisheries and USFWS BiOp letters. Graves said they would send a letter signifying the end of formal consultation by March 8. He informed the group that they will be sending a final BO, even though this is not usually how it is handled. FERC prefers to have a draft first so they can review it before it is final. However, to expedite the proceedings, Graves felt it best to send a final BO this time. USFWS on the other hand has hinted they would be sending a draft. If FERC wants a final, they need to put it into writing, Graves said. Rohr said he would call Fletcher and get a feel for where FERC stands on this. Rohr will be sure to let Fletcher know that NOAA Fisheries will be sending a final. Then, Bickford will touch base with Mark Miller on how USFWS should proceed.

The next HCPCC conference call will be held on Friday, February 27<sup>th</sup>, 2:00 pm. A tentative face to face meeting was scheduled for Friday, March 12, 10:00 am.

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
February 27, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Friday, February 27, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee met by conference call. Listed below were those in attendance.

Keith Truscott, Chelan PUD  
Chuck Peven, Chelan PUD  
Shaun Seaman, Chelan PUD  
Brian Cates, USFWS  
Merrill Hathaway, FERC  
Jim Hastreiter, FERC  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribe  
Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates  
Bob Clubb, Douglas PUD  
Shane Bickford, Douglas PUD

**ACTION ITEMS:**

1. Graves to type up some language addressing the tribal participation issue for letter to FERC.
2. Truscott or Seaman to work on some language addressing the tributary habitat fund.
3. Peven to talk to Hays about better ways to identify species, particularly subyearlings.
4. Rohr to work on getting package ready for MCCC.
5. Rohr to look into the possibility of starting the meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 am to ensure completion of all agenda items.

**FERC Comment Letter:**

Following agenda approval, the meeting began with a discussion on the draft comments for FERC submittal. Clubb explained the work being completed to address concerns that were raised during CRITFC's presentation to FERC at the Feb. 11 Commission meeting. Draft comments were sent out to the group for review. Clubb also explained that any issues not addressed in the letter have been already addressed elsewhere in the FERC record. Hathaway suggested that some language be included to address the habitat tributary fund. The group agreed the letter should state the positive aspects, such as it meets the 2% goal, will be used to match other funding, will create teamwork with local entities, the PUD's agree to track progress with separate resources, and the positive benefits to non-listed native species such as Lamprey and Bull Trout. In addition, the signatories are all in agreement with the amount. Clubb agreed to do what he could to provide language along these lines.

The group discussed non-signatory tribal participation on the committee. Following much discussion, the group agreed that some language in the letter should be provided, noting that the obligation to consult with the tribes exists independent of the HCP. Graves offered to work up some language addressing the issue in the letter to FERC. Following legal approval, he agreed to have it to Clubb on Monday morning. Truscott and/or Seaman agreed to work on some tributary fund language.

#### **NOAA Fisheries Consultation Comments:**

Graves explained that they are on track to get their consultation comments submitted by March 8, which will basically be a BiOp in the form of an 8 page letter for each project. The issuing of the permits and FERC approval of the HCP are two separate legal actions but they are both authorizing the projects to be run in accordance with the HCP. Therefore, the BiOps that have been written are identical. FERC will adopt the requirements as separate amendments to the license.

#### **Coordinating Committee Chair:**

Clubb explained they are moving forward on getting the committee chair position filled. A job description had been discussed and reviewed last year. The group felt it would be a good idea to take a look at that again before it becomes public. Clubb expressed his concerns that making this a public process would bring an overload of job applicants. The group discussed whether a public process or a closed session, with committee members submitting 2-3 names for consideration, would be more appropriate. Graves, Woodin, and Marco agreed that it would best to keep the process public. Woodin suggested the job description be “fine-tuned” to cut down on job applicants. In addition, the members will submit a few names for recommendations they would like considered. Woodin expressed his concerns that this is moving too quickly, saying the HCP should be signed before moving forward with this process. However, Clubb explained that the process should get started now so when the HCP is signed, these actions can be put into place immediately. The group agreed to consider it over the next couple weeks. They will come prepared to make a final decision on whether now is the time to be moving forward in this process and should this be an open or modified restricted process.

#### **Chelan PUD 2004 Draft Spill Plan:**

A list of necessary documents was provided. These items will be part of the discussion at the next meeting. The group reviewed and approved the list, with the exception of document #8, which will be looked into for duplicity.

The members all received copies of the draft spill plan and came prepared to provide comments. Graves requested a minor change to the table under 2004 index sampling at Rocky Reach: The estimate of how many fish to catch is a maximum of 84K, although that is not carved in stone. Graves expressed his concerns with the system chosen for early warning on Sockeye spill. Peven agreed his concerns were valid and explained they had planned to start spilling just as soon as about 200 fish show up at the project. Graves also pointed out that PRT does not provide 2.5% passage and would need to be adjusted to meet that request. Lastly, Graves suggested they look into alternative ways to identify subyearlings. Peven agreed to have Hays look into it.

Peven made a suggestion for the sockeye study completion, wondering if operating the first week of the sockeye run without spill would be beneficial. Then they could get an idea about what sockeye do without spill, which would allow for more precision on how steelhead and Chinook will do in comparison. He felt it would make the sockeye study more scientifically robust and defensible. Graves suggested the idea be considered for the end of the run, rather than the beginning, when less sockeye would be affected. Woodin warned that while getting a good evaluation is important, they need to be careful with tradeoffs in real time survival augmentation and protection. He explained it is clear in the HCP that protection programs are to be conservative in meeting the needs of the most critical species. The group agreed to discuss this further at the meeting on March 12.

**Other:**

Woodin reminded Rohr that the spill plan needs to be presented to the MCCC on the 31<sup>st</sup>. Rohr said he had it covered.

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, March 12, 10:00 am to 4:00 pm at Seatac Wyndham Gardens Hotel. The group discussed possibly starting at 9:00 am to get more done. Rohr agreed to look into it and get back to the group.

**DRAFT / DRAFT / DRAFT**

**HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING**

March 12, 2004

Meeting Report

By D. Rohr and Associates

On Friday, March 12, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee (HCPCC) met at SeaTac. Those in attendance are listed as follows:

Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Brian Cates, USFWS  
Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Shaun Seaman, Chelan PUD  
Steve Hays, Chelan PUD  
Chuck Peven, Chelan PUD  
Steve Hemstrom, Chelan PUD  
Bob Clubb, Douglas PUD  
Shane Bickford, Douglas PUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

**ACTION ITEMS:**

1. Rohr to contact parties on the short-list for the chair position.
2. Rohr to draft an ad for the chair position and send it out to the committee for review.
3. Rohr to work on getting the Tributary Committee organized for a meeting.
4. Chelan to make appropriate changes to the Plans where agreed to.

Listed below are the agenda items and a summary of the discussion that followed.

- **Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes:** Rohr offered an alternative to getting the meeting minutes approved: complete them through e-mail and get final approval at the face-to-face meetings. The group agreed with the plan.
- **Discussion/Review of February 11<sup>th</sup> FERC Meeting:** The USFWS BiOp rough draft is completed and under review. Cates expects they will submit a draft to FERC shortly. Meetings and discussions on the issue continue to take place.
- **Coordinating Committee Chair Position:** Rohr provided the group with a copy of the job description the committee agreed on last summer. The goal at this meeting was to review the description, provide names for the short list, and, if the group decides to make the process more open, discuss various ways to conduct the public announcement.



Graves had spoken internally with respect to the short list vs. the large list approach. The consensus from NOAA was the short list of names would be sufficient for the open process. Woodin stated that WDFW is opposed to a short-list only process. They were willing to provide a short list at this meeting to ensure that the appropriate people have opportunity to be considered. Marco commented that the Colvilles were OK with a short list for this meeting's purposes but they have concerns over not having an opportunity to get the word out to a more broad audience. Cates said that USFWS doesn't want to lose the opportunity of finding the perfect person to fill the roll by limiting the number of applicants. Seaman stated that Chelan PUDs prefer the short-list approach. Douglas PUD was happy with whatever process all HCP members were satisfied with, and Clubb provided a short list along with the rest of the group.

The group also discussed the issue of whether the new chair would be facilitating all three committee's or would there be a need to hire separate chairs for each committee. Bickford feels there are significant advantages to having one chair for all three. Woodin commented that WDFW would prefer to have one person running all three functions. Someone fitting would be a multi-person entity, which allows for several people to attend different meetings but still have it all under one place. There were concerns over someone trying to make this a full-time job when it really is a part-time job.

Each signatory party then provided their short list as follows:

- Chelan PUD: Dan Silver and Bob Bugert
- NOAA: Bob Bugert, Doug Arndt, Doug Ancona, Mike Scheiwe, Lorri Bodi, Nick Iadanza, Steve Padula
- Douglas PUD: Mike Schiewe, Bob Bugert, Lorri Bodi, Brian Allee, Al Wright, Wes Ebel
- Colville: Bob Bugert, Steve Smith, Dan Warren, Bob Foster, Dick Nason
- WDFW: Besides the others already suggested, Donna Silverberg
- USFWS: Bob Bugert, Bill Shake, Fred Olney

Rohr agreed to work on getting everyone on the short-list aware the job is now available.

Woodin suggested they begin pulling together the Tributary Committee so they can be engaged in this selection process. Chelan agreed this would be OK on an ad hoc basis. Douglas PUD said it would be fine but those committee's cannot function until the HCP is finalized. The Coordinating Committee members then provided names for the Tributary Committee, as follows:

Dennis Beich, WDFW  
Chris Fischer, Colville  
David Morgan, USFWS  
Dale Bambrick, NOAA Fisheries  
Chelan and Douglas will provide to Rohr at later date

Rohr will work on getting that group set-up to meet ASAP. Rohr will try to set the meeting for April 22. The group agreed the tributary and hatchery committee's will provide their input for the chair selection to their appropriate CC representative. The CC will be the final decision makers for the position. If the CC decides to have three separate chairs for each committee, the individual committee's will select their top picks for the chair.

Woodin suggested advertising in the region. The group agreed to place the ad in websites, newspapers, fish and wildlife agencies, and universities over the four states. Woodin commented that he would contact personnel people at WDFW and forward information to Rohr relative to advertising within a specific group of potential candidates in the northwest. The committee asked Rohr to work on getting an ad drafted and out to the CC for review. They agreed the ad should run for three weeks. The potential hire date will be July 1, assuming the HCP has FERC approval of the HCP's by that time. Delay is possible depending on that outcome. The ad will be made clear that people can apply for one or all three of the committee's. The goal is to have the ad published by the first of April. The ad would run through April 21, ending before the Tributary Committee meeting is held.

- **Chelan PUD 2004 Spill Plan:** Seaman explained the comments from the February 25 draft still need to be incorporated into the Plan. Listed below are the oral comments provided by committee members:
  1. Graves again expressed his concerns over the method the PUD is using to identify the subyearlings from the yearlings. Peven assured Graves they were using the best possible methods for identification.
  2. Woodin suggested the plan clearly state that the summer spill program will not impact the spring spill program at Rocky Reach (RR). Seaman pointed out the language was already included in the plan.
  3. Peven informed the group that they did investigate the possibility of getting real-time reports for when 2.5% of the sockeye run had arrived at RR. As thought, they found this would not be a problem. In an effort to improve last year's results, the PUD will begin spill once the sampling reaches 200 or more sockeye.
  4. Woodin commented on section 1C, Spring Spill. Regarding collection estimates, he asked for the plan to clarify that the intent is for expanded count (language similar to Rock Island (RI) language would be fine).
  5. Woodin asked about spill program communication protocol this year. Seaman explained they would keep in touch by e-mail not less than once weekly. He agreed to add appropriate language into the plan stating this intent.
  6. Marco suggested someone from Chelan PUD (Peven) get involved with the Lake Osoyoos Advisory Committee to help know when the sockeye are on the way into the States. Marco agreed to provide information on the committee to Peven.
  7. The group discussed the protocol for getting this plan out to the Mid-Columbia Coordinating Committee (MCCC). The HCPCC will submit the information to the group in an effort to receive feedback before final approval of the Spill Plan is made. Rohr will send the revised draft to the MCCC ASAP to allow as much time for internal review before discussion at the March 31 MCCC meeting. The

group agreed to issue a statement to the MCCC that March 31 will be the deadline for comments, oral or written. However, the intention is to remain flexible to the timeline if needed. Communication with the MCCC will continue as the season closes in. Graves suggested a sentence be added that clarifies the role of this committee in relation to the other previously established committee's. The group agreed the sentence should provide information about the MCCC and RICC communications regarding implementation of the fish passage objectives plan. It should also state, and show, that revisions under the spill plan are still meeting the various settlement agreement requirements. The intent of the HCPCC is to communicate with the RICC and MCCC very carefully and consistently.

8. The committee further discussed Peven's suggestion from the last meeting to curtail sockeye spill for a small block of time at the end of the run, in an effort to have zero spill to compare the survival test results with. Woodin pointed out that according to the HCP, 95% of the whole sockeye run needs protection. Graves said he was uncomfortable with the proposal without assurances that the zero test and the 24 test will get results. Peven agreed these were issues that needed further investigation. The group decided to table the idea for this season and look into its feasibility for next year.
- **CPUD Survival Study:** Peven explained this new version has a few changes. The number of fish per release was updated and discrepancies were cleaned up. The substantive information is unchanged. Listed below are the oral comments made by committee members:
    1. Woodin commented it was not clear what the operation will be for fish releases in the tailraces at RR and RI. Peven explained that language is included in the study plan. He agreed to clarify that the language included applies to all three tailraces: Wells, RR, and RI.
    2. Graves asked if they will be looking at actual size distribution of fish that are tagged compared to what the actual size distribution of run of river population is. He wanted to know what population would be used for the study and how it represents the run at large. Peven agreed to add language that provides those details.
    3. There was discussion about PIT tags compared to acoustic tags. Graves asked where the fish for the study were being held. What followed was a detailed discussion on how the 450K fish being raised at Wells will be disbursed. The Hatchery Committee has been discussing the issue and is waiting for the CC to make a recommendation. Chelan PUD will have access to 100K for their survival study assuming the HCP is signed by FERC, and all the fish survive. The group decided a decision needs to be made by April 15. Bickford, Peven, and Seaman agreed to draft language on the issue for future discussions. The committee members agreed to meet by conference call on Thursday, April 1, 3:00 pm to discuss this issue further.
    4. Cates referred to page 6, asking if much investigation of bird activity in the area had taken place. He asked that the area be well-inspected and have the Plan reflect what the results of the inspection were.

5. Regarding release sites (pg 7), Woodin requested Chelan include specifics for RR and RI as was done for Wells. He also expressed his concerns over the short duration of the samples not being a good representation. Hays explained they feel four 1 minute subsamples will provide more accuracy than two subsamples of longer length. Hemstrom explained those subsamples actually end up being around 2 minutes. Accordingly, Chelan agreed to change the language stating no less than 2 minutes samples.
  6. Regarding contingencies, item 3 (pg 8), Woodin thought it seemed as if they were putting higher priority on the index sampling than injury descaling data. Since the first three samples will be rushed, he asked for reassurance that injury samples be taken at a minimum on the 4<sup>th</sup> sample. Chelan agreed to the request and will change the language to reflect it.
  7. In the last section on page 9, "table 3" should be "appendix 1". The language will be corrected.
- **FPE Study:** This study has been renamed Study Plan for Measuring Route Specific Fish Passage. Peven explained the procedure for splitting the fish passing the spillways at RI, saying the process gives a little more information on the behavior of fish. They combine the numbers at the end of the study.
  - **Fish Bypass Evaluation:** No new changes were made to this evaluation. Here are the oral comments provided:
    1. Graves asked if the same shutdown triggers used last year would be used this year. Peven said yes.
    2. Woodin suggested based on last years experience, they might want to consider reducing the thresholds and operating more conservatively. In his opinion, since the baseline has been set at zero, any descaling above that should be a trigger. Peven explained the difficulty in assessing whether damage could be attributed to fish coming in or injury from the bypass. The descaling trigger is currently 5%, which is extremely low already, Peven stated. If they see 3-5%, they would keep a closer eye on it, and anything above 5% for three consecutive days would be investigated. WDFW does not feel that 5% to trigger an investigation is low enough. Much discussion took place on why or why not 5% is an appropriate level. The final agreement was for Chelan to consult with the CC when numbers rise to 3% or more. Peven agreed to add the following language: "The district will consult with the CC if any abnormal fish conditions outside of the values provided below are found in the sample population."
    3. Graves expressed interest in revisiting the evening sampling idea. Chelan had reviewed the data from last year and found the operation would not have been beneficial. The numbers had huge variations but the proportions for each species were not much different.
    4. Graves requested a section that breaks down each species and the sample of each portion in the plan for the coming year and reporting in 2003 data. Chelan PUD agreed.
    5. Woodin pointed out there is no discussion about the sampling screen problem. Peven agreed to add that language.

6. Seaman asked if the CC would agree to allow Chelan PUD to release the final report by April 31. The committee agreed.
7. On page 8, in the table, Cates noted that not all hatchery fish are ad clipped or marked. Chelan will modify the table to address Cates' comment.
8. Woodin suggested the stacked bar graphs on the reports for species composition on pages 21-25 be changed to something more readable. Chelan agreed.
9. Woodin asked why appendix F was attached when it is not referenced in the document. Chelan agreed to look into the reasons why it is attached. They thought it was there incase someone wanted to know what the methods were.
10. Graves requested they report how many fish are being sampled. Chelan agreed.
11. Peven explained they will be including informational needs into the report (Murdoch idea).

A draft report for the biological evaluation will be out by the end of December. If they have difficulty meeting the schedule, Chelan will provide the pertinent information at that time.

- **Batelle Study:** Oral comments were provided as follows:
  1. On page 6, Woodin thought they would have a hard time getting run-of-river subyearling juvenile sockeye. Chelan agreed to correct the language.
  2. On page 7, last sentence in the treatment groups paragraph, the half a body length per second represents 11% of the difference. Woodin wondered how many fish it would take to detect a 5% difference rather than 11%. After some discussion, Chelan agreed to look into whether there is a value to get 5% compared to 11%. It may not be practical.
  3. Page 10, Woodin pointed out the buoyancy differences: 80% power of detecting a 20% difference. Chelan agreed to look into that as well.
  4. In the paragraph at the top of page 12, Woodin asked the PUD to consider if the behavior itself (fish that expel air) is somehow a function of having a tag in there. He was concerned that being tagged might force the fish to expel air. Peven agreed to look into it.
  5. On page 14 regarding treatment groups for task 4, Woodin expressed concerns that the sample sizes seem small (3 groups of 25). In conjunction with the sample size and data analysis, there should be some discussion about the expected precision or how to define detectible differences. If they define what to do with the data, it may answer the question of whether the sample size is too small. Chelan agreed to investigate the issue.

Chelan PUD will correct the reports ASAP and send them all out to the MCCC before the meeting on the 31<sup>st</sup> of March.

- **Discussion of HCP Hatchery Committee Activities:** Seaman and Peven explained they are still working on a facilities plan. At the last meeting, the committee finally agreed to rearing densities on high Elisa and low Elisa fish. The schedule for the M&E Plan is still the end of June (both inside and outside). Hays continues to work on and include information on relicensing. March 26 is the next meeting of this group, where Murdoch will be discussing results of the evaluations for Chinook and steelhead.

- **Other: *Rock Island Fishways:*** Seaman explained the repairs being made for this season. All ladders are operating. ***Fish Passage Plan:*** Graves informed Andrew of the comments made on the conference call. He looked them over and thought they were good enough. ***Fish Bypass Optimization Team:*** Peven explained this team was created to explore ways to optimize bypass efficiency. They are currently collecting information and waiting to see what the test results show before making any decisions on how to move ahead. Woodin requested periodic check-ins with the CC. He expressed his concerns that, based on last year's FPE, they won't meet this year's FPE. Peven agreed and stated they are working on it. Discussions continue on what to do if FPE's aren't being met. Once a solid list of alternatives is completed, the CC will discuss the issue. Seaman explained they are trying to stay well ahead of the curve so they are prepared on what to do when the time comes to discuss it. ***Data Sharing:*** Peven explained that Chelan PUD is in the process of contracting with Skalski for adult counts, tributary trap smolt counts, and putting Rocky Reach and Rock Island data into DART (as discussed in previous CC meetings). The process will include daily information sharing to meet daily postings on DART. Chelan is working hard to get everyone's needs met from the program and they still have a few details to work out. Peven expects the program to be up and running within the next two weeks. The eventual goal of the program is to provide real-time analysis, which will be much more of an asset than posted data.
- **The next HCPCC face-to-face meeting is scheduled for April 22, 1:00 pm. The next HCPCC conference call is scheduled for April 1, 3:00 pm.**

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
April 1, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Thursday, April 1, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee (CC) met by conference call at 3:00 pm. The attendees are listed as follows:

Brian Cates, USFWS  
Mark Miller, USFWS  
Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Laura Praye, WDFW  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Shaun Seaman, Chelan PUD  
Chuck Peven, Chelan PUD  
Bob Clubb, Douglas PUD  
Shane Bickford, Douglas PUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Peven will send a write up on the steelhead agreement to Kris Petersen and the rest of the HCPCC.
2. Rohr to meet with Clubb and Seaman to discuss final details for chairperson ad.
3. Rohr to meet with CPUD and/or DPUD Personnel Departments to review and discuss final details for chairperson search.
4. Rohr/Beck to continue working on getting Tributary Committee meeting put together.

Listed below are the agenda items and a summary of the discussion that followed.

- **Steelhead Study Fish Update:** Seaman explained there has been much discussion about using the hatchery/hatchery steelhead for CPUD's '05 survival study. According to the existing settlement agreements, DPUD is required to raise 480K steelhead every year. The HCP only obligates them to raise 349K. Therefore, if the HCP is signed this spring, DPUD would have 131K excess fish available for CPUD's survival study. If the HCP does not get signed, DPUD would need all of the fish being raised to meet their previous settlement agreement obligations. However, the Wells broodstock fell short of the 480K needed to make the plan work. At the Mid-Columbia Coordinating Committee (MCCC) meeting on March 31, they received approval to get more broodstock and continue on as planned before. Bickford thought logistically it could be done. He explained concerns expressed by the States over the marking program. The group proceeded to discuss alternatives for raising the fish, where to rear them, how to transfer them, where to hold them, and how they will be marked. The group made the final decision to rear the fish at Wells in a dirt pond initially and transfer to Turtle Rock for final rearing. The transfer

will occur when the water cools down, which is easier on the fish. The fish will spend the remainder of their time at Turtle Rock. CPUD will release half the fish in the Wells tailrace and the other half in the tailrace of RR as part of a survival study for the RR project. CPUD agreed they will rear the fish, no matter how many broodstock they end up with or what happens with the HCP. Everyone agreed that if the HCP does not receive FERC approval, Chelan will be raising the fish to meet the Wells obligation but would be using them for their survival study. Peven agreed to write up a summary for Kris Petersen, outlining the final agreement. Peven will also send the write-up out to the whole CC. Seaman thanked everyone for their cooperation and efforts to make this happen to everyone's satisfaction.

- **Committee Chairperson Update/Review:** First of all, some of the members added Mike Erho and Dennis Rohr to the short list for committee chair. Rohr then explained the job description and public announcement sent to the group for review. He assured the group that approval from DPUD and CPUD will be imperative before sending anything out to the public. The first item discussed was the job description for the short list. Beck has been working on getting e-mail addresses and/or phone numbers for the short list, with help from CC members. Once everyone agrees the language is appropriate, the information will be sent to the list. Rohr suggested he would tell them they have been identified as possible applicants and ask for a letter of interest and resume sent to him. Everyone agreed with the suggestion. The job announcement was also discussed. Rohr understood there would be a three week deadline once the ad is placed. The CC thought two weeks would be plenty of time for the public to see the notice. Woodin checked with the personnel dept. for posting on websites. However, they do not have any kind of list set up for that. Therefore, the group agreed to post the ad in the following places:
  1. Newspapers or locations: Seattle Times, The Oregonian, Boise, and Vancouver BC.
  2. Universities: UBC, UW, WSU, OSU, UI, MSU, and UM.
  3. The four state fish and wildlife agencies.

The ad will run for two weeks consecutively. For the newspapers ads, they will run for two Sunday editions. Clubb suggested they give potential applicants an idea of how much time the job will involve and how much the pay will be. The PUDs need to get-together and discuss the various pay options. The group thought it would be good to offer a base pay or retainer of sorts that would include a certain number of hours, plus an hourly rate beyond that. Rohr will work on getting a meeting set up between Clubb, Seaman, and himself to finalize these kinds of details. Rohr will also meet with personnel sometime next week. The hiring timeline will be July 1, 2004. Any further comments on the ads should be sent to directly to Rohr.

- **Tributary Committee Meeting Update:** Rohr and Beck have been working on schedules for the joint Trib/CC meeting. However, there is some difficulty in finding a date that everyone is available. Rohr asked if it was necessary to have the meeting held jointly. The CC did not think it was imperative. They will continue to work on getting the Tributary committee meeting set-up ASAP. The CC did agree they should meet by conference call once they start seeing an increase in outmigration. Accordingly the CC will hold a conference call on Friday, April 9, 3:30 pm to receive an update on the migration and discuss RI spill. CPUD also let the group know that the bypass is up and running as of April 1. Seaman suggested they discuss selecting Bugert to run the



Hatchery and Tributary committee's since his name was on everyone's list. However, the rest of the CC agreed they did not want to cut off the options early regarding other applicants that might be available. Accordingly, there was no further discussion.

- **Finalization of 2003 Reports:** Seaman had sent out the '03 reports and inquired if everyone had had a chance to review them. Woodin said he had reviewed them and had no additional comments. Graves had sent a request asking that they report the length distribution for smolt monitoring so they could assess what percent of the population is being tagged. Seaman said he was fairly sure that information had already been added into the '03 reports but would double check. It will definitely be in the 2004 report. Otherwise, there were no additional comments provided. Seaman asked if everyone agreed they be considered final. The CC agreed. Note that CPUD will wait at least a week to give CRITFC an opportunity to respond to the plans before finalizing the documents.
- **Update of 2004 Plans/Studies:** Seaman explained they updated the 2004 spill proposal and sent it out to the MCCC last Monday. The MCCC made no changes to the proposal. The CC had no additional comments either. Again, CPUD will wait until CRITFC has an opportunity to respond.
- **Other:** Peven explained that C1 at RR has been shut down due to some hydraulic vibrations that had them concerned. They expect the unit to be running again by April 2.
- **The next HCPCC conference call is scheduled for Friday, April 9, at 3:30 pm.** Details will be provided shortly.

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
April 9, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Friday, April 09, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee (CC) conference call was held. Attendees on the call are listed as follows:

Brian Cates, USFWS  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Chuck Peven, Chelan PUD  
Bob Clubb, Douglas PUD  
Shane Bickford, Douglas PUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Rohr to work on getting a Hatchery Committee conference call set-up for next week. Rohr will call Peven on Monday morning to discuss further.
2. Rohr to provide final package for job posting to the CC by e-mail.
3. Peven to inform Yount and Seaman of the CC's discussion regarding comments in response to the Yakama filing.

Listed below are the agenda items and summary of the discussion that followed.

- **How to Rear Hatchery Chinook for Potential '05 Survival Study:** Peven began by explaining this discussion would be an overview with no decisions needed to be made at this time. An issue was brought to his attention regarding the East Bank Hatchery fish that were collected and where they would reside in case they needed them for another survival study with PIT tags next year. Recall, last year they had agreed to do one year of side-by-side survival studies for yearling Chinook at Rocky Reach (RR) and compare it to the three years of side-by-side studies from Rock Island (RI). If the side-by-side study for RR has point estimates that are similar to what has been observed at RI, then the District would no longer need to use PIT tags the following year for yearling Chinook. In an effort to assure they would have those fish available for the study if needed, they segregated some of these fish in the hatchery. The District expects to know for sure if they will need to do a side-by-side study by August or September. Peven spoke with Mike Tonseth, WDFW, and there was some misunderstanding as to how many fish they will need. This alleviated the concern. Because of permits, the fish would need to go to the Okanogan. If they don't end up needing them, they will use them for the Similkameen or Bonaparte programs. However, if they do have to conduct another survival study next year, there are questions on where to hold these fish in addition to the

steelhead that will come on station this fall. They will need to explore some various options such as segregating the pond at Turtle Rock, where the Wells steelhead are going to be held. There is still time to discuss it but Peven wanted the group to know what was going on. Stilwater and Jateff will need to be involved.

- Woodin asked for an update on the supplemental trapping of steelhead at Wells. Bickford said they trapped 70 fish this week but most of them were Wenatchee elastomer (sp?) fish. They may need to do some hatchery by hatchery crosses instead. Rohr will talk further with Peven regarding possibly getting the HCP Hatchery Committee together next week for a conference call to discuss the issue further. Rohr will contact Peven on Monday morning to discuss further.
- **Spill Review/Update:** At this point, smolt counts at RI have been minimal. On April 1, there were zero counts, April 5<sup>th</sup> up to 10, then between 50-65 for a few days, and dropping down to 15 on the 9<sup>th</sup>. Graves inquired about DART not providing 2004 information. Peven stated they are still working on getting that going. They expect it to be up and running by early next week (April 14 or thereabout). Peven took a moment to explain how to move around in the site and what information will be provided. Cates said in the Entiat they have been seeing fish for 2-3 weeks. Peven explained that even though they are seeing fish at the traps, it doesn't necessarily mean they will be moving out of the tributaries at this time. Mainstem water temperatures are still cool. CPUD is keeping a close eye on the numbers and will start spill as soon as the criteria is reached at Rock Island, or on April 17 at the latest. For Rocky Reach, sockeye should be arriving sometime in early May. CPUD will keep the CC posted by e-mail as the events unfold.
- **Update on Chair Position:** Rohr provided details on his work to date. The package is complete and under review with the PUD's. He hopes to have final approval from Seaman and Clubb by early next week. He expects the newspaper ads to run on Sunday, April 18 and April 24. They will be posted in the Idaho Statesman, Oregonian, Seattle Times, and Vancouver Sun. Universities and F&W Agencies will also be targeted, as previously discussed. The deadline for resumes and letters of interest is May 15. Woodin asked if the CC could be included in the final distribution for their records. Rohr agreed with the request. Rohr also informed the group that he has had a few discussions with folks from the short list. The main questions these people have had are how much time would the job involve, where the meetings would be located, how pay will be handled, and whether the job would be contracted or PUD employee.
- **Tributary Committee Meeting Update:** The date for the first HCP Tributary Committee meeting has been set for May 21, 2004, at 9:00 am in Wenatchee. The location was chosen because all of the committee members are already in Wenatchee or nearby towns. The CC is invited to attend the meeting. An agenda will be discussed and sent out shortly. The timing is good since close of applications is May 15.
- **Yakama Filing:** An e-mail was sent earlier in the week with information on the recent Yakama filing to FERC regarding the HCP. The PUD's are responding to the filing and draft comments are available to committee members for review if desired. Clubb explained they included language stating that if FERC allows the Yakama's as full voting members, the PUD's, WDFW, and Colville Tribes may seriously consider withdrawing from the agreement. Marco and Woodin were okay with the language. The CC had no further comments on the draft response. The PUD's hope to have the comments sent to

FERC by Tuesday next week at the latest. Peven will inform Yount and Seaman of the committee's discussion.

- **The next HCPCC meeting will be held by conference call on May 24, Monday at 2:00 pm.**

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
May 6, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Thursday, May 6, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee (CC) met by conference call. Those in attendance were as follows:

Brian Cates, USFWS  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA  
Shaun Seaman, CPUD  
Steve Hemstrom, CPUD  
Tom Treat, CPUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

The purpose of the call was to update the CC on the start of Sockeye spill at Rocky Reach dam. Seaman began by informing the group they started spill a few moments earlier. This was due to high numbers of sockeye trapped on May 5 in the evening. Of the 1500 total fish collected in the 57 minute sample, 95 were sockeye. This equated to 200 sockeye in 120 minutes. Counts for the morning sample of May 6 were 27 in 1.5 hours, which was normal compared to sockeye counts in the previous days. Seaman explained this year's start of sockeye spill is odd since they are still seeing low numbers of fish and wanted the group to understand that Chelan would not always vary the index period. However, not wanting a repeat of last year, they chose to start spill due to the high counts from the evening sample on May 5. Graves expressed his appreciation for their flexibility and stated they will discuss the hiatus of spill when the time comes. He feels it will be easier to fine tune the 95% of the run at the end rather than the beginning. The group then went on to discuss model ideas to develop an index outside of real time in an effort to get better at predicting sockeye.

The group also discussed the logistics of the upcoming Fish Forum presentation on the HCP process. Shaun Seaman and Shane Bickford will be conducting the presentation, then allow other committee members to speak, and conclude with questions from the audience. The Forum is scheduled for June 2 & 3.

The group agreed a meeting should be scheduled to discuss the applications received for the Committee Chair positions. Accordingly, a place holder was set for Tuesday, June 1, 2004.

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
May 17, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Monday, May 17, 2004, the HCP CC met by conference call. Attendees on the call are listed below:

Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Shaun Seaman, CPUD  
Andrew Grassell, CPUD  
Bob Clubb, DPUD  
Shane Bickford, DPUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Rohr to provide copies of the resumes and cover letters to all members of the Coordinating, Hatchery, and Tributary Committees.
2. Rohr to work on getting a conference call set-up with the Hatchery Committee.
3. Seaman to send out the Power Point Presentation that will be provided at the Fish Forum.

The main purpose of the call was to discuss the HCP Chair position applicants. Rohr provided the group the names of the 21 applicants. He reminded the group of the May 24 conference call placeholder and the June 1 meeting placeholder where the applicants can be discussed in greater detail. Rohr suggested they might want to establish some criteria and decide on a scoring system for each applicant. He will have the applications received scanned into an electronic format and then send copies of the resumes and cover letters by e-mail within the next few days.

Rohr suggested the group discuss the involvement of the Habitat and Tributary Committee in this selection process. The group agreed that both committees should have input into the decision making process for their committee chair. After some discussion, the group decided to have Rohr send the Tributary and Hatchery committee members copies of the applications for review and to provide explanation of how the process will move forward. Each committee will come up with a list of the top 3 candidates for the CC to work with. The CC will then use those lists to help determine the most appropriate candidate for the job.

The CC will begin work on the list themselves at the upcoming conference call scheduled for Monday, May 24. Those committee members who cannot attend the call should send their short list to Rohr by the 24<sup>th</sup>. The Tributary Committee will discuss the candidates at their meeting on Friday, May 21. The Hatchery Committee will need to meet by

conference call ASAP to discuss their possible candidates. Rohr will work on getting that set-up.

Regarding criteria, the group agreed that setting criteria was unnecessary as long as they all agreed to come prepared to discuss the reasons for choosing their top 5 candidates. The group also agreed the criteria should be a candidate chosen by a unanimous vote.

Rohr also discussed the Fish Forum. The HCP CC will be making a presentation on the HCP process on Wednesday, June 2, at 1:30 pm. Most of the members will there. Seaman and Bickford will begin working on the presentation shortly and will send it out to the committee members for review when it is completed. They are hoping that committee members will provide additional comments during the presentation regarding how the first year went. The group will touch base on the subject on the May 24<sup>th</sup> conference call.

Seaman informed the members that the '03 study reports were sent out to the CC and MCCC and he has received no comments. Accordingly, CPUD is considering them final. The members agreed.

Seaman also updated the group regarding the elevated level of descaling and injury occurring at the RR surface collector. After some investigation, they found the large part of the problem being human error. Accordingly, CPUD is working on procedures for the staff to follow. They also recommend that if they continue to see the same levels of descaling, they will need to suspend the fish marking program. Graves said that was fine and explained he has had similar problems when working with other fish marking groups.

In regards to changes in the Batelle Study, Seaman explained that Skalski and Woodin had requested an increase in sample size to find long-term survival. Accordingly, the sample size was doubled from 25 fish per group to 50 fish per group. The updated version of the study plan has been completed and will be sent out to members.

Lastly, Seaman explained that RI is seeing mortalities this year similar to last year. Accordingly, they used underwater cameras to specifically find the problem area. They did find a problem area at the R11 gate along the edges. Parts have been ordered and repairs are being made to the gate edges. The work will result in no impact to the fish attraction system. They hope to have the work completed today or early tomorrow.

The next HCP CC conference call is scheduled for Monday, May 24, 2004, at 2:00 pm.

HCP CC conference call  
Meeting Report  
May 24, 2004

Brian Cates, USFWS  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Shaun Seaman, Chelan PUD  
Bob Clubb, Douglas PUD  
Shane Bickford, Douglas PUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

Rohr explained the Tributary Committee met on Friday, May 21, 2004. The committee anticipates that they will discuss the chair position by conference call on Friday, May 28. Their goal is to have three names for the Tributary representative or 3 names for overall recommendation. The Hatchery Committee is having discussions but has not yet spoken as a group. They hope to have a conference call within the week. In the meantime, they are receiving the information from various resources and hope to have a Hatchery Committee recommendations by the June 1 Coordinating Committee meeting. A final decision should be made at the June 1 Coordinating Committee meeting. At that time, the committee will decide whether it will be one chairperson for all three committee's or one for each committee.

Fish Forum: Rohr reminded the group of the Fish Forum on June 2 at 1:30 pm. Committee members need to be there if possible. The Power Point Presentation has been completed and should be sent out to the group shortly. Committee Members will be expected to make a statement of how things have gone during the past year.

At this point, Dennis Rohr and Richelle Beck dropped off the line so the committee could have a candid discussion about the committee chairperson applicants.



HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
May 28, 2004

Conference Call Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On May 28, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee (CC) met by conference call. Those in attendance were as follows:

Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Brian Cates, USFWS  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA  
Shaun Seaman, CPUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

The meeting was requested by Shaun Seaman, Chelan PUD, who provided the following written statement/email for the purpose of the call:

Steve Hemstrom has been keeping a close eye on the sockeye run including the RealTime prediction for the run. According to RealTime, the May 6th start date equated to 1.36% of the run. Based on providing spill for a minimum of 95% of the run, sockeye spill would end when the 96.36% point has been reached. At this point Realtime is predicting that this point will be reached sometime between May 31st and June 1st. As you can see on the RealTime report, (assuming you have printed it out) there were still a number of fish counted at Rocky Reach recently, but the numbers are also dropping fast.

In addition, the sampling crew have not seen any sub-yearling chinook (based on identifying chinook between 75 - 90 mm). Based on this information, it is possible that we may be ending spring spill in the next few days.

When the conference call began, Rohr asked Seaman to explain the current situation and provide an update. Accordingly, Seaman stated that Sockeye spill will continue at least through the weekend since the counts jumped to 365 on Thursday, May 27. On Friday morning [of this call], the counts were up to 75, which does not meet the trigger criteria. The PUD expects to be at 96.4% of the run by the 31<sup>st</sup> of May. The PUD plans to continue sampling over the weekend and provide an update to the CC at the Coordinating Committee meeting on Tuesday, June 1. The committee may need to discuss the issue of a smaller run size than expected. The group also discussed possible meetings and communication with the Canadians.

Seaman also informed that group that some of the marked fish releases yesterday at Rocky Reach in the left and right channels resulted in some mortalities and circular descaling patterns (from the right channel only). They will be sending down a diving crew promptly to check on this. More information will provided shortly.

Repairs to the Rock Island R11 gate were completed last week. Over the last few of days there have been zero mortalities. The PUD is confident the repairs were successful.

Spill volume at Rock Island has been 20.02% through the season. Rocky Reach has an even spill volume of 24.4% right now.

The next HCP Coordinating Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 1, 2004, at 1:00 pm in the Wells Conference Room at Douglas PUD.

## HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL

June 4, 2004

Meeting Report

By D. Rohr and Associates

On Friday, June 4, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee (CC) met by conference call to discuss sockeye spill. Those in attendance were as follows:

Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries

Rod Woodin, WDFW

Brian Cates, USFWS

Shaun Seaman, CPUD

Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes

Chuck Peven, CPUD

Steve Hemstrom, CPUD

Chelan PUD requested a discussion to reduce sockeye spill now that RealTime was showing that 97.5% of the run had passed as of June 4. None of the other criteria for reducing spill has been met. In the morning sample on June 4, 334 sockeye were counted in the 120 minute sample (includes expansion). The group was unaware of any sockeye releases, although there was some transferring to net pens occurring.

Seaman requested the group discuss what triggers would be acceptable to reduce spill. Woodin offered an allowance of up to 1% of the run for the next two days before reducing spill. In other words, they would need 3 out of 5 consecutive days of counts at or below 1%. Discussion over that suggestion took place. All members of the agreement agreed to the compromise, giving some allowance for the early start of spill. If the PUD sees two days this weekend of 1% or less, spill would be reduced on Sunday at midnight.

The CC agreed to set a place holder for a Monday conference call. Accordingly, the call was scheduled for Monday, 1:00 pm, 509-663-8121 x1234.

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
June 25, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Friday, June 25, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee met by conference call to discuss the upcoming interviews for the permanent chair position. Those in attendance are as follows:

Brian Cates, USFWS  
Mark Miller, USFWS  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Shaun Seaman, Chelan PUD  
Chuck Peven, Chelan PUD  
Bob Clubb, Douglas PUD  
Shane Bickford, Douglas PUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

Rohr began the meeting by explaining the process/agenda. He stated the order of the applicant interviews would be Dan Silver, Steve Smith, and then Mike Scheiwe. All applicants were confirmed. Rohr also noted he had spoken at length with each applicant. The group discussed whether the applicants could see the interview questions ahead of time. Most of the members were uncomfortable with the idea. Some agreed it depended on the questions. The meeting was scheduled for June 30, 2004, and would begin at 10:00 am with a presentation from Skalski. The interviews were scheduled to begin promptly at 12:30 pm.

The group then moved to a review of the interview question that had been sent by e-mail to the committee members. After much discussion, the group agreed to the following questions and Graves provided the questions/breakdowns to the group by e-mail.

**HCP Coordinating Committee Chair Position Questions**  
**Silver**

1. Why are you interested in being the chairperson for the HCP Coordinating Committee?
2. Describe your experience working with multi-agency committees - especially with regard to contentious issues.
3. Describe some of the key provisions of the three HCPs. (**Coordinating Committee only**)

4. How does this HCP fit with other regional recovery efforts including Grant PUD relicensing and BiOp, the FCRPS BiOp remand, Subbasin planning, CRI, etc...?  
**(Coordinating Committee only)**
5. What do you believe is most important to accomplish between meetings in order to ensure that the face to face meeting is as productive as possible?
6. Describe your past experience handling disruptive parties in a meeting.
7. How would you handle a situation where one or more committee members is in disagreement on the interpretation of study results and the disagreement is preventing the committee from making further progress on the issue?
8. How would you propose to communicate a coordinating committee dispute (technical or programmatic issue) that needs to be brought to the policy committee for resolution?
9. How do you see the committees and the various chair positions fitting together?
10. This position is responsible for organizing meetings and producing meeting minutes and various reports. Describe how you will address these functions and describe how much time you will be able to devote to the committees and describe your plan for utilizing support staff.

## **HCP Coordinating Hatchery Chair Position Questions Smith**

1. Why are you interested in being the chairperson for the HCP Hatchery Committee?
2. Describe your experience working with multi-agency committees - especially with regard to contentious issues.
3. Discuss your knowledge and views of the three Chelan and Douglas HCPs including the appropriate use of supplementation hatcheries to meet the no net impact survival standard. **(Hatchery Committee only)**
4. How does the HCP hatchery programs fit with other regional recovery and conservation efforts including Grant PUD's relicensing and BiOp, US v Oregon production issues, Subbasin planning, etc...? **(Hatchery Committee only)**
5. What do you believe is most important to accomplish between meetings in order to ensure that the face to face meeting is as productive as possible?
6. Describe your past experience handling disruptive parties in a meeting.
7. How would you handle a situation where one or more committee members is in disagreement on the interpretation of study results and the disagreement is preventing the committee from making further progress on the issue?
8. How would you propose to communicate a coordinating committee dispute (technical or programmatic issue) that needs to be brought to the policy committee for resolution?
9. How do you see the committees and the various chair positions fitting together?
10. This position is responsible for organizing meetings and producing meeting minutes and various reports. Describe how you will address these functions and describe how much time you will be able to devote to the committees and describe your plan for utilizing support staff.

## **HCP Coordinating / Hatchery Committee Chair Position Questions Schiewe**

1. Why are you interested in being the chairperson for the HCP Coordinating Committee?
2. Describe your experience working with multi-agency committees - especially with regard to contentious issues.
3. Describe some of the key provisions of the three HCPs. **(Coordinating Committee only)**
4. How does this HCP fit with other regional recovery efforts including Grant PUD relicensing and BiOp, the FCRPS BiOp remand, Subbasin planning, CRI, etc...? **(Coordinating Committee only)**
5. What do you believe is most important to accomplish between meetings in order to ensure that the face to face meeting is as productive as possible?
6. Describe your past experience handling disruptive parties in a meeting.
7. How would you handle a situation where one or more committee members is in disagreement on the interpretation of study results and the disagreement is preventing the committee from making further progress on the issue?
8. How would you propose to communicate a coordinating committee dispute (technical or programmatic issue) that needs to be brought to the policy committee for resolution?
9. How do you see the committees and the various chair positions fitting together?
10. This position is responsible for organizing meetings and producing meeting minutes and various reports. Describe how you will address these functions and describe how much time you will be able to devote to the committees and describe your plan for utilizing support staff.
11. Discuss your knowledge and views of the Chelan and Douglas HCPs including the appropriate use of supplementation hatcheries to meet the no net impact survival standard. **(Hatchery Committee only)**
12. How does the HCP hatchery program fit with other regional recovery and conservation efforts including Grant PUD's relicensing and BiOp, US v Oregon production issues, Subbasin planning, etc...? **(Hatchery Committee only)**

The committee members agreed to take turns asking the questions. Graves agreed to assign a name to each question. Rohr will begin with introductions and turn the interview over to the first questioner.

Woodin suggested the group agree on a score keeping method for the group to use. He suggested 10 points per question – 1 being most unsatisfied and 10 being most satisfied. Rohr agreed to provide the questions with room for a score after each question.

The Chair position for the Tributary Committee held Bob Bugert at the top of the list. Chelan and Douglas agreed to contact Bugert about chairing the one committee when he returns from vacation.

A conference call will be held on Tuesday, July 6, 4:00 pm, to make a final decision for the chair positions.

The committee also discussed the status of the FERC approval. Clubb explained they had concerns with the final FERC Order. It seems that FERC did not specify that the HCP would supercede the Rock Island and Wells settlement. They are not sure if this was an oversight or not. The Order also specifies the Mid-Columbia Coordinating Committee continue to function as an informational and discussion forum for the HCP actions. Graves said his discussion with Hastreiter suggested the language was included to help placate a few commissioners. The 30 day re-hearing process will be used to help clarify these issues. The committee agreed to jointly agree the HCP would need to supercede the settlement agreements. In the meantime, the PUDs are moving ahead as if the HCP's are approved as of June 21, 2004.



HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
July 6, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Tuesday, July 6, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee (CC) met by conference call to discuss the chair position and obtain an update on the FERC process. Those in attendance were as follows:

Brian Cates, USFWS  
Mark Miller, USFWS  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Tracy Yount, Chelan PUD  
Shaun Seaman, Chelan PUD  
Chuck Peven, Chelan PUD  
Bob Clubb, Douglas PUD  
Shane Bickford, Douglas PUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

Before starting the discussion on committee chair, the group briefly heard information on the 401 Certification and the DOE bowing to tribal comments. This may affect the HCP process in the future.

The group discussed the chair position. In short, the unanimous choice for CC chair was Mike Schiewe. The Hatchery Committee position was not unanimous and discussions were needed. The final decision was to have each agency consider the options internally, Rohr to talk to Bugert about the Tributary Committee, and have the group reconvene for further discussion by conference call on Tuesday, July 13, at 9:30 am.

Yount provided the group with an update on the FERC status. He explained Vasile was trying to craft a response to FERC regarding the language in the order that has the signatory parties concerned (previously discussed on noted in meeting minutes). The PUD recognizes FERC's attempt to keep the tribes involved and is working hard to provide a suggestion to FERC to fulfill their request. They are looking for ideas from the CC on how to respond to FERC. Would the CC consider the suggestion to join with Grant PUD's BO Coordinating Committee, or use the existing Mid-Columbia Coordinating Committee (as suggested by FERC), or should they set-up a whole new forum that Grant PUD and the tribes could participate on. Filing for a re-hearing is due by July 21.

The group agreed that joining Grant PUD's Coordinating Committee would not be a good option since their program is for a limited duration and only focuses on listed

species. Accordingly, the CC will consider the other two options and discuss the issue again on the 13<sup>th</sup>.

The next CC meeting is on Tuesday, July 13, 9:30 am at 509-661-4842 x1234.

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
July 13, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Tuesday, July 13, 2004, the HCP CC met by conference call to discuss the committee chairperson position. Those in attendance were as follows:

Brian Cates, USFWS  
Mark Miller, USFWS  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Heather Bartlett, WDFW  
Shaun Seaman, CPUD  
Bob Clubb, DPUD  
Shane Bickford, DPUD  
Rick Klinge, DPUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

Rohr began the discussion by explaining the situation relative to Bugert and the Tributary Committee position. Rohr said Bugert would be willing to take the position as long as he was guaranteed 20 hours a week. He also requested to address the CC directly. Seaman responded he had no idea at this point if 20 hours a week was feasible and Chelan PUD would not be able to make that guarantee at this time. Klinge from Douglas PUD seconded Seaman's statement saying they were sure the job would not generate 20 hours a week, even on average. The rest of the coordinating committee concurred and felt that if that was Bugert's bottom line, they needed to move on to the second candidate on the list provided by the Tributary Committee, which was Mike Scheiwe. The CC saw no reason why there would be a need for Bugert to address the CC directly.

The CC then discussed whether everyone was comfortable having Scheiwe chair all three committee's. Chelan PUD explained their reservations over having one person chair all three committee's. Seaman stated that given the decision over Bugert, they would most likely change their vote from Scheiwe to Smith for the Hatchery Committee. Douglas PUD stated they felt both Scheiwe and Smith to be good candidates but found strong value in having one person chairing all three committee's. Cates stated he had concerns that one person would not be able to attend all the meetings. Marco agreed with those concerns. He stated the Colvilles still preferred Smith but were willing to go with Scheiwe if that is what the committee wanted. Graves said NOAA was still strongly for Scheiwe because he had such strong expertise in the area of designing and implementing hatchery programs. The CC agreed that if Scheiwe were running all three, it would be on the condition that he be available to attend all of the meetings and not send someone else to do it. Seaman suggested they have Smith chair the Hatchery Committee and use Scheiwe when needed for technical issues. The CC agreed to consider that option, talk

internally, and discuss the issue again by conference call on Thursday, July 15, at 8:00 am.

Regarding the FERC issue, Clubb explained Vasile was working with the signatory parties legal council directly. If any of the CC saw something in the letter (a draft letter to FERC being circulated for review that the signatory parties would sign) they had an issue with, they were to talk to their legal council directly.

The meeting ended with final confirmation of the conference call scheduled for 8:00 am on July 15.

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
July 15, 2004

Meeting Minutes  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Thursday, July 15, 2004, the HCP CC met by conference call to discuss the HCP chairperson position. Those in attendance were as follows:

Brian Cates, USFWS  
Mark Miller, USFWS  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Kris Petersen, NOAA Fisheries  
Bill Tweit, WDFW  
Heather Bartlett, WDFW  
Shaun Seaman, CPUD  
Bob Clubb, DPUD  
Shane Bickford, DPUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

Rohr reminded the group they had consensus on Scheiwe for the CC chair position. However, the Hatchery Committee (HC) and Tributary Committee (TC) chair positions were still up for discussion. Rohr explained at the last CC conference call, the group took Bugert off the list and were now looking at having Scheiwe to chair all three or just the CC and TC while Smith chair's the HC.

Tweit stated they had a process question over the Bugert decision. He asked at what point should the CC be making decisions about an issue that directly affects another committee and how involved will the other committees be in contributing to those decisions. He understood that at the last CC conference call, they essentially removed Bugert from the list. He wondered why that decision didn't go back to the Tributary Committee (TC) first before moving forward with discussions on Scheiwe. It seems if there is a dispute, there should be a joint meeting between the involved committee's before a final decision is made, just to make sure everyone is on the same page.

Seaman explained he saw the CC as being the "resolver" of issues between the three committees. He felt that Bugert basically pulled himself off the list by setting terms that can't be met. He would need to review the TC minutes but was under the impression that the TC knew the CC would move to the next candidate if Bugert turned the position down.

Bickford explained that on the TC conference call last week, there was discussion over what to do if the CC did not agree to Bugert's terms. He felt there was agreement among the TC that they would go to the second candidate. He understood Tweit's point

regarding the feedback loop but also felt that the 20 hour a week requirement was not acceptable.

Tweit stated he understood there needed to be resolution but this is an extremely important decision. Dennis Beich, the WDFW TC representative was not under the impression that if the CC did not agree to Bugert's terms it would take him off the table. Either way, the CC should have reviewed the discussion with the TC before moving forward with discussions about having Scheiwe for the TC Chair.

Graves said at the last several meeting he understood that everyone was to go back to their committee representatives and see where they stood on the issues under discussion. Dale Bambrick, the NOAA TC representative felt the TC was comfortable moving to the second choice if the CC could not meet Bugert's terms. Tweit stated that was fine but the best way to assure that everyone is on the same page is to have a joint meeting when there are decisions being made at CC that affect the other committees.

Seaman explained the goal was to reduce the amount of meetings being held and try to work out issues internally before coming together for a discussion. The last discussion of the CC was left saying they needed to confirm with Bugert on whether the 20 hour guarantee was the only way he would chair the TC. Tweit stated that the TC was not fully on board with the CC moving to the 2<sup>nd</sup> choice. Although there was consensus from the CC that there wasn't 20 hours per week of work, did the TC agree with that position? Clubb stated there were four TC representatives on the call that agreed there wasn't 20 hours of work. Douglas PUD will not agree to fund anyone for 20 hours a week on the TC so there would never be consensus in the other direction.

Rohr stated that the CC needs consensus to make these decisions and it sounds like WDFW is not in agreement with the rest of the group. Therefore, it would be a good idea to have a combined CC and TC conference call to discuss the issue. Tweit agreed with the statement. WDFW has no problem moving on to Scheiwe once everyone is clear that the TC is ready to move forward with the second choice. Graves suggested Rohr send an e-mail saying the CC does not think this position will provide 20 hours of work per week and therefore a conference call between the TC and CC is needed. The CC also agreed it would be good to have the HC join the call as well.

Rohr asked if the CC reps would please make this a priority. If the TC and HC reps cannot be on the call, please discuss their position and come prepared to represent them on the call. The group agreed to meet again on Tuesday, July 20, 8:00 am.

The CC agreed for future reference there needs to be clear language on how the committee's will operate, especially under dispute resolution. Everyone needs a chance to be heard before final decisions are made.

The group then turned to the HC chair position discussion. Petersen stated from NOAA Fisheries' standpoint of hatchery RM&E design, they think Scheiwe could be very beneficial to the committee based on his background. The resource agencies would gain

the ability to learn more if Scheiwe were chairing the committee. However, if the majority of the CC wanted Smith, NOAA acknowledges there may be times when Scheiwe could be called in for assistance and they are comfortable with that.

Clubb explained they are struggling with the concept of having two chairmen working on the same thing. First of all, it dilutes the effectiveness of the chair. Second, if the majority of the work will be done by Scheiwe, they don't want to pay double for work that could be done by one. It really depends on how much involvement Scheiwe would have before they could conclude their position. Seaman stated they would be using Scheiwe strictly for his expertise and would have no chairmanship authority. They had offered the alternative as a means to move the process forward and find agreement. Chelan has strong reservations over having one person running all three committee's. Petersen stated they support using Scheiwe as a resource and Smith for the chair. Clubb explained they just don't want to pay twice. They see a strong advantage to having one chairperson for all three committee's, especially for simplification in the process. They feel that Smith is a good candidate but Scheiwe is the best. However, they are not going to go against the group if there is consensus to go with Smith. WDFW stated they feel Smith has a good amount of practical expertise with hatchery development. Colville requested they wait to make a final decision until they know for sure what is going to happen with Bugert. They also have concerns over having one chair for all three committee's and their decision will be based on the TC outcome. The group agreed to table the discussion until next week.

The group also discussed the FERC letter that has been circulated among the signatory parties. The attorney's held a conference call yesterday. Graves stated some minor edits were made to the letter and Vasile agreed to recirculate it. So far, the USFWS is the only party not participating at this point.

The HCP CC/TC/HC conference call will be held on Tuesday, July 13, 2004, at 8:00 am. Details will be provided shortly.

HCP COORDINATING, HATHCERY, AND TRIBUTARY COMMITTEE  
CONFERENCE CALL  
July 20, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Tuesday, July 20, 2004, the HCP CC, HC, and TC's met by conference call to discuss the committee chair positions. Those in attendance are listed as follows:

Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Kris Petersen, NOAA Fisheries  
Brian Cates, USFWS  
Mark Miller, USFWS  
David Morgan, USFWS  
Heather Bartlett, WDFW  
Bill Tweit, WDFW  
Dennis Beich, WDFW  
Chris Fisher, Colville Tribes  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Shaun Seaman, CPUD  
Keith Truscott, CPUD  
Bob Clubb, DPUD  
Shane Bickford, DPUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

Rohr began the meeting by explaining the purpose of the call. He brought the group up-to-date as to where the committee chair positions stood. He explained that Bugert was working on some other possible contracts which could help him make his final decision on whether to accept the HCP position. He promised to have answer to the group by Wednesday afternoon, July 21. Rohr posed several questions to the group for discussion. First, is the position still open to Bugert without the 20 hour a week guarantee? Second, can the group wait until Wednesday to hear from Bugert regarding his final decision? Third, is there a conflict of interest if Bugert were to gain contracts working for the Governors Salmon Recovery Board and the Surf Board people?

Fisher first asked that if Bugert gets the other contracts, would the request for 20 hours a week guaranteed be removed. Beich responded that he would like to hear the group have some discussion on what everyone thought the general scope of work would be for each committee chair. Seaman stated that each individual chair would organize the meetings and make sure the minutes are recorded. Reports will have to be generated as well. The chairs would also be responsible for diplomacy between meetings and the interaction between the chairs, as well as individual projects for each committee. Bickford noted that the scope was written out in the chair position advertisements. Beich responded that the scope wasn't necessarily applicable to the TC needs since they need more of a



specialist to the committee. Seaman stated they had discussed that before the process began and accordingly found in the selection process an appropriate candidate for each committee. Once the committee chairs are in position, the committee's can discuss what the scope of work will be. Truscott agreed they are not at the point yet to discuss this much further.

Beich noted the TC had agreed it would be important for the chair to attend other process meetings that related to the TC to keep apprised of the regional tributary activities. Tweit stated that if Bugert did get those other contracts, those meetings would be covered by different entities. Marco agreed there was a value to have Bugert bring his knowledge in regards to the activities in the upper Columbia tributaries and would see attendance of those meetings as a task for the committee chair. Graves asked how many of the Tributary Committee members attend those meetings already. Beich responded that they want someone out there in those meetings who can report back to the group. Morgan agreed with Beich. Truscott noted that Bugert's knowledge and involvement in these groups was what made him the committee's first choice. Graves offered that the group move to offer the job to Bugert without the guarantee. If he declines, move to Scheiwe.

Rohr asked about the conflict of interest issue. The group felt that over-all there wasn't much to be concerned about there and trusted the TC to keep watch over any issues that may arise. Clubb stated if Bugert was sensitive to that, they could alert committee members if it looked like there would be a conflict. Bickford stated if Bugert accepts the position, there should be discussions on how any conflict would be worked through. Tweit stated he trusted the TC to manage that but Bugert does need to be cognizant.

The group also discussed whether there would be a conflict if Bugert was an employee of the State or a contractor. Seaman stated that as long as the PUD's are contracting to Bugert and not as an employee of the State of Washington, he can receive employment from any organization. Graves stated that although he has some slight concern over a possible conflict of interest, the fact that there has to be committee consensus before decisions can move forward, the conflict is extremely minimized. Petersen noted that as an employee of the State, he would have to fill out a form noting the other jobs he has. The State might have an issue with conflict of interest but it shouldn't be an issue here.

Rohr noted it sound like the committee agrees to still offer Bugert the job. If he turns it down, the committee will move to Scheiwe for the position. Beich stated he has concerns over the ability of one person to chair all three positions. Rohr said if Bugert rejects the offer, the TC can get back together and review the 3 candidates again. Graves stated that in fairness to Scheiwe, they would need to confirm that he would need to be in attendance at all the meetings.

The final decision of the group was to offer the job to Bugert. If he rejects it, the discussion goes back to the TC and ultimately comes back to the CC.

The group then moved to a discussion of the HC chair position. Tweit stated they still prefer Steve Smith for the position. Marco stated they too favor Smith but believe that

both candidates would be good for the job. NOAA, USFWS, CPUD, and DPUD all favor Scheiwe for the HC as long as Bugert is on the TC. Clubb said it seems that Marco was willing to go with Scheiwe and Marco agreed. Tweit stated they would not block consensus.

The group reached agreement. Scheiwe will be asked to chair the CC and HC if Bugert agrees to chair the TC. If not, more discussion will be needed. If Bugert does take the position, Rohr will go to Scheiwe and provide him with the news. Rohr will also contact all other applicants accordingly.

Truscott briefly stated that the Sockeye migration at Tumwater has started to fall off and they will need to push collection forward if they are to reach the brood stock collection goals. Truscott agreed to send the information by e-mail within the hour. The HC will meet on July 21 and discuss the issue in full detail.

No future CC meeting was scheduled. This concluded the discussion for today.

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
August 2, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Monday, August 2, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee (CC) met by conference call. Those in attendance were as follows:

Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Mark Miller, USFWS  
Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Shaun Seaman, CPUD  
Steve Hemstrom, CPUD  
Mike Scheiwe,  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

The purpose of the discussion was to discuss the termination of spill at Rocky Reach and Rock Island Dams. Seaman began the conversation by explaining that based on RealTime numbers, it could be time to end spill within the next few days.

Rohr took a quick moment to explain that Chelan and Douglas were in the process of finalizing Scheiwe and Bugert's contracts.

The group first discussed Rocky Reach. Hemstrom explained they had been tracking the daily numbers from the bypass. On July 30, 67 fish were counted for a 2 hour count; on July 31, 108; on August 1, 105; and on August 2, 54. Program RealTime predicted a 95.6% passage point had occurred on August 2. The total cumulative run was 17,003, conservatively. Hemstrom provided historical data of when the 95 percentile was reached in previous years: 1997, July 28; 1998, July 26; 1999, Aug. 13; and 2003, Aug. 8.

Woodin questioned the large confidence interval. Hemstrom agreed it was strange that it started small and got larger as the season progressed. Seaman thought it might be due to the difference between last year's counts (170K) and this year's counts. Marco thought it might be due to the large swing in daily counts.

Woodin noted the daily counts would have to jump above 300 to push the 95% out. Hemstrom stated that if 400 fish were counted for the next two days, that would put RealTime at 96.2% on the 4<sup>th</sup> of August. Woodin suggested they establish some kind of criteria to be used to reinstate spill if there is a large jump in the daily counts.

Seaman turned the discussion back to establishing some criteria for terminating spill first. He suggested they look at the following day counts and if they don't cause a bump in

RealTime, terminate spill at midnight. Seaman reminded the group that the bypass would continue operating through the month of August to help with the remaining subyearlings. Woodin stated he was antsy that they are truly at the 95% mark when they are expecting passage to go for another 28 days. He reiterated the need to establish some criteria to turn spill back on if daily counts increased. Seaman then suggested if less than 200 fish were counted on August 3, they would stop spill, if 250 were counted, another call would be held, and if 300 or more were counted, spill would continue. Records are indicating early migration across the region compared to the last 10 years. Graves reviewed the trap data, which shows very little recent subyearling activity in the tributaries. The group continued to discuss various criteria that could be used to reach agreement.

The committee soon agreed to the following criteria for terminating spill at Rocky Reach: If less than 250 fish were counted on August 3, 2004, at Rocky Reach, spill will be terminated at midnight on August 3, 2004. If the count on August 3, 2004 at Rocky Reach is over 250 fish, spill will continue and a conference call will be held among the parties at 3:30 pm on August 4, 2004. If, after terminating spill at Rocky Reach, counts exceed 2% of the cumulative total in one day, spill will be reinstated at midnight that same night and a Coordinating Committee conference call will be held the following day. This exception will continue until August 14, 2004.

The discussion then turned to Rock Island spill. Hemstrom informed the group that as of August 1, 2004, 94.2% of the run had passed, according to RealTime, following that day's count of 90 fish. The cumulative count was 22,178. On August 2, 2004, the count was 73, bringing the percentile of passage up to 95.48%. Seaman suggested they use similar criteria as what was agreed to for Rocky Reach, using 0.3% of the cumulative rather than a specific number, and include the same caveat for reinstating spill. Graves asked if the PUD would consider shutting spill at noon on the 4<sup>th</sup> if 0.3% or less of cumulative were counted. This would allow some travel time from Rocky Reach. Seaman agreed.

The committee agreed to the following criteria for terminating spill at Rock Island: If spill is terminated at Rocky Reach, and 0.3% or less of the cumulative total are counted on August 3, 2004 at Rock Island, then spill will be terminated at noon on August 4, 2004. If the count at Rock Island Dam is greater than 0.3% on August 3, 2004, spill will continue and a conference call will held among the parties at 3:30 pm on August 4, 2004. If, after terminating spill at Rock Island, counts exceed 2% of the cumulative total in one day, spill will be reinstated at midnight that same night and a Coordinating Committee conference call will be held the next day. This exception will continue until August 15, 2004.

The group discussed the next HCP Coordinating Committee meeting and agreed to hold it on Wednesday, September 8, 10:00 am, at SeaTac.

Woodin also noted that WDFW would be sending out a letter to the committee members requesting a joint meeting of the Coordinating Committee and the Executive Committee to formally kick-off the HCP Implementation. More to come later.

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
August 4, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Wednesday, August 04, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee met by conference call to discuss termination of Rock Island spill. The following members were in attendance:

Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Mark Miller, USFWS  
Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Steve Hemstrom, CPUD  
Mike Scheiwe,  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

The group met by conference call because counts on August 3 at Rock Island exceeded 0.3% of the cumulative total. However, on August 4, the daily count was 55, bring RealTime to say that 96.3% of the run was complete. Total cumulative passage was 22,385. Accordingly, the group agreed to terminate spill at Rock Island Dam at midnight on August 4, 2004. The decision was contingent upon the caveat that if counts exceed 2% of the cumulative total to date in one day, spill would be reinstated at midnight that same night and a Coordinating Committee conference call would be held the following day. This exception will remain in place through August 15, 2004.

After some discussion of the Executive Committee meeting, the call was adjourned.

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE EMERGENCY CONFERENCE CALL  
August 10, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Tuesday, August 10, 2004, the HCP CC met by conference call to discuss spill at Rocky Reach and Rock Island. Those in attendance were as follows:

Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Brian Cates, USFWS  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Steve Hemstrom, CPUD  
Chuck Peven, CPUD  
Mike Scheiwe  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

Having been the one to request the call, Woodin explained that since they turned off spill on August 3, the index has accumulated 4.2% of the seasonal total. He expressed his concern that within the next two days, the counts could very well kick the percentage to above 5%, therefore showing they missed the 95% of the run. Peven reminded the group that the HCP does allow them to operate to a survival standard. He stated the bypass would be operating and they could gain some valuable research on the effectiveness of spill vs. no spill during this time. He explained the current studies which show very little positive results from spill for subyearlings and the difficulty they were going to experience when they tried to explain to upper management that spill was reinstated without meeting last week's agreed upon criteria. Woodin disagreed there could be information gleaned from a no spill operation since there is no study in place. The information might be good for post season review and adjustments for 2005 operations but otherwise would be of little data value for this season.

Woodin proposed the juvenile spill of 9% of the daily average flow be reinstated starting at midnight tonight, leaving it on until the additional index counts (from the 11<sup>th</sup> forward) add up to 2% of the season cumulative. Hemstrom expressed concerns over the proposal, saying it could be well past August 14 to spill if they follow the proposed operation. He explained RealTime was saying the 95% was reached on August 5, only two days beyond spill. Woodin stated that in those 2 days they accumulated 400 fish. Hemstrom said that since it will take a large quantity of fish to get RealTime to move off the 8/5 date, they would be more likely to agree to turning spill back on for 2 days.

Graves expressed his concerns over the results they were likely to see at the end of the season if right now they are at 4.2%. He did not want to see they had failed to meet the 95%. Peven agreed and suggested for the short-term, they start spilling immediately and plan to talk again on Thursday, August 12, at noon to review the current data. Graves

suggested the spill start today at noon to make the calculation easier on Thursday. The committee agreed to the proposal.

To recap: Chelan PUD will reinstate spill on Tuesday, August 10, 2004, at 12:00 pm. The HCP CC will meet again by conference call on Thursday, August 12, 12:00 pm to review current data and make a decision to continue or discontinue spill.

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
August 12, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Thursday, August 12, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee (CC) met by conference call to continue discussion regarding spill at Rocky Reach. Those in attendance were as follows:

Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Brian Cates, USFWS  
Mark Miller, USFWS  
Steve Hemstrom, CPUD  
Chuck Peven, CPUD  
Mike Scheiwe, Anchor Environmental, LLC  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

Hemstrom began the meeting by providing current details. On August 12, the count was 215 (1.1% of cumulative), bringing the cumulative total to 18,977. RealTime stated that 97.8% had passed at this point and that 95% of the run had passed by August 10. By taking the 895 fish that passed the project without spill between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and the 10<sup>th</sup> and dividing it by the cumulative total, Hemstrom stated that 4.72% of the total run had not been spilled. This allows for only 0.3% of the total run with no spill for the remainder of the season, if 95% of the run is to be spilled.

There was some discussion over next year's operations, which may include looking at variability.

Peven suggested they target a specific number of fish that everyone can agree to for shutting down spill. Marco stated they need to take into consideration there was no spill for almost 5% of the run so the number would have to be low enough to keep the total unspilled below 5%. Woodin suggested spill continue until the 895 becomes 3.5-4.0% of the season cumulative. If they get near the end of August and haven't reached that point, they may have to reconvene to discuss the issue again. Hemstrom calculated that to drop to 4%, they would need about 2500 more fish counted. He expressed concerns over convincing their upper management that this operation is best. Woodin stated he was concerned that by shutting spill off too soon, the percentage of unspilled fish will jump above 5%.

The committee agreed a decision could not be made at this point. Accordingly, spill will continue at Rocky Reach and the committee will meet on Monday, August 16, 12:00 noon, to discuss the issue further. In addition, discussion of Rock Island spill will take place if numbers continue to increase over the weekend.



Rohr informed that committee that the Executive Committee meeting has been scheduled for Tuesday, August 31, 1:30 pm, at SeaTac. Details will follow shortly. He stated that this date was best for everyone, although we are still trying to get a NOAA Fisheries representative there.

HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
August 16, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Monday, August 16, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee (CC) met by conference call to continue discussions to terminate spill at Rocky Reach Dam. Those in attendance were as follows:

Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Brian Cates, USFWS  
Mark Miller, USFWS  
Shaun Seaman, CPUD  
Steve Hemstrom, CPUD  
Chuck Peven, CPUD  
Mike Schiewe, Anchor Environmental, LLC  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

The meeting began with Hemstrom providing current fish count data. On August 13, 212; August 14, 110; August 15, 61; and August 16, 179. These counts bring the cumulative to 19,539, 98.5% of the run according to RealTime. These counts also bring the 895 counts down to 4.58% for no spill.

At the last meeting, Chelan had suggested the committee agree to a specific daily count for criteria to terminate spill. Woodin stated on this call the number would have to be pretty small to keep below 5%. He suggested 20 fish per day for the remainder of the season might stay within the ½% available to work with. Seaman stated Chelan PUD wanted to protect as much of the run as they could. However, they are trying to find a happy medium that allows them to terminate spill before the end of August while still meeting the criteria in the HCP. He expressed his concerns over spilling for such small numbers of fish when the studies have shown spill with only 5% efficiency.

Schiewe asked if there was a number, which would run for 2-3 days, the committee would feel comfortable agreeing to for terminating spill. Woodin said he would be comfortable if the counts dropped to 20 fish or less per day for 3 days consecutively. Cates agreed the number needed to be down in that level. Woodin said they would need to get down to 99.5% of the run before shutting down. They had made a mistake agreeing to turn off spill too soon and now they need to fix the error while they had to opportunity. Hemstrom argued they used the best information they had to make that decision and doesn't feel the operation should be considered a mistake.

Schiewe asked how firm the 95% was given the uncertain relationship between 93-95%. Woodin replied it was firm. Seaman stated the coordinating committee has the flexibility within the HCP to do what they feel would be best to protect the species.

Peven asked if the committee was willing to agree on 50 fish for 3 days instead. Cates asked what the number was based on. Peven stated that spill is kind of punitive at this point and they have to convince their management that this is best for everyone. Woodin argued the survival may be small but it is positive. The number would have to be low enough to stay within 5%.

The committee agreed to meet again in a few days. In the meantime, Peven and Hemstrom would work on some alternative scenarios showing various counts and where those counts would land them in the five percentile.

The next conference call was scheduled for Wednesday, August 18, 2004, 12:00 pm. (On Tuesday, the call was moved to Thursday, August 19, 2004, 12:00 pm to accommodate Ritchie Graves and allow more time to work on the scenarios.)

## HCP COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL

August 19, 2004

### Meeting Report

By D. Rohr and Associates

On Thursday, August 19, 2004, the HCP Coordinating Committee met by conference call to continue discussions to terminate spill at Rocky Reach. Those in attendance were as follows:

Rod Woodin, WDFW  
Jerry Marco, Colville Tribes  
Brian Cates, USFWS  
Mark Miller, USFWS  
Ritchie Graves, NOAA Fisheries  
Shaun Seaman, CPUD  
Steve Hemstrom, CPUD  
Chuck Peven, CPUD  
Mike Schiewe, Anchor Environmental, LLC  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

Hemstrom began the meeting by providing the current fish count status at Rocky Reach: On August 17, 86 subs were counted; August 18, 40 subs; August 19, 41 subs. This brought the cumulative total to 19,706, which equated the 895 fish passage without spill to 4.54%.

Hemstrom and Peven had worked on some scenarios of the percentage of passage that would occur if spill was terminated on August 19, 2004. Scenario 1, which was the most realistic, followed a slow decline over the remainder of August, averaging 14 fish per day. This scenario predicted spill would be met for 94.74% of the run. Scenario 2 modeled the sub count at 20 fish per day for the remainder of August and predicted spill would be met for 94.41% of the run. Scenarios 3, 4, and 5 increased by 10 fish per day and the percentage of the fish run spilled for slowly decreased. All scenarios fell short of 95%.

Seaman stated the range of efficiency is broad. Some years they will be over, sometimes under, and to narrow it down to exactly 95% will be difficult. Peven suggested if they get 40 fish or less again tomorrow, they terminate spill. If counts increase, the group could reconvene. Woodin stated he did some scenarios as well but it was difficult to guess what would happen if they shut spill off tomorrow. The operation would be contingent upon whether those 895 fish go above 5%. Cates sated if they turn spill off for 4 days and the counts shoot up again, it will be extremely difficult to catch back up.

Seaman again stated the PUD's discomfort of focusing on a definitive percentage with a very loose science. It seems odd to continue to hold to exactly 95%. Woodin argued they agreed to reduce spill to 9% based on one year of data, which showed flexibility on

their end. Seaman said he understood and they really appreciated that flexibility. However, they are still arguing over 0.25%. Marco argued on the other end, they could be arguing over 1-2%. There is just no way to tell right now.

Woodin suggested the PUD turn spill off and start adding additional index data to the 895. If the numbers get near 5%, turn spill back on. Peven asked if there was flexibility to get to 5.5% instead. Graves said he agreed the cumulative index is the ultimate measure. He suggested the group think about how the season will be evaluated this winter. Will they be evaluating the data on route specific information? What is the purpose of this exercise? Peven reminded the group as they go forward through the years, they will be able to refine the process. This winter, they will conduct an evaluation of what would have been the best data to use in making the decision to terminate spill.

Schiewe asked the group what they thought of Woodin's proposal. Seaman said they would like to turn off spill and keep it off if the trend continues to decline. Cates suggested if they need more assurance, why not just go a few more days with spill. Woodin said if they wait until the 20<sup>th</sup> to terminate spill, he would be agreeable to go to 5.2%. Seaman stated only 40 fish would bump it to above 5.2%.

Schiewe asked the members to state their opinions on what process they would feel is best. Marco compared the process to a poker game. He stated the situation this year is unique because they turned off spill too early. He understands the difficulty with turning spill off and on. However, he is still not comfortable where they are for spill protection and thought spill should continue for a few more days. The lesson learned this year was to not be so hasty to shut down spill in future years. Graves agreed saying once it is behind, it is difficult to catch up. Cates agreed with Marco. Arguing over such small percentages is unproductive. He would agree to a few more days of spill, see where that lands us, and discuss off-season in hopes of doing better next year. Woodin said he would agree to 2 more days of spill and then shutting it off for the season as long as the daily index counts stay below an average of 50 fish for the next 2 days. Seaman stated Chelan could live with that. If the index counts are above 100 fish for the two days, spill will continue and the group will meet again by conference call on Monday morning at 10:30 am. The rest of the committee agreed.

To recap the final decision:

If the index counts at Rocky Reach for August 20 and 21, 2004, average 100 fish or less, spill will be terminated at midnight on Saturday, August 21. If the counts exceed 100 fish, spill will continue through Sunday, August 22, and the Coordinating Committee will reconvene by conference call on Monday, August 23, at 10:30 am. Spill may be terminated at noon on Monday, August 23, depending on the counts for Sunday, August 22, 2004.



Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.  
1423 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Suite 300  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
Phone 206.287.9130  
Fax 206.287.9131

## Final Memorandum

---

**To:** Wells, Rocky Reach, and Rock Island HCP Coordinating Committees

**From:** Michael Schiewe, Chair, HCP Coordinating Committees

**CC:** Shaun Seaman, Chuck Peven, Andrew Grassell, Shane Bickford, Bill Tweit, Bill Towey, Brian Cates, Ritchie Graves, Dick Nason, Ali Wick

**Date:** December 17, 2004

**Re:** Final Minutes of October 12, 2004 HCP Coordinating Committees Meeting

---

The Wells, Rocky Reach, Rock Island Dams Habitat Conservation Plans Coordinating Committees met at the Portland International Airport Conference Center in Portland, Oregon on October 12, 2004 from 10:00 am to 3:00 pm. Attendees included are listed in *Attachment A*.

### Action Item Summary:

- Mike Schiewe will draft a letter on behalf of the Coordinating Committees inviting the non-signatory parties and Grant County to participate as non-voting members of the Tributary and Hatchery Committees, and requesting each party designate a point of contact for receiving agendas and final minutes of the Committees meetings. Unless the FERC ruling on the CRITFC request requires reconsideration of the Policy Committees agreement on involvement of the non-signatories, the letter would be finalized and sent prior to the next Tributary Committee meeting scheduled for November 24, 2004.
- Shaun Seaman and Shane Bickford will develop a list of actions planned for the coming year, and use the timing of those actions to draft a proposed timeline for meetings of the Mid-Columbia Forum.
- Chelan PUD (Andrew Grassell) will confer with John Skalski and advise the Committee on the statistical implications of the non-overlapping standard error bars on acoustic vs. PIT tag survival estimates for yearling Chinook in 2004.
- Chelan PUD (Andrew Grassell) will prepare a summary of past reports on radio tag and PIT tag estimates of adult fallback at the HCP projects. This summary will include overshoots and fallbacks by hatchery program.
- Mike Schiewe will develop an outline for the HCP Annual Reports to FERC, and will communicate with Bob Bugert on how to integrate the Tributary Committee's report into this document.
- Chelan County (Chuck Peven) will craft a short written statement stating what the Committee is being asked to agree to, regarding tagging methods and survival for studies for

sockeye, subyearling Chinook, and steelhead. These issues will be on the agenda for the next Coordinating Committees meeting.

- Ali Wick will check with the group on a potential standing meeting date for monthly meetings.

**Decision Summary:**

- Consistent with the Decision Tree for approval of “stand alone” acoustic tag survival studies, the Committee agreed that Chelan PUD has met the requirement for 2 or more years of side-by-side comparisons with yearling Chinook salmon in which the means were within 1.25 percentage points.
- Based on 3-year average project survival estimates of 94.4% and 93.5% (acoustic tag and PIT tag study results, respectively), Chelan PUD has completed Phase I (passing the 93% project survival standard) for yearling Chinook salmon at Rock Island Dam (RI).

**Meeting Minutes:**

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

(Mike Schiewe)

See Attachment A for list of attendees.

**II. Brief Update on Hatchery and Tributary Committees**

(Mike Schiewe and Bob Bugert)

Mike Schiewe updated the Committee on the following Hatchery Committees activities:

- The Chelan PUD Facilities Evaluation Report is nearing completion and will be made available for review by Committee members prior to the November meeting.
- Chelan PUD is reviewing the WDFW Hatchery Improvement List and providing feedback and comments to WDFW on this list.
- The review period for the Chelan Hatchery M&E Plan has been extended to Oct 22, 2004 and will be on the agenda for the November meeting of the Hatchery Committees.
- Development of a Douglas PUD Hatchery M&E Plan is just starting. It will be very similar to the Chelan plan, but will be a separate document so as not to delay finalizing the Chelan plan.
- The Hatchery Committees approved the Canadian Flow Management Model proposed by Douglas PUD to meet their sockeye mitigation requirement.
- Grant PUD will fund the Skaha Lake sockeye fry reintroduction program for the 2004-2005 brood cycles.

Bob Bugert updated the group on the following major Tributary Committees activities:

- A document describing the general operating procedures for the Committees are nearing finalization.
- A document describing funding policies and procedures is being developed and is expected to be completed in early winter. The intended audience includes the stakeholders in North Central Washington.

- The committee is drafting a protocol (including an application form) for new tributary projects, and is discussing the potential role of the Regional Technical Team (RTT) in the review process.
- Bugert raised the subject of coordination of the Tributary Committees activities with Grant PUD. Several Committees members commented on the value such coordination, but there were several questions (which couldn't be answered) regarding Grant PUD's interest in coordination with the HCP committees.
- Bugert indicated that he hoped that the decision of the Policy Committee regarding non-signatories could be communicated to the parties prior to the next Tributary Committees meeting on November 24, 2004.

**III. FERC Rehearing Request Update** (Ritchie Graves)

Ritchie Graves updated the group on a recent meeting with CRITFC staff and other interested parties on this matter. He commented that non-signatories will still need to be approached regarding this request. He also noted that the NNI in the HCP is different from that in the Priest Rapids Settlement Agreement, with the latter requiring additional funding for failure to achieve the 91% survival standard. Bill Tweit clarified that the NNI in the HCP and the Priest Rapids Settlement Agreement is, for all practical purposes, quite similar; this is because Chelan and Douglas PUDs are not expected to come up short of the survival standard, whereas Grant PUD is expected to have a shortfall. Chelan PUD addressed their potential shortfall by constructing the new juvenile fish bypass system at Rocky Reach Dam.

**IV. Preliminary Results of 2004 Study Season** (Andrew Grassell and Chuck Peven)

Andrew Grassell and Chuck Peven summarized the results of the 2004 study season, discussing the following:

- Spill coverage at Rocky Reach (RR) exceeded the goal of 95% of the run for sockeye (98%); for subyearling Chinook coverage was slightly under the goal (94%). At Rock Island (RI), yearling Chinook and sockeye spill coverage was slightly below the goal, (93.47 and 90.02%, respectively), while subyearling Chinook coverage met the goal, and steelhead were above the coverage goal (98.38 and 95%, respectively). Chelan noted that all of these values are based on end of season calculations, which consider the entire run periods after all the fish have passed.
- Survival estimates at RR in 2004 for yearling Chinook salmon were 92.9% and 92.6% (for acoustic tag and PIT tag studies, respectively); and for steelhead were 98.3% (acoustic tag only). Survival estimates at RI in 2004 for yearling Chinook were 94.2% and 91.4% (for acoustic tag and PIT tag studies, respectively); and for steelhead was 96.6% (acoustic tag only). Based on 3-year average project survival estimates of 94.4% and 93.5% (acoustic tag and PIT tag study results, respectively), Chelan PUD has completed Phase I (passing the 93% project survival standard) for yearling Chinook salmon at Rock Island Dam (RI). Peven indicated that results for the other plan species were still being analysed (to be



completed by Oct. 27<sup>th</sup>). Following the analysis, Chelan PUD will be evaluating what the results mean in operational terms.

- Results of the yearling Chinook survival studies at Rocky Reach indicated that there was a decrease in survival after May 6<sup>th</sup> – and that this coincided with the start of spill. A multivariate analysis exploring the relationship between survival and spill, temperature, flow, and dissolved gas failed to demonstrate that any one factor explained this change in survival.
- Comparisons of acoustic and PIT tag studies with yearling Chinook showed that results for 2002 and 2003 were similar at RR and RI in 2004. Based on the results of these studies and the decision tree, Chelan PUD asked the group to consider eliminating the need for additional side-by-side PIT and acoustic tag studies with yearling Chinook, and to accept acoustic tags in the future. Chelan is planning on a side-by-side study with Steelhead at RR in 05 as agreed to in 2003 by the committee to support the use of the acoustic tags for this species. The Committee agreed with acceptance of the acoustic tags for yearling Chinook for remaining Phase I studies but reserved that the technology used for steelhead should wait until after the 2005 studies and the Phase III 10-year evaluations should be determined at the time of the evaluation so as to consider the state-of-the-art at that time. Chelan PUD also asked the Committees to consider accepting acoustic tag studies for sockeye and possibly subyearling Chinook. No final decision was reached, pending the preparation of a short written statement stating exactly what the Committee was being asked to agree to at the next meeting. The discussions on tagging methods and survival for studies for sockeye, subyearling Chinook, and steelhead will be on the agenda for the next Coordinating Committees meeting.
- Andrew Grassell reported that Battelle's acoustic tag effects studies showed that sockeye experienced no tag mortality, but that subyearling Chinook experienced a high percentage of mortality. These results suggest the present generation of acoustic tags may not be a useful tool for survival studies conducted with sub-yearling chinook. Although analyses of these data are still incomplete, preliminary results suggest that temperature was a complicating factor in the high mortality experienced by subyearling Chinook. Completed study results will be presented at the next meeting.

Chuck Peven discussed the following upcoming work preliminarily planned for 2005:

- 3D analysis at RR and RI, triple release survival studies at RR (depending on results from John Skalski's work on subyearling Chinook), potential lamprey passage studies, and adult fallback studies at RR. A side-by-side (acoustic and PIT tag) steelhead survival study will be conducted at RR.
- Ritchie Graves requested a summary of past reports on adult radio-tag estimates related to fallback percentages at all three of the PUD projects. Chelan PUD and Douglas PUD agreed to prepare this summary; this

summary would include PIT-tag estimates of overshoot rates by hatchery and differences in fallback rates between hatchery and wild radio-tagged fish.

- Adult ladder maintenance at both projects and RR PIT coil installation will be initiated next season. Ritchie Graves suggested that Chelan PUD check with the USFWS on bull trout issues for this work.
- An over/under spill gate will be tested at RI next season. Initial model testing has indicated that this configuration could improve fish passage efficiency. Currently, the plan is to install this in winter and test with balloon tags in March 2005.

**V. Sockeye Flow Management Agreement** (Shane Bickford)

Shane Bickford updated the committee that the Hatchery Committee had given their approval that implementation of the Canadian Flow Management Model would satisfy Douglas PUD's sockeye mitigation responsibility. The Coordinating Committee agreed that they were comfortable with the Hatchery Committee's decision.

**VI. Committee Action Plan for 2005** (Shaun Seaman and Chuck Peven)

Action Plans: It was discussed that this Action Plan would be a short document, with separate sections for each of the HCP projects (Wells, RR, and RI), with the goal of describing plans for the coming year. This document would be provided to all committees to share with their respective organizations. Shaun Seaman and Shane Bickford will develop and circulate a draft prior to the next Coordinating Committees meeting.

Annual Reports: Mike Schiewe noted that it was time to start thinking about a schedule for preparing annual reports. Ritchie Graves will look up when the annual reports need to be prepared per FERC. It was suggested that these should be submitted by the end of March and prior to the new study season. They should focus on the previous study season's results. Mike Schiewe will draft an outline.

**VII. Committee Protocols** (Mike Schiewe)

Mike Schiewe led the group in a discussion of the following points:

- A) Agendas: Issues that require a decision should be submitted 10 days prior to the meeting, along with any pertinent handouts. Although the agenda can be amended at the beginning of the meeting for any additional items, the goal will be to circulate a near-final agenda 5 days before the meeting.
- B) Decisions: Decisions considered at committee meetings may be deferred by any member for up to 5 days following the meeting. This is to take into account new information or parties not being able to review documents in time for the meeting. A member can request a delay for a particular decision only once per the HCPs.
- C) Minutes: Draft minutes will be provided in memo format within one week of each meeting and then one week will be given for comments. Draft minutes will be sent to

Committee members and attending alternates only – with each member being responsible for forwarding the drafts within their own agency. Any edits or suggested changes should be returned to Ali Wick by the Committee members only. Each meeting will be opened with an approval of the previous minutes, after which the meeting minutes will be amended as final if necessary and re-sent to the attendees and committee members.

- D) Location: An effort will be made to coordinate this with Hatchery Committees meetings if possible. The next Coordinating Committees meeting will be scheduled by email, but the Committees will consider setting a standing meeting date to be cancelled if needed.
- E) Timing and Alternates: Committee members will notify the Chair of their inability to attend any meeting in advance of that meeting, and provide the name of an alternate. Alternates will retain decision-making authority for their respective entities.
- F) Next Meeting: Ali will contact committee members on their availability for a meeting coincident with the Hatchery meeting in SeaTac, possibly on Monday, November 8<sup>th</sup>, and their availability and preference for standing monthly meetings.

**Attachment A**  
**List of Attendees**

---

Michael Schiewe *	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Ali Wick	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Bob Bugert	Consultant (Chair, Tributary Committee) (by phone)
Bill Towey *	Colville Tribes
Shane Bickford *	Douglas PUD
Andrew Grassell	Chelan PUD
Shaun Seaman *	Chelan PUD
Chuck Peven	Chelan PUD
Steve Hays	Chelan PUD (by phone)
Brian Cates *	USFWS
Ritchie Graves *	NOAA Fisheries
Bill Tweit *	WDFW
Dick Nason	Dick Nason Consulting

\* Denotes Hatchery Committees member or alternate



Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.  
1423 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Suite 300  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
Phone 206.287.9130  
Fax 206.287.9131

## Final Memorandum

---

**To:** Wells, Rocky Reach, and Rock Island HCP Coordinating Committees

**From:** Michael Schiewe, Chair, HCP Coordinating Committees

**CC:** Chuck Peven, Carmen Andonaegui, Steve Hays, Tracey Steig, Rich Townsend, John Skalski, Curt Smith, Al Giorgi, Bob Clubb, Dick Nason, Ali Wick

**Date:** January 27, 2005

**Re:** Final Minutes of December 13, 2004 HCP Coordinating Committees Meeting

---

The Wells, Rocky Reach, Rock Island Dams Habitat Conservation Plans Coordinating Committees met at the Prime Hotel in SeaTac, Washington on December 13, 2004 from 9:30 am to 3:00 pm. Attendees included are listed in Meeting Minutes Attachment A.

### **ACTION ITEM SUMMARY**

- Chelan PUD will send out the 2005 Action Plan to committee members before the next Coordinating Committees meeting of 2005 (Item II).
- Chelan PUD will provide a report of expected impacts to fish from the Rocky Reach Trunion bearing replacement project at the next meeting (Item III).
- Chuck Peven will prepare a statement of agreement detailing how Chelan PUD views the use of 2004 survival study data, to be provided before the next Coordinating Committees meeting (Item VI, paragraph 2).
- Chuck Peven will attach the decision tree to the summary statement of tagging methods, adding a qualifier to the agreement that this is based on current knowledge as of the start of 2005, and will email this to the committees for their review; approval will be on the agenda for the next meeting (Item VII, paragraph 2).
- Shane Bickford agreed to provide a written summary of recent discussions with the State Auditor to the Committees and Grant PUD (Item IX).
- Chelan PUD will prepare a statement of agreement regarding its intentions for: a) timing of the spill studies once the run of fish begins; and, b) the overlap between spill and the study plan (Item IX, paragraph 1).

- Chelan PUD will amend the fallback statement of agreement for consideration at the next meeting, with changes applied (Item XI, paragraph 3).
- Douglas PUD was asked to provide a more detailed summary of fallback and fate of fallback fish to the committee prior to the January 2005 meeting (Item XI, paragraph 3).
- Mike Schiewe or Ali Wick will circulate Annual Report outlines for committee review and comment prior to the next meeting (Item XII).
- Committee members will be thinking about what information they would include or exclude from the public website, which will be discussed at the next meeting. Bob Bugert will be included in this discussion (Item XIII).

## **DECISION POINT SUMMARY**

- Committee members agreed with the study plans presented regarding the implementation of Chelan PUD's planned 2005 studies (Item X, paragraph 2).
- The Committees decided to revisit the fallback statement of agreement at the next meeting, with changes applied (Item X, paragraph 3).

## **MEETING MINUTES**

### **I. Welcome and Introductions (Mike Schiewe)**

See Meeting Minutes Attachment A for list of attendees.

Mike Schiewe opened the meeting by asking for approval of the October 12, 2004 Committee Meeting Minutes. Shaun Seaman had minor revisions to these Minutes, and the Minutes were approved subject to these changes (Ali Wick will send out final Minutes by email). In the future, revised Meeting Minutes will be sent out in redline-strikeout version and will include names of commenters adjacent to their comments.

### **II. 2005 Action Plan (Shaun Seaman)**

Shaun Seaman updated the Committees on the Chelan PUD 2005 Action Plan. The goal is to have a single, concise document that describes the major actions and events that the committees can expect from Chelan PUD during the calendar year. Chelan PUD will send this out before the next Coordinating Committees meeting.

### **III. Rocky Reach Spill Gate Bearing Replacement (Shaun Seaman and Steve Hays)**

Steve Hays updated the group that this work is needed to maintain safe operation of the spill gates. The work will begin with spillway Number 8 this year. The current schedule is to begin work in March 2005, with work to be completed in June 2005. Hays commented that Chelan PUD has looked at the spill plan and expects imperceptible impacts to fish, and that plans for this spillway work will be included in the spill plan. Jerry Marco suggested scheduling this work during out-years so there would be no impacts to fish. Shaun Seaman commented that Chelan PUD will provide a more detailed report discussing these impacts at the next meeting.

### **IV. Ladder Outages (Rocky Reach and Rock Island) 2004-2005 (Chuck Peven)**

Chuck Peven updated the group that Larry Basham has provided comments to Chelan PUD regarding power operations to benefit fish passage during ladder power outages. His suggestion was to shift the power load to Powerhouse 1 when the right fishway is down in order to further attract fish to the left and center ladders. Chuck Peven commented that in response to these suggestions, Chelan PUD does load Powerhouse 2 primarily but that it is not possible to shift power to Powerhouse 1 as requested because there is currently work going on in Powerhouse 1.

Ritchie Graves suggested that Chelan PUD continue to take into account Mr. Basham's comments because of his expertise with adult passage. Shaun Seaman agreed with this suggestion and commented that Chelan PUD will recognize this expertise and will continue to bring Mr. Basham's suggestions to the group.

### **V. FERC Reporting on Rocky Reach Bypass System (Shaun Seaman)**

Shaun Seaman updated the group on Chelan PUD plans for filing the Rocky Reach bypass report to FERC. This report will be filed by February 15, 2005, and prior to this, will be submitted to the committees by January 15, 2005 for their review. Shaun commented that even though the committees have a 30-day review period for this report, Chelan PUD would encourage expedited comments in order to facilitate timely filing.

**VI. Rock Island PIT and Acoustic Tag Comparison (John Skalski)**

John Skalski and Rich Townsend provided a presentation on the average difference between the two tag types (Meeting Minutes Attachment B). This presentation included information on study design, survival estimates, and trends in survival, including route-specific survival. In general, Skalski was comfortable with the results gained for route-specific survival and relative survival through the collectors. However, small sample sizes limited the ability to identify statistically significant differences around passage routes.

There was discussion regarding residualization of sub-yearlings and that low survival may be a combination of mortality and residualization. Chuck Peven commented that Chelan PUD may look at reconsidering criteria for subyearlings. Chelan PUD agreed to prepare a decision agreement detailing how Chelan PUD views the use of these data, which will be provided to the Committees before the next meeting.

**VII. Appropriate Tag Methods (Shaun Seaman and Chuck Peven)**

Chuck Peven led a discussion of the proposed statement of agreement for tagging methods (Meeting Minutes Attachment C). Committee comments were as follows:

- Ritchie Graves – NOAA Fisheries' concern is that the two tag types may measure different things and that PIT tags provide information further downstream than acoustic tags because of the location of the transceivers. However, he was willing to agree with the summary statement.
- Bill Tweit – WDFW agreed that the decision tree had been followed and agreed with the summary statement.
- Jerry Marco – Colville Tribes would like a statement added that qualifies that this is based on the state of current knowledge.
- Brian Cates – USFWS agrees with the summary statement.

Chuck Peven agreed to attach the decision tree and add a qualifier to the summary agreement that this is based on the current knowledge as of the start of 2005. Peven will email this to the committees for their further review and this will be on the agenda for the next meeting.



### **VIII. Recent FERC Order and Mid-Columbia Forum (Mike Schiewe)**

Mike Schiewe opened this discussion by asking Shane Bickford to relay the information the committee has recently received from FERC (issued November 23, 2004). Bickford commented that among the items in the Order, FERC has denied the CRITFC request for voting status in the HCP Committees. FERC also clearly articulated that the Mid-Columbia proceeding has been terminated including the provision that the HCP Coordinating Committee be required to cross coordinate with the Mid-Columbia Coordinating Committees.

Mike Schiewe commented that he had confirmed with the non-signatory parties their interest level in participating as non-voting members in future committee meetings. The following summarizes these contacts:

- Steve Parker of the Yakamas.
- Gary James of the Umatillas indicated that the Umatillas were not likely to participate.
- Tom Dresser of Grant PUD indicated that Grant PUD was interested in participating and Chris Carlson and Tom Dresser will be the representative for the Hatchery Committees and Tom Dresser and Russell Langshaw will be the representative for Tributary Committees.
- Brett Swift of American Rivers indicated that American Rivers was likely interested, but does not have a designee at this time.

There was discussion about the non-signing parties' interest in participating in the Mid-Columbia Forum and the future timing for these meetings. The committee consensus was that it would likely be most useful if these meetings were held in March to review study plans and later in the year to provide study results. It may be necessary to gauge the response level and ask other committees what they forecast the interest level of the non-signatories to be.

### **IX. Tributary Committees Update**

Bob Bugert provided the following information to Mike Schiewe regarding progress in the Tributary Committees. He indicated that most of the effort has been directed toward developing a process for soliciting, reviewing, and approving habitat projects. Bugert

anticipated that RFPs would be sent out in March 2005, with a tentative due date in September 2005, and decision-making in Winter 2006. These dates apply for larger projects (in general, those totaling >\$25,000) and there may be a separate process for smaller projects. There have been discussions with the state auditor culminating in an understanding of the project regarding the land/assets associated with these potential projects. Shane Bickford agreed to provide to the members of the Tributary and Coordinating Committees and to Grant PUD a written commentary, related to Douglas PUD's discussions with the State Auditor's Office, to the members of the Tributary and Coordinating Committees and to Grant PUD in this matter.

**X. 2004 Study Results and 2005 Study Designs (John Skalski)**

John Skalski provided an overview of planned studies for 2005. The planned study matrices, sent out before the meeting, were amended to include checkmarks for sockeye studies under project survival and route-specific survival (see Agenda Attachment C, here amended as Meeting Minutes Attachment D). The decision whether to conduct 14-day or 24-day studies will be made prior to initiating the studies. Some committee members voiced concern about edge effects in the transition period between spill and no-spill. John Skalski commented that these effects would blur the distinction between the two treatments, affecting the power and magnitude of the estimate of treatment effect. Shane Bickford suggested that Chelan PUD check the diel passage data to find the peak of fish passing. Most fish were passing at 5 am, so it could be possible to investigate managing the transition time to occur outside this period. Before the next meeting, Chelan PUD will provide a decision agreement of their intentions regarding: a) timing of the studies once the run of fish begins; and, b) the overlap between spill and the study plan.

Al Giorgi provided a presentation of the 2005 proposed study to investigate the relationship between spill and fish passage locations (turbines versus surface collector; Meeting Minutes Attachment E). These studies aim to estimate passage route survival and to document the shift in approach paths, forebay distribution, and passage locations under spill versus non-spill conditions. Overall, the committees agreed with the plans presented regarding the implementation of these studies.

## **XI. Adult Fallback Summary (Shane Bickford and Chuck Peven)**

Shane Bickford and Chuck Peven provided a summary of adult fallback studies from past years at the Wells, Rocky Reach, and Rock Island projects (see Agenda Attachments G, H, I). Chuck Peven led a discussion about the fallback results and asked the committees to concur with a statement of agreement verifying that Chelan PUD has met its obligation to measure fall back rates of adults prior to the end of Phase I of the HCP (Section 5.4.2.d of the HCP states that the PUD must determine the biological significance of fallback events on the overall fitness of adult plan species).

Committee members and meeting attendees had the following comments regarding the statement of agreement:

- Carmen Andonaegui: Sample sizes of historical studies may not have been large enough to determine that Chelan PUD has taken appropriate measures to reduce fallback.
- Bill Tweit: What is biologically significant has not been defined.
- Ritchie Graves: It could be important for Chelan PUD to do fallback studies with radio tags and PIT tags, using returning PIT tag fish to determine origin and radio-tagging to track returning spawners. Further, because most of the fallback studies at Rocky Reach were conducted prior to installation of the bypass system there may be a need to verify that the levels observed in the past are consistent with the existing features at the dam including the new bypass system.

The committees deferred a decision until Rocky Reach operations have been resolved. Shane Bickford expressed the opinion that deferring the decision at Rocky Reach should not prevent a decision at Wells or Rock Island. He was concerned that Douglas PUD would remain in Phase I, despite having the fallback data, juvenile survival data, and consistent operations at the Wells project throughout all of the studies conducted to date. The committees decided to amend the decision agreement for consideration at the next meeting with the following changes: a) Chelan PUD has demonstrated that spring chinook, steelhead, and sockeye fallback studies are acceptable for Phase I; b) the PUD is expecting substantial changes at Rocky Reach and possible hatchery operations; and, c) Douglas PUD is supportive of implementing further studies should substantial changes be made in project

operations in the future. Shane Bickford agreed to provide a more detailed summary of fallback and fate of fallback fish to the Committees prior to the January 2005 meeting.

**XII. Annual Reports (Mike Schiewe)**

These reports (one each for Rocky Reach, Rock Island, and Wells) need to be ready to submit by the end of March 2005; Mike Schiewe or Ali Wick will circulate outlines for these reports prior to the next meeting.

**XIII. HCP Website (Mike Schiewe)**

Mike Schiewe encouraged committee members to be thinking about what information they would include or exclude from this public site, to be discussed at the next meeting.

**XIV. Other Issues (Mike Schiewe)**

Ritchie Graves updated the committees that critical habitat designations have been proposed for parts of the Entiat and Wenatchee, and that descriptions of the effected areas are out for comment at this time. One of the subproposals is that HCP areas are exempt in the final designation rule, and that any basin owned more than 45 percent by the federal government is exempt.

**List of Meeting Minute Attachments:**

Attachment A: List of Attendees

Attachment B: Skalski Presentation (.ppt)

Attachment C: Agreement Statement for Appropriate Tag Methodology

Attachment D: Revised Study Matrices for 2005

Attachment E: Giorgi Presentation (.ppt)

**Attachment A  
List of Attendees**

---

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Michael Schiewe *	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Ali Wick	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Jerry Marco *	Colville Tribes
Shane Bickford *	Douglas PUD
Bob Clubb	Douglas PUD
Shaun Seaman *	Chelan PUD
Chuck Peven	Chelan PUD
Steve Hays	Chelan PUD
Brian Cates *	USFWS
Ritchie Graves *	NOAA Fisheries
Bill Tweit *	WDFW
Carmen Andonaegui	WDFW
John Skalski	UW
Rich Townsend	UW
Al Giorgi	Bioanalysts
Curt Smitch	Thompson Smitch Consulting Group
Tracey Steig	HTI
Dick Nason	Dick Nason Consulting

\* Denotes Coordinating Committees member or alternate

---

**APPENDIX B**  
**HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN HATCHERY COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

---

# HCP HATCHERY COMMITTEE MEETING

Wells, Rocky Reach and Rock Island HCPs

Thursday, September 2, 2004

9:30 – 4:30

Chelan County PUD Offices

327 N. Wenatchee Ave.

Wenatchee, Washington

## Final Summary Notes

### I. Welcome and Introductions (Mike Schiewe, Chair)

See attachment A for list of attendees.

### II. Chelan M&E Plan (Chuck Peven, Chelan PUD)

Chuck Peven introduced the Draft Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (Plan). The plan includes HCP goals and hatchery objective goals which are directly linked to indicators for those goals such that each objective has one “target” or “primary” indicator. Peven set a one-month review period, stating Oct. 1 as the due date for comments. He would like the Committee to especially consider whether targets are set up correctly to meet the primary indicators. Chuck will be out of the office during the next few weeks, and so requested that in the interim, questions should be sent to Andrew Murdoch, with written final comments sent to Peven. Following addressing these comments, it is his intent to send the Plan out for regional peer review with the intention to complete it by the end of July 2005 for implementation in 2006.

### III. Skaha Lake Sockeye Program (Deana Machin, Okanagan Nation Alliance (ONA))

Deana Machin presented the current plan being developed by the Okanagan Nation Alliance (ONA) to re-establish sockeye salmon into the Okanagan Basin. She gave a brief history of the project and discussed recent plans and reviews, including an annual review by the Canadian Okanagan Basin Technical Working Group (composed of Canadian federal and provincial agencies and First Nations). Machin discussed the Risk Assessment conducted in 2000-2003 which evaluated potential issues associated with the reintroduction, concluding that the introductions posed little risk with regard to fish disease or invasive exotic fish species. The current plan includes a 12-year program with objectives to be

evaluated in 3-year increments. The ONA is hoping to have funds in place by mid-September.

#### IV. Canadian Flow Management Program (Rick Klinge, Douglas PUD)

Rick Klinge briefly described the history behind and the current status of the flow management program. Given the current status and based upon the results presented at the June Wells Coordinating Committees meeting, Mr. Klinge asked for the committee to approve the flow management program as Douglas PUD's long-term mitigation program for sockeye losses at Wells Dam. Kim Hyatt (DFO) summarized the results of a twenty five year retrospective analysis of the flow management program that demonstrated that the program, on average, would increase the number of sockeye smolts leaving Osoyoos Lake by 55%. Klinge pointed out that given that the Wells HCP only requires a 7% increase in sockeye survival, the proposed implementation of the flow management program should more than meet the needs of the Wells HCP. Kristine Petersen (NOAA – Fisheries) requested the opportunity to review and have intra-agency discussions on this topic. There was discussion by the committee as to whether this was a Hatchery or Coordinating Committee issue. Bickford pointed out that this particular topic was covered under both the Hatchery and Coordinating Committee sections of the HCP and that it was appropriate to discuss in this forum. This issue will be put on the agenda for the next Hatchery Committee meeting and a decision on the use of the flow management program to meet NNI for sockeye is expected at that meeting.

#### V. Discussion: Grant/Douglas Hatchery Agreement (Shane Bickford, Douglas PUD)

A discussion was held regarding current and future plans to have Douglas PUD raise mitigation and study fish for Grant PUD. The framework of this plan is contained within the Grant-Douglas Hatchery Interlocal Cooperation Agreement that was distributed via e-mail to the committee prior to the meeting. The specifics of the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement were discussed at the June broodstock meeting and received general support from the committee. Based upon committee acceptance at the June meeting, WDFW incorporated Grant's fish rearing requests into the 2004 brood stock protocol. Since the June meeting, several of the key issues have been addressed that were impeding full implementation of the Grant-Douglas Hatchery Cooperation Agreement including HCP approval by FERC, the issuance of Grant PUD's Hydro BiOp and the development and subsequent approval of the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement by Douglas PUD's and Grant PUD's commissioners.

Bickford indicated that the Cooperation Agreement before the committee today, is a 10-year framework document covering the legal, financial and fish rearing aspects associated with Douglas PUD raising fish for Grant PUD. The intent of the Agreement is to gain HCP committee approval, on a yearly basis, for the



various fish rearing programs requested by Grant. Provided that the Hatchery Committee would be able allowed to review and if needed alter any of the various rearing programs covered by the Cooperation Agreement, on an annual basis, the WDFW, USFWS, Colville and NOAA Fisheries Hatchery Committee representatives approved the Cooperation Agreement and approved the three rearing groups requested by Grant PUD for 2004. The groups approved for implementation during 2004 included 100,000 steelhead and 201,000 spring chinook to be raised at mitigation for losses at the Priest Rapids Project and 150,000 steelhead for use in Grant PUD's scheduled 2006 survival study.

VI. Discussion: Skaha Mitigation Opportunity (Mike Schiewe, Chair)

A discussion was held regarding the mitigation opportunity presented by the ONA earlier in the meeting. Concerns were voiced that the results of the Lake Wenatchee project may affect whether this will be necessary to meet the HCP's requirement of 300,000 smolts. Kris Peterson of NOAA Fisheries mentioned that it should be looked at as a package deal in a proposal from Chelan PUD. A conference call to discuss this proposal was set for 8 am on Sep. 15<sup>th</sup> and Shaun Seaman agreed to circulate a document outlining the preferred option prior to this call.

VII. Discussion: 2005 Wells Steelhead Adult Broodstock and Expected Production (Kirk Truscott, WDFW)

A discussion was held confirming the numbers and arrangement for entities requesting steelhead smolts for mitigation and survival study purposes. Kirk Truscott gave a description of these groups, noting that broodstock for production fish above Wells will be 33% wild and 67% hatchery origin, and that survival study fish will be 100% of hatchery origin. Included in this discussion was the elimination of the 100,000 steelhead requested by Chelan PUD for survival studies in 2006. The committee members discussed and agreed to the revised Wells steelhead brood stock collection goal. The revised Wells Hatchery steelhead production groups, as described by Kirk, and as agreed to by the committee included;

- 49,000 H x W steelhead for Wells HCP passage losses (3.8% loss)
- 300,000 H x W steelhead for Wells Dam inundation compensation
- 100,000 H x W steelhead for Grant BiOp implementation
- 150,000 H x H steelhead for Grant PUD's 2006 survival study
- 100,000 H x W steelhead for the Winthrop National Hatchery
- 180,000 H x H steelhead for the Ringold Springs Program

VIII. Chelan Facilities Report (Chuck Peven, Chelan PUD)

Chuck Peven discussed the Chelan Facilities Report and indicated that Chelan PUD has comments only from WDFW thus far. He described the Independent and Dependent actions that will need to be considered in these comments. He would like to hear from the remainder of the Committee before Friday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, or comments can be sent to Shaun Seaman after that date. Following receipt of these comments, Kevin Kytola will summarize them and send that summary to the group.

IX. WDFW Preliminary Priorities List (Kirk Truscott, WDFW)

Kirk Truscott briefly presented this list, noting that it was provided in Alternative 3 of the Draft Facilities Evaluation Report. He mentioned that this list centers on steelhead acclimation ponds because of Columbia River water and the potential homing issues. At this point, decommissioning Turtle Rock is the last item of the priority list.

X. Discussion: Chiwawa Spring Chinook (Kirk Truscott, WDFW)

Kirk Truscott initiated this discussion on fish raised on Chiwawa and Wenatchee River water throughout the winter and the potential implications for straying issues. He expressed some concern that action should be taken to address these issues and he would like to be apprised of the schedule for this action. Chuck Peven responded that Truscott's concerns were duly noted and that the Feasibility Study due in early October to internal review will provide a springboard to make decisions on these issues. Kris Petersen and Truscott both requested to be present at the meeting to review this document and discuss the path forward.

XI. Discussion: Similkameen Facility (Kirk Truscott, WDFW)

Kirk Truscott initiated this discussion on the issue of juvenile losses over the past several years due to disease and temperature issues at this facility. He noted that this issue needs to be added to the priorities list for hatchery programs funded by Chelan under Alternative 3 because these events result in missing the mitigation requirement marks under the HCP. He also noted that he is interested in a commitment from Chelan to provide an alternate water source. Chuck Peven (Chelan) and Tom Dresser (Grant) both responded that they were aware of the interest, and that two solutions are being considered 1) tempering water temperatures during withdrawal and 2) moving the water intake to above the spawning locations.

XII. WDFW Potential Improvements List (Chuck Peven, Chelan PUD)

Chuck Peven noted that WDFW submitted this list to the recovery team and that the “Justification” column has since been added. He would like the Committee to come prepared at the next meeting to discuss this list. He would like the Committee to especially consider whether these requests are related to the evaluation that suggests something is wrong. The example given was on page 2, number 10 – Is there anything in the facilities report that justified this request?

### XIII. Next Meeting

(Mike Schiewe, Chair)

It was agreed that any materials needing review and comment at future meetings would be provided 5 working days prior to meetings in order to facilitate preparation for the meetings.

October 5<sup>th</sup> is the next Hatchery Committee meeting, to be held in either SeaTac or Portland.

**Attachment A. List of attendees**

*Hatchery Committee:*

Michael Schiewe (Chair)	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Jerry Marco	Colville Tribes
Shaun Seaman	Chelan PUD
Rick Klinge	Douglas PUD
Brian Cates	USFWS
Kris Peterson	NOAA Fisheries
Kirk Truscott	WDFW

*Attendees:*

Denny Rohr	D. Rohr and Associates
Erich Wolf	Sapere Consulting
Kevin Kytola	Sapere Consulting
Dick Nason	Dick Nason Consulting, Inc.
Mike Tonseth	WDFW
Andrew Murdoch	WDFW
Bob Rogers	WDFW
Rick Stillwater	WDFW
Shane Bickford	Douglas PUD
Bob Clubb	Douglas PUD
Chuck Peven	Chelan PUD
Chris Carlson	Grant PUD
Tom Dresser	Grant PUD
Kim Hyatt	Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada
Howie Wright	Okanagan Ancient Alliance
Deana Machin	Okanagan Ancient Alliance

## Final Memorandum

---

**To:** Wells, Rocky Reach, and Rock Island HCP Hatchery Committees

**From:** Michael Schiewe, Chair, HCP Hatchery Committees

**CC:** Shaun Seaman, Chuck Peven, Shane Bickford, Rick Klinge, Jerry Marco, Brian Cates, Kristine Petersen, Kirk Truscott, Andrew Murdoch, Rick Stillwater, Erich Wolf, Dick Nason, Ali Wick

**Date:** November 12, 2004

**Re:** Final Minutes of October 5, 2004 HCP Hatchery Committees Meeting

---

The Wells, Rocky Reach, Rock Island Dams Habitat Conservation Plans Hatchery Committees met at the Chelan County PUD Offices in Wenatchee, Washington on October 5, 2004 from 9:30 am to 2:30 pm. Summaries of Action Items and Decision points are included at the beginning of this memorandum, followed by the meeting minutes. Attendees included are listed in *Attachment A*.

### Action Item Summary:

- At the next meeting, it will be clarified how the reduced production of Methow and Wenatchee 2004 brood chinook will be assigned to the PUDs or the USFWS (See Section II, Paragraph 2).
- To support a discussion on rearing strategies for Methow and Wenatchee 2004 brood chinook, Kirk Truscott will send everyone the tables outlining WDFW's recommended rearing strategies for this brood (See Section II, Paragraph 4).
- To support a discussion on the potential shifting of high ELISA fish into the subyearling program either as releases into the Wenatchee or as transfers to Turtle Rock, Andrew Murdoch will have the potential numbers for this shift at the next meeting (See Section II, Paragraph 4).
- Sapere, Chelan, and WDFW will initiate subcommittee discussion about the sockeye juvenile rearing criteria for net pen rearing (See Section III, item I).
- Chuck Peven will send out to the committee a report that Andrew Murdoch had previously prepared, to add as an Appendix to the Facilities Evaluation Report. The report chronicles previous year production by brood year and stock. (See Section III, item M).

### Decision Point Summary:

- All Committee members accepted (agreed) that the flow management program met Douglas PUD's sockeye mitigation responsibility (See Section VII).

**I. Welcome and Introductions** (Mike Schiewe)  
See *Attachment A* for list of attendees.

**II. 2004 Brood Methow Spring Chinook and 2004 Brood Wenatchee Summer Chinook** (Kirk Truscott)

Kirk Truscott informed the group that results of BKD testing of the '04 brood Methow spring Chinook indicated that ELISA O.D. values ranged up to 2.4, with approximately 37% that ranged between O.D. values of 0.19 and 2.4, and that WDFW's specific recommendation for the 2004 brood (this recommendation specifically does not set precedence for future broods) would be to divide these fish into the following rearing groups, which would be uniquely marked prior to release:

- Fish <0.12 ELISA levels reared at density index of 0.12
- Fish 0.12 to 0.19 ELISA levels reared at density index of 0.06
- Fish >0.19 ELISA levels reared at density index of 0.03

Truscott commented that meeting the goal of 550,000 smolts would not be possible under this scenario (365,000 would be possible). Since the production goal would not be achieved, Shaun Seaman asked how the reduced production would be assigned to the PUDs or the USFWS under the HCP. Shane Bickford noted that the agreement for hatchery production that Douglas PUD has with both Chelan PUD and Grant PUD specifically call out that the fish that can be raised would be proportionately distributed to the various PUDs at the rate that they are participating in that particular hatchery program.

Kirk Truscott mentioned that a decision on these rearing strategies would need to be made soon so that fish could be divided for rearing. Mike Schiewe asked whether WDFW was asking for a decision now, or whether this was more of "heads up" to the Committee members that they needed to have internal discussions in anticipation of a Committee decision at or before the next meeting?

This led to a discussion as to the process that NOAA Fisheries, USFWS, and WDFW will take to fulfill their Treaty obligations; the agency representatives indicated their intent to pursue their decision processes to be able to comment or agree with the above WDFW rearing strategies in future communications. Kirk Truscott agreed to send everyone the tables outlining the above rearing strategies and WDFW's recommendations (*Attachment B*).

Kirk Truscott then described the issues regarding the Wenatchee summer Chinook. There were currently about 20 "extra" female fish, but the hatchery was not yet finished with spawning for the season. He mentioned that if there was more than 10% "excess production," they may move these fish to the Turtle Rock subyearling program, especially if there are high ELISA fish. He noted that at this point it was too early to know the exact number of fish that were in excess of program needs. Andrew Murdoch commented that they may shift high ELISA fish into the subyearling program either as releases into the

Wenatchee or moving them to Turtle Rock. Kris Petersen raised the concern that shifting certain fish may affect the age distribution of a population. Murdoch indicated that this would be taken into account, and he would have the numbers at the next meeting. Chuck Peven recommended that if subyearlings were going to be released, that they be released within the Wenatchee River Basin.

**III. Chelan PUD Facilities Evaluation Report** (Chuck Peven)

Chuck Peven commented that they had received comments from two parties on the Facilities Evaluation Report and invited Erich Wolf to discuss the comment table distributed at the meeting (*Attachment C*).

Wolf proceeded through a discussion of the following comment points:

- A) Dryden Pond is the only facility for which available water vs. water right issues matter, as all other facilities water demand are either below available water (i.e., there is no gap for either available water or water right) or they are above the water right (i.e., there is a problem for both available water and water right). Kirk Truscott indicated that the report should identify what types of improvements could be made where water is needed, or at least a brief statement that infrastructure improvements will be addressed.
- B) All Committee members agreed that agreement was reached on 11 March 2004 to evaluate the Chiwawa program at a production level of 298,000 fish. The committee members also agreed that the authorized production level for the program remained at 672,000 fish and that the 298,000 fish production level was utilized for review purposes only. The Facility review at the 298,000 production level was a function of potential reductions in Chelan PUD obligations in future years, pending agreement/consent by the Hatchery Committee. Several conditions must be met to facilitate consideration of program reduction, including full Chelan PUD sockeye mitigation and Grant PUD production of spring Chinook in the Wenatchee Basin. Kirk Truscott commented that Chelan PUD would need to recognize that densities may change over time and modifications may be needed. Chuck Peven responded that this was recognized; however, the District was looking to reach agreement at this time on rearing densities to use in its evaluation to potentially modify facilities, and if new lower densities occurred in the near future, Chelan PUD may be hesitant to make modifications to accommodate a lower density.
- C) The Committee agreed to change the adult holding flow index for Yearling Chinook to 2 gpm/fish. Kirk Truscott indicated that the flow levels listed here are criteria for fish health. Chuck Peven asked and Erich Wolf answered that this level should not affect the water demand at the peak point during the year for any facility. Wolf commented that language would be added to the report to reflect 1gpm/10 lbs fish. Shaun Seaman commented that Chelan PUD will want to look at this on a case-by-case basis each year based on actual production. Rick Stillwater

commented that they are close to exceeding flow indexes; this was improved by refurbishing the wells, but they are still 3-4 cfs short of the water right.

- D) The group agreed that rearing criteria citations will be modified to cite specific sources.
- E) It was confirmed that cost estimates would include contingency and tax.
- F) Erich Wolf confirmed that he conferred with Mike Tonseth (WDFW) on this matter.
- G) No changes will be made per this comment.
- H) Tables will be updated per this comment.
- I) Kirk Truscott indicated concern with the sockeye juvenile rearing criteria for net pen rearing. Shaun Seaman responded that Chelan PUD is concerned with being locked in to the arrangement described in the table. Chuck Peven indicated that there would be subcommittee discussion between Sapere, Chelan, and WDFW to resolve this issue.
- J) See (I) above.
- K) Tables will be color-coded per this comment.
- L) The report will be updated per this comment.
- M) There was some concern over the level of detail regarding historic production in a footnote in the report. Erich Wolf commented that to address this, he would add a report that Andrew Murdoch prepared as an appendix. This report chronicles the previous production by brood year and stock on release numbers and averages. Chuck Peven indicated that he will send this out to the committee for their information.
- N) See (E) above.

Jerry Marco briefly discussed the Colville Tribes' comments on the Facilities Evaluation Report (Letter to Chuck Peven dated September 9, 2004). Chuck indicated that the changes Marco suggested will be made.

Kirk Truscott indicated that WDFW would like to review a final version of the report (with the changes discussed today incorporated) before giving it their final approval. Several other Committee members agreed. Chuck Peven indicated that the subcommittee would meet regarding letter (M) (above), and that the report would be sent out for everyone's review prior to the next meeting. The group agreed that a decision on accepting and approving the report will be on the agenda for the next Hatchery Committees meeting.

#### **IV. Chelan PUD M&E Plan**

(Chuck Peven)

Andrew Murdoch discussed that he had only received comments from the USFWS and needs comments so that the next draft can be prepared. It was decided that the comment period for this document could be extended as long as the Committee members send their final comments to Murdoch by Friday, Oct. 22. Following revisions of the plan with these comments, the next step would be outside review and follow-up revisions based on the outside review.



- V. Douglas PUD M&E Plan** (Shane Bickford)  
Shane Bickford introduced this topic. He stated that preparation of the Douglas PUD Hatchery M&E Plan was just getting started, but that he expected it to be complimentary and coordinated in terms of methodologies, objectives, and goals with the Chelan PUD Hatchery M&E Plan. He indicated that since the Douglas PUD plan was on a different schedule for completion than the Chelan PUDs plan that Douglas PUD didn't want to delay the completion of Chelan's Plan, and they (Douglas PUD) were anticipating that they would be separate documents. Bickford asked if the Committee had any reservations with this approach and none were voiced. A draft Douglas PUD M & E Plan will be evaluated and finalized once the Chelan PUD Hatchery M&E Plan is finalized.
- VI. Okanagan Sockeye Program** (Shaun Seaman)  
Shaun Seaman updated everyone that there had been a follow-up conference call with the Hatchery committee scheduled at the close of the last Hatchery Committee meeting regarding the Skaha Lake sockeye program; but since Grant County had decided to fund the program for the 2004-2005 brood cycle (current date through May of 2006) the call had been cancelled. Chuck Peven indicated that he would be in contact with Tom Dresser to discuss future funding and participation the PUDs and that discussions will be ongoing with Douglas, Chelan, and Grant PUDs on this matter. Peven mentioned that they are trying to coordinate hatchery programs for Grant and Chelan PUDs for the Upper Columbia as one package per NOAA Fisheries preference. Kirk Truscott asked for clarification on whether Chelan's Okanagan obligations were on hold until this package is prepared. Shaun Seaman responded that no, this was not the case, and that discussions on the programs were ongoing.
- VII. Flow Management Model** (Rick Klinge)  
Rick Klinge recapped the status of the model and asked for the Committee's approval that the flow management program would satisfy Douglas PUD's sockeye mitigation responsibility. Mike Schiewe asked for clarification whether Douglas PUD was currently paying for the model itself or both the model and the implementation of the modeled actions. Klinge responded that Douglas PUD is funding the model work – that is, the input and maintenance of the model—and that the implementation of the work is being funded by the Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection (Canada). Kirk Truscott asked whether future M&E on this project would include acoustic surveys. Klinge responded that, yes, the fall-winter-spring acoustic assessment of biomass was ongoing, and other acoustic work is being pursued by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans- Canada (DFO). All Committee members accepted (agreed) that the flow management program met Douglas PUD's sockeye mitigation responsibility.
- VIII. Committee Protocols** (Mike Schiewe)  
Mike Schiewe led the discussion and clarification of the following protocol points:

- A) Agendas: Issues that require a decision should be submitted 10 days prior to the meeting, along with any pertinent handouts. Although the agenda can be amended at the beginning of the meeting for any additional items, the goal will be to circulate a near-final agenda 5 days before the meeting.
- B) Minutes: Draft minutes will be provided within one week of each meeting and then one week will be given for comments. Draft minutes will be sent to Committee members and their designated alternates only – with each member being responsible for forwarding the drafts within their own agency; meeting attendees and committee members can then forward these to appropriate others as needed. Each meeting will be opened with an approval of the previous minutes, after which the meeting minutes will be amended as final if necessary and re-sent to the attendees and committee members.
- C) Location: One or two times a year, the meeting will be scheduled for the SeaTac area, and an effort will be made to coordinate this with the HCP Coordinating Committee Meetings if possible.
- D) Timing and Alternates: Committee members will notify the Chair of their inability to attend any meeting in advance of that meeting, and provide the name of an alternate. Alternates will retain decision-making authority for their respective entities.
- E) Annual Reports: Mike Schiewe requested an outline/format for these reports and Shane Bickford and Shaun Seaman agreed to send an example of past reports to the chair. For the 2004 report, it was agreed that the record would begin in August with a brief summary of the history of the committee prior to August.
- F) Next Meeting: The next meeting was set for November 9 in the SeaTac area. The meeting will likely be at the PRIME hotel.

**IX. WDFW Improvement List**

(Rick Stilwater)

Rick Stilwater led a discussion of comment from WDFW on Chelan PUD hatchery facilities. It was decided that only those comments that were marked 'Assess' or 'Defer' would be discussed; thus, the discussion began with comment #7 (*Attachment D*):

- 7) Stilwater noted that the chiller cannot be throttled down without damage or ceasing to work. Chuck Peven mentioned that the concern regarding this issue is covered under Alternative 3 in the Facilities Evaluation Report.
- 8) This concern is covered under Alternative 3 in the Facilities Evaluation Report.
- 9) This concern is covered under Alternative 3 in the Facilities Evaluation Report. Chuck Peven commented that there is currently a strategy to have alternative motors and pumps on-site.
- 10) Chuck Peven noted that staff from Chelan PUD will look into this and develop a cost estimate.
- 11) Chuck Peven mentioned that this is included in the Alternatives of the Facilities Evaluation Report.
- 12) This is already included in the item summary.
- 13) This has already been addressed.

- 14) The new system is not working properly, especially at Chiwawa. Chuck Peven will speak with the Tech Shop to investigate this concern.
- 15) Shaun Seaman will talk to the in-house security staff regarding this. Brian Cates mentioned that they have a remote security system at one of their broodstock ponds and that he could be consulted for reference on this system.
- 16) Shaun Seaman mentioned that he will check on any issues of vehicle maintenance with the new fleet manager.
- 17) This item was discussed with the idea that some lag in response time is to be expected for any scenario.
- 18) It was acknowledged that this concern was valid.
- 19) This item will be deferred at this time.
- 20) Shaun Seaman indicated that he would get back to Rick Stilwater on this matter.
- 21) Shaun Seaman indicated that they are currently evaluating this concern.

Shaun Seaman commented that worker safety and fish issues are number one priority with Chelan PUD, and that they will evaluate these matters in order to resolve any outstanding issues there.

Rick Stilwater asked for a decision on whether the acoustic study on yearling chinook was going forward because WDFW needed to decide in the next two weeks whether to divide the fish groups. Shaun Seaman responded that a decision on October 12<sup>th</sup> at the Coordinating Committee meeting should be timely enough to split these groups.

Mike Schiewe closed the meeting and thanked everyone for their attendance and reminded everyone that the next meeting is set for November 9<sup>th</sup> in the city of SeaTac.

**Attachment A**  
**List of Attendees**

---

Michael Schiewe *	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Ali Wick	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Jerry Marco *	Colville Tribes
Shane Bickford	Douglas PUD
Rick Klinge *	Douglas PUD
Shaun Seaman *	Chelan PUD
Chuck Peven	Chelan PUD
Kirk Truscott *	WDFW
Rick Stilwater	WDFW
Andrew Murdoch	WDFW
Brian Cates *	USFWS
Kristine Petersen *	NOAA Fisheries
Erich Wolf	Sapere Consulting, Inc.
Dick Nason	Dick Nason Consulting

\* Denotes Hatchery Committees member

## Final Memorandum

---

**To:** Wells, Rocky Reach, and Rock Island HCP Hatchery Committees

**From:** Michael Schiewe, Chair, HCP Hatchery Committees

**CC:** Chuck Peven, Shane Bickford, John Penny, Rick Stillwater, Kevin Kytola, Erich Wolf, Dick Nason, Ali Wick

**Date:** December 17, 2004

**Re:** Final Minutes of November 9, 2004 HCP Hatchery Committees Meeting

---

The Wells, Rocky Reach, Rock Island Dams Habitat Conservation Plans Hatchery Committees met at the Prime Hotel in SeaTac, Washington on November 9, 2004 from 9:00 am to 2:30 pm. Summaries of Action Items and Decision points are included at the beginning of this memorandum, followed by the meeting minutes. Attendees included are listed in *Attachment A*.

### **Action Summary:**

- For the next meeting of the Hatchery Committees, Chelan PUD will prepare an overview of their hatchery program (showing linkages among programs) that can be used by the Committees as a context for individual decisions.
- Committee members will provide Chuck Peven with answers to questions regarding the Chelan M&E Plan by December 1, 2004.
- Chuck Peven will define his needs for help on the Chelan M&E Plan (especially on the appendices) upon sending out the next review draft prior to the next meeting.
- Kirk Truscott will consider the 2005 Chelan PUD Facilities Potential Study list in light of WDFW's improvement list, and he will discuss the list with Chelan PUD before the next meeting. The Hatchery Committees will be briefed on these discussions at the next meeting.
- At the next meeting on Dec. 14<sup>th</sup>, the Facilities Evaluation Report will be on the agenda for approval.
- Regarding the letter to non-HCP-signatory parties, Mike Schiewe will convey to the Committee any responses to the letter prior to the next meeting.

- Chelan PUD will distribute the Facilities Evaluation Report to the committee for review in the week after Thanksgiving, to facilitate committee review for a decision at the next meeting.
- Ali Wick will communicate with the committee to set a standing meeting day, looking at the first or third weeks of the month.

**Decision Summary:**

- The WDFW request to transfer approximately 100,000 'excess' Wenatchee summer chinook to Turtle Rock was approved with the following stipulations: fish are 1) selected from returns over the entire run; 2) considerations of age structure will be taken into account when transferring fish to Turtle Rock (progeny will be from age-5 fish).
- WDFW will hold high BKD Chiwawa River spring Chinook until they reach marking size, and then will mark and early-release them. If they cannot be held to marking size, WDFW will confer with NOAA Fisheries to consider release elsewhere.
- Rearing density for sockeye in net pens will remain at 0.05-0.06 lb fish/cubic ft water, with the understanding that it could be exceeded on an experimental basis.

**I Welcome and Agenda Approval (Mike Schiewe)**

See *Attachment A* for list of attendees.

Chuck Peven added the Chiwawa Feasibility M&E Study to the agenda.

**II Approval of Minutes from October 5, 2004 Meeting (Mike Schiewe)**

The minutes were approved with no amendments.

**III Chelan PUD Interpretation of Sockeye Mitigation (Shaun Seaman/Chuck Peven)**

**A Introduction and BAMP document**

Chuck Peven introduced the subject by saying that Chelan PUD is reviewing their obligations for sockeye mitigation, and that how they interpret their mitigation requirements directly affects their Facilities Evaluation Report, as well as their discussions with Grant PUD regarding the integration/coordination of their respective mitigation programs. Chelan PUD's obligation under the Rocky Reach and Rock Island HCPs is 300,000, and 571,040 sockeye smolts, respectively – for a total of 871,000 smolts.

Peven explained that under the Biological Assessment Management Plan (BAMP), the combined sockeye production goal for the Okanogan and Wenatchee basins is about 1.4 million smolts, with 1 million in the Okanogan and 343,000 in Lake Wenatchee. Above and beyond this, Grant PUD (under their settlement agreement) will be obligated to produce 1.1 million sockeye smolts. Hence the total production will exceed the BAMP goal by some 571,000 smolts. Notwithstanding this larger issue, Chelan would like to seek agreement from the Committee that the mitigation production for Rock Island be allocated 60% to the Okanogan and 40% to Lake Wenatchee – which would equate to approximately 342,000 smolts to the Okanogan and 229,000 to Lake Wenatchee. The 60/40 split represents the approximate ratio of adult returns to the Okanogan and Wenatchee basins, respectively.

Mike Schiewe asked if the BAMP is a binding document, and Chuck Peven responded that it is a guidance document, with its origins during the HCP negotiation. Kirk Truscott explained that the 40 percent in the split represents the geometric mean over the past 25 years (42 percent rounded down), assuming equal fish survival. Truscott stated that since the goal of the split was to achieve a 60/40 split in returning adults at Rock Island, then adjusting for overwinter survival should be a consideration. He further stated that doing so would mean that approximately 280,000 smolts should be produced in Lake Wenatchee.

## **B Discussions on Lake Wenatchee fish**

Chuck Peven asked whether the 280,000 sockeye could be raised in Lake Wenatchee. Kirk Truscott responded that, yes, this would be possible. Brian Cates commented that the USFWS opinion is that Chelan PUD could certainly go up to 280,000 fish if needed.

Chuck Peven asked Erich Wolf if this arrangement would present a net pen capacity problem, and Wolf answered that 280,000 fish would be close to full capacity for the net pens. Chuck Peven commented that Chelan PUD is working to integrate programs with Grant PUD in the Wenatchee and it is unlikely that Chelan PUD will be able to install 20 more net pens in Lake Wenatchee. Brian Cates asked if there was a health issue in the net pens, and Truscott responded that if adults were moved to the East Bank facility, there shouldn't be an issue. Jerry Marco asked what the maximum net pen capacity was at Lake Wenatchee, and Truscott responded that the number depends on release timing. If the adults are moved to the East Bank facility, they can increase capacity by 200,000, or four net

pens. Shaun Seaman commented that if 280,000 is the number chosen, it may limit Grant PUD's ability to meet its obligations. Rick Stilwater commented that they have come close to producing 280,000 fish before. Chuck Peven asked whether it would be appropriate for Chelan PUD to reduce the Okanogan obligation by 50,000 fish. Brian Cates commented that if it is not likely to impede other programs, the USFWS would not have a problem with the proposed increase.

Kris Petersen commented that the Wenatchee program is functioning and the Okanogan is not. Moreover, she said that NOAA Fisheries is concerned with how the sockeye hatchery program ties together with other programs. She emphasized that she was concerned with any discussion that focused just on sockeye, and requested that Chelan PUD explicitly consider how this question would affect their overall hatchery program for all species. She stated that NOAA Fisheries needed more information before agreeing to the Chelan PUD proposal. She further stated that NOAA Fisheries is initially supportive of WDFW's number of 280,000 fish.

### **C Decision process on Wenatchee fish**

There was some discussion on what would help NOAA Fisheries and the rest of the committee come to a decision and what would be the timing of the decision. Kris Petersen commented that NOAA Fisheries is uncomfortable making a decision on sockeye at this point because of basin-wide uncertainty regarding other species, namely spring chinook and steelhead. She commented that the sockeye program has a direct impact on the Chiwawa program and that NOAA Fisheries needs more information on the Chiwawa program.

Kirk Truscott commented that Chelan PUD will need to define and detail sockeye mitigation and propose solutions for accomplishing remaining obligations. He further commented that Chelan PUD could plan for 280,000 fish in the Wenatchee and then consider whether it would be feasible to make up the difference in the Okanogan. Shaun Seaman said that net pen space and capacity is limited, so Chelan seeks to decide on the sockeye component so that remaining space can be evaluated. Seaman said that Chelan PUD would be able to accept the boundaries of 228,000-280,000 fish.



Mike Schiewe asked when the decision on the number of Wenatchee fish has to be made within the context of the rearing cycle, and Chuck Peven responded that decisions would need to be made before broodstock collection in July 2005. Acknowledging the connection between the Okanogan sockeye question and the Chiwawa spring chinook program, Peven stated that the feasibility report on water management at the Chiwawa facility will be ready for Committee review at the end of this year, but the earliest Chelan PUD will be able to deal with water source issues is 2005. Peven noted that the goal was to determine whether Chelan PUD may be able to modify facility operations to reduce dependency on Wenatchee water. Shaun Seaman commented that Chelan PUD would make completing their evaluation of water management options at the Chiwawa facility a high priority. A proposal to allocate the Rock Island sockeye mitigation obligation with 280,000 for Lake Wenatchee and 291,000 for the Okanogan, will be on the agenda for the next Hatchery Committees meeting.

#### **IV Disposition of “Excess” Wenatchee Summer Chinook Broodstock (Kirk Truscott)**

Kirk Truscott opened the discussion by noting that at the last Hatchery Committees meeting he had alerted the Hatchery Committees that the number of adult Wenatchee summer chinook taken in as broodstock was higher than the program required. To resolve this, WDFW is proposing to transfer approximately 100,000 juveniles (the expected excess) to the Turtle Rock yearling program; the Turtle Rock Program traditionally rears only Wells-origin chinook. Truscott asked for Committee approval for these numbers.

Kris Petersen asked about the age structure of the broodstock and their BKD status, and specifically about the process by which progeny and parents would be transferred. Kirk Truscott responded that they would be selected from the entire range of return timings, and that the return in 2004 all had relatively low ELISA values. Petersen's main concern in bringing up this issue was to confirm that the process used by WDFW to select which fish would be transferred would avoid the progeny of returning 5 year-old adults. Her concern was to avoid impacting the age structure of the Wenatchee stock. Based on length at age data, the 04 BY Wenatchee summer chinook are predominately age-5; therefore, the production shift of excess Wenatchee summer chinook to the Turtle Rock program will be gametes from age-5 adults rather than age-4; Truscott confirmed that this would be taken into account.

Shane Bickford asked whether there would be separate holding at Turtle Rock for the Wenatchee and Wells stocks, and whether they would be individually marked. Kirk Truscott indicated that that would be the plan. Chuck Peven asked whether releasing these “excess” fish as fry in the Wenatchee had been considered as an alternative. Kirk Truscott stated that the expected survival of fry releases are so low that transferring these “excess” fish was a more desirable choice than fry release.

Kris Petersen proposed that WDFW’s proposed transfer be approved with the following stipulations: fish are 1) selected over the entire run; 2) primarily 5-year-olds. Mike Schiewe verified that the Committee agreed to these stipulations.

#### **V Update on Chelan Hatchery M&E Plan Chuck Peven)**

Chuck Peven and Andrew Murdoch developed a list of questions for the Committee to answer as part of their review of the Chelan M&E Plan. These questions were handed out to meeting attendees (*Attachment B*). Clarifications on several questions were suggested by Mike Schiewe, as follows:

1. It needs to be clarified how long-term fitness is to be measured.
2. Definitions will need to be agreed upon for this question.
3. It was clarified that “reference” does not mean the same as “control.”
4. It was decided that this is a great idea and suggestions for implementation are welcome.
5. Chuck Peven clarified that he was not sure whether this is appropriate, as there may be political implications to setting escapement levels.

It was noted that answering these questions before December 1 would allow Chelan PUD and WDFW to consider them while generating the next version of the M&E Plan. Chuck Peven will define his needs for help (especially on the appendices) when he sends out the next review draft prior to the next meeting. It would be helpful if committee members volunteer to help. Peven commented that the next draft may incorporate some, but not all, of NOAA Fisheries’ comments, as they were received after the deadline, and some comments regarding flow/purpose of the document would require more extensive document restructuring.

However, he indicated that the latest version may address some of these structural issues. The Committee confirmed that the final plan due date is June 2005.

#### **VI Integrated Hatchery Program for the Mid-Columbia (all PUDs) (Chuck Peven)**

Chuck Peven indicated that he is in preliminary discussions with Grant PUD to explore ways to integrate the Chelan and Grant PUD hatchery programs.

#### **VII Update on Chiwawa River Spring Chinook (Kirk Truscott)**

Kirk Truscott provided an update on the BKD status of Chiwawa River Spring Chinook. There were 4 females with moderate to high ELISA scores; WDFW does not currently have the facilities to rear them separately, and does not plan to incorporate them into the general population. WDFW's proposed solution is to conduct an early release of 14,000 fish (out of a projected production of 430,000 fish).

Kris Petersen expressed concern that these early-release fish (which would not be marked) could compromise a study going on at Tumwater. Kirk Truscott responded these fish are currently isolated in incubation, and if it is possible to hold them to marking size, these fish might be marked prior to release. If they cannot be held to marking size, a decision will have to be made with NOAA Fisheries as to whether to consider release elsewhere.

The discussion turned once again to the water supply at the Chiwawa facility as it relates to the ability to hold the high ELISA fish to a size large enough to mark. Shaun Seaman reiterated that Chelan is waiting for the results of the feasibility study, and that Chelan PUD is committed to implementing any necessary actions. Operational fixes may be possible, including pumping supplemental water from the Wenatchee, which would keep the fish in water but is not ideal due to acclimation objectives.

#### **VIII Update from Sockeye Rearing Criteria Subgroup (Chuck Peven)**

Chuck Peven started the discussion by reviewing the initial agreement of the Sockeye Rearing Criteria Subgroup. The agreement was that pen-reared sockeye would be reared at 0.05-0.06 lb/f<sup>3</sup>-in. He further indicated that Chelan PUD was open to investigating rearing at higher densities on an experimental basis, but was reluctant to implement any new standards due to the difficulties of correlating observed mortality effects with density. Kirk Truscott commented

that if results of rearing density studies indicated that higher rearing densities provided no negative effect to rearing survival, WDFW would consider rearing at higher densities to meet mitigation obligations. It was discussed that a discussion of rearing density and historical production of sockeye in net pens be added to the Facilities Review at future meetings of the Hatchery Committees.

### **IX Converting Turtle Rock Subyearling Program to a Yearling Program (Chuck Peven)**

Chuck Peven introduced this discussion by noting that a proposal to convert the Turtle Rock Subyearling Program to a Yearling program has come from WDFW and WA State Senator Linda Evans Parlette. The proposal includes changing the program from producing 1.6 million subyearlings to producing 400,000 yearlings for release at Chelan Falls. It was noted that high fall water temperature at Turtle Rock is a major reason that this is currently operated as a subyearling program, and that temperature would be a considerable obstacle to overcome in a conversion to yearlings. The proposed release at Chelan Falls was suggested as a means of establishing a homing site that might minimize straying, and provide a focus for harvest. Any redirection of this program would require agreement from the Hatchery Committees.

Chuck Peven indicated that the potential of this program was currently being evaluated by Chelan PUD, and the purpose of bringing this discussion item before the Hatchery Committees is to obtain early feedback on whether the Committees feel the conversion justifies more detailed analyses. Modifications would be needed at Turtle Rock in order to convert the program, but upgrades would be different for the yearling and subyearling programs. If converting Turtle Rock is an option, Chelan will need to conduct a more detailed analysis of options.

Several members expressed interest in the conversion, but at the same time had concerns. Kirk Truscott explained that WDFW had proposed similar shifts in production strategies for the Wells summer chinook program and other co-managers in the Columbia Basin (i.e. Yakama Nation) expressed concern regarding the shift from the typical life history that is required to convert a subyearling program to a yearling program. Rick Klinge indicated that converting to a yearling program might mean that more high BKD fish would have to be reared at Wells Hatchery. Currently, high ELISA fish are split between Wells and Turtle Rock. Brian Cates indicated that the USFWS would want to explore potential impacts to other HCP programs.

The agencies also expressed some support for the conversion. Kirk Truscott said there is little doubt that adult returns would increase with conversion, and that utilizing an acclimation and release at Chelan Falls would likely reduce the high straying that is typical of Turtle Rock releases. Kris Petersen noted that an objective to increase harvest opportunity by concentrating returning fish near Chelan Falls would be consistent with NOAA Fisheries' goals,

The policy implications of this conversion were discussed. Kris Petersen confirmed that a Biological Opinion (or amendment to the current Opinion) would be required for the conversion of the program and that the key ESA considerations are both the conversion of the facility and adult returns, as well as localization of the homing adults. Petersen suggested that WDFW consider survival comparisons, contribution to fisheries, and harvest and management issues, all of which will be necessary information for ESA decision-making. Kirk Truscott indicated that the proposal had only recently been presented to WDFW in Olympia and more detailed risk/benefit analysis is planned. Kevin Kytola commented that the proposed conversion has US v. Oregon implications, and that these should be considered in WDFW's review.

The Committee discussed the possibility of conducting a small-scale feasibility study as a first step. Kris Petersen commented that this would be a good approach to exploring possibilities without obligating a lot of money. Shaun Seaman indicated that he would want to look at issues with the current Turtle Rock facility. Shane Bickford commented that any conversion may take 4 years, based on complex considerations.

Shane Bickford further commented that the overall question being considered could be broken down into as several smaller but distinct questions or issues:

1. Determining whether to convert from subyearlings to yearlings
2. Evaluating options for improving homing fidelity
3. Evaluating means of increasing harvest opportunity
4. Evaluating the economic benefit of having a facility near to the City of Chelan (per Linda Evans Parlette)

Shaun Seaman reiterated that Chelan PUD needed some preliminary feedback from the Committee to determine whether to continue with their evaluation of this proposal. He indicated that Chelan PUD needs to consider the costs of the various options. He further indicated that if a conversion required significant new funding beyond Chelan PUD's HCP obligations, then they might look to WDFW and the State for assistance. Shaun Seaman recommended that this discussion remain a standing item on the agenda.

#### **X Potential 2005 Facilities Studies (Shaun Seaman/Erich Wolf)**

Erich Wolf reviewed several potential studies identified in the WDFW Feasibility Report that will be addressed in 2005. These include the following.

- Segregating Chiwawa ponds: Modify piping or changing pond operations to allow ponds to be independently operated, with water sources mixed or segregated
- Turtle Rock: Prepare a scope of work for potential work; analyze upgrade costs to meet obligations or consider decommissioning in safe state
- Chelan Falls: Evaluate options for siting an acclimation pond
- Similkameen Pond Water Quality: Evaluate alternative water intake locations and water treatment as a means of minimizing disease from returning
- East Bank Spawning Structure: Determine the need for a spawning structure at East Bank
- Chelan Falls Intermediate Tanks: Address the gap in capacity (current shortfall of 6 tanks)
- East Bank Adult Holding Pond: Evaluate alternatives

Shaun Seaman asked whether Chelan PUD should present plans or results from these studies to the HCP Committees. Kris Petersen responded that it would be appropriate for the Committees to review the biological criteria but probably not the engineering. Kirk Truscott indicated WDFW will consider the above study list in light of their improvement list, and he will discuss the list with Chelan PUD before the next meeting. The outcome of these discussions will be brought before the Committee at the next meeting.

Chelan PUD will distribute the Facilities Evaluation Report to the committee for review the week after Thanksgiving, to facilitate committee review and a decision for approval at the next meeting.

### **XI Timeframe for Rearing Decision on High-ELISA broodstock (Chuck Peven/Kirk Truscott)**

Kirk Truscott indicated that WDFW received a letter from the Yakama Tribe concurring with WDFW's plan to outplant 204,000 high-ELISA fish Methow spring chinook. He noted that the current plan for these fry is to keep them out of the upper Methow basin; they will be mainstem releases (*Attachment C*).

### **XII Non-Signatory Parties Draft Letter (Mike Schiewe)**

As chair of the Coordinating Committee and with concurrence of all members, Mike Schiewe drafted and sent a letter inviting non-signatory parties to participate in the HCP process. These parties include the Yakama and Umatilla tribes, Grant County, and American Rivers. The letter invited their participation in the proposed Mid-Columbia forum and to regularly attend the Hatchery and Tributaries Committees meetings as non-voting members.

It was discussed that FERC could rule on the conditions of this participation in one of 3 ways:

1. Curtail participation of non-signatories
2. Allow limited participation as proposed above by the Signatory Parties
3. Open up voting rights to these groups

It was discussed that it is possible that non-signatory parties could be in attendance at the next meeting. Mike Schiewe will convey responses to the letter or lack thereof to the Committee for consideration, prior to the next meeting.

### **XIII Next Meeting and Committee Procedures (Mike Schiewe)**

The date for the next meeting was established as December 14, 2004. Ali Wick will communicate with the group to set a standing meeting day, preferably in the first or third weeks of the month.

Meeting minutes will be distributed to Committee members and attendees; agendas will be distributed to Committee members as well as designated alternates, if this is requested by the Committee member. Committee members are free to further distribute agendas and minutes within their respective organizations.

**Attachment A**  
**List of Attendees**

---

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Michael Schiewe *	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Kristin Noreen	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Jerry Marco *	Colville Tribes
Shane Bickford	Douglas PUD
Rick Klinge *	Douglas PUD
Shaun Seaman	Chelan PUD
Chuck Pevan	Chelan PUD
Kirk Truscott *	WDFW
Rick Stilwater	WDFW
John Penny	WDFW
Brian Cates *	USFWS
Kristine Petersen *	NOAA Fisheries
Erich Wolf	Sapere Consulting, Inc.
Kevin Kytola	Sapere Consulting, Inc.

\* Denotes Hatchery Committees member



## Final Memorandum

---

**To:** Wells, Rocky Reach, and Rock Island HCP Hatchery Committees

**From:** Michael Schiewe, Chair, HCP Hatchery Committees

**CC:** Chuck Peven, Shane Bickford, Bob Clubb, John Penny, Rick Stilwater, Kevin Kytola, Erich Wolf, Scott Buehn, Charlie Snow, Andrew Murdoch, Dick Nason, Ali Wick, Chris Carlson

**Date:** January 27, 2005

**Re:** Final Minutes of December 14, 2004 HCP Hatchery Committees Meeting

---

The Wells, Rocky Reach, Rock Island Dams Habitat Conservation Plans Hatchery Committees met at the Prime Hotel in SeaTac, Washington on December 14, 2004 from 9:30 am to 4:00 pm. Summaries of Action Items and Decision Points are included at the beginning of this memorandum, followed by the Meeting Minutes. Attendees included are listed in Meeting Minute Attachment A.

### **ACTION ITEM SUMMARY**

- Chuck Peven will modify the Statement of Agreement section of the Agenda Attachment A – Sockeye Split Agreement; the final revised agreement will be circulated for final approval at the next meeting (Item V).
- Kevin Kytola agreed to make the final changes to the Facilities Evaluation Report and to re-send the document to Committee members for final approval at the next meeting (Item VI).
- Kirk Truscott agreed to check on the letter needed from WDFW for accessing the Chewuch weir (Item VIII).
- Chelan PUD will send out its prioritized list of actions from the WDFW Request List before the next meeting (Item XII).

### **DECISION POINT SUMMARY**

- Committee members agreed on the numbers given in the Sockeye Split Agreement (Agenda Attachment A); the final revised agreement will be approved at the next meeting (Item V).

- The Facilities Evaluation report will be on the agenda for approval at the next meeting (Item VI).

**I Welcome, Agenda Approval, Meeting Minutes Approval (Mike Schiewe)**

See Meeting Minutes Attachment A for list of attendees. Mike Schiewe opened the meeting by asking for approval of the meeting agenda and the November 9 Meeting Minutes. Shaun Seaman recommended minor changes to the Minutes, and the Minutes were approved subject to these changes (Ali Wick will send out final Minutes by email). In the future, revised Meeting Minutes will be sent out in redline-strikeout version and will include names of commenters adjacent to their comments.

**II Recent FERC Order and Mid-Columbia Forum (Mike Schiewe)**

Mike Schiewe opened this discussion by updating the Committees on non-signatories to the HCP that have been invited to participate in Hatchery and Tributary meetings as non-voting members. Mike Schiewe will provide agendas and meeting minutes to the designated point of contact for these parties. The Mid-Columbia Forum will be a meeting point for further communication and coordination, with an open invitation to interested parties.

**III WDFW 2005 Proposed Scope of Work: Methow Natural Production M&E (Rick Klinge, Charlie Snow, Andrew Murdoch)**

Rick Klinge introduced this summary of the 2004 monitoring for natural production and 2005 scope of work. This work represents a link between program goals and objectives and the M&E goals and objectives that will be developed for Douglas PUD's 5-year M & E Plan (due June 2005), and he views this information exchange as a communication point for the Committees to be involved in future scopes of work.

Charlie Snow and Andrew Murdoch provided a presentation of spawning surveys for spring chinook and steelhead, as well as smolt-trapping results (juvenile production estimates), and life-stage-specific survival rates (Meeting Minutes Attachment B). These surveys were completed in the Methow River, the Twisp River, and the Chewuch River. The ultimate objective of these studies is to calculate life-stage-specific survival rates for spring chinook and summer steelhead.

#### **IV Chelan PUD Hatchery Program Planning –The Big Picture (Shaun Seaman, Chuck Peven, Kevin Kytola)**

Chuck Peven and Kevin Kytola provided a presentation detailing hatchery mitigation strategies for Chelan PUD with the objective of gaining input from the Committees (Meeting Minutes Attachment C).

The Committee discussion from this presentation focused on the following issues:

- The decision to convert Turtle Rock to a yearling program will depend on several factors, including co-manager approval, resolution of technical issues, and economics.
- The Chelan PUD proposal for rearing Chiwawa spring chinook is consistent with the BAMP Table 4. The number of Chiwawa chinook was originally set at 672,000 in the HCP because, in part, Chelan PUD was not able to meet its Okanogan sockeye mitigation obligations. If Chelan PUD is able to meet this obligation, the HCP provides the Hatchery Committee the flexibility to alter other programs such as reducing the current Chiwawa production level of 672,000 spring Chinook to a 7 percent mitigation production level – or about 298,000 yearlings. Reduction is also dependent upon Grant PUD initiating (to be defined) its chinook mitigation program at Nason Creek, which complicates the situation. The two criteria that need to be met for Chelan PUD to reduce its obligations from 672,000 to 298,000 fish are: a) the initiation of the sockeye program in the Okanagan to meet HCP mitigation requirements for this species; and, b) Grant PUD beginning their spring chinook program in the Wenatchee River (Nason Creek).

#### **V Split of Production Goals for Sockeye in the RI HCP between Wenatchee and Okanagan Basins (Chuck Peven)**

Chuck Peven introduced the statement of agreement regarding the sockeye split between the Wenatchee and Okanagan basins (Agenda Attachment A). Kris Petersen commented that the language in the agreement should state that the production goal for Okanagan sockeye would ultimately be 591,000. Also, Jerry Marco commented that the parenthetical language regarding Skaha Lake rearing and the total number of 571,040 should be removed to avoid confusion on rearing strategies. Committee members agreed that this is a first step for Wenatchee sockeye production and there will be additional discussions needed for the

Okanagan basin sockeye program. Committee members agreed on the numbers in the statement of agreement section and Chuck Peven agreed to modify this statement for circulation and Committee approval at the next meeting. .

#### **VI Facilities Evaluation Report Review (Chuck Peven)**

Chuck Peven led a discussion on edits to the Facilities Evaluation Report. Erich Wolf modified the document as the comments were offered. These comments included adding subcommittee notes as an appendix and adding a new attachment to discuss rearing criteria, as well as several text edits. Kevin Kytola agreed to make these changes and to re-send the document to Committee members for final approval at the next meeting.

#### **VII Chelan PUD M&E Plan Discussion (Shaun Seaman, Chuck Peven)**

Chuck Peven stated that the Appendices to the Chelan PUD M&E Plan still need work and review, but that the June 21, 2005 deadline will still be met. The order of events will be as follows:

- Presentation at the February Hatchery Committees meeting to discuss Committee comments
- Outside peer review and comment
- Incorporate peer review comments
- Hatchery Committee approval (by June 21)
- Field activities begin in 2006

#### **VIII Update on Twisp Weir, Chewuch Weir, and Twisp Screen Improvements (Shane Bickford)**

Shane Bickford updated the Committees on modifications which are being made this winter on the Twisp weir; they are to be completed by March 2005 prior to brood collection. The design of the Chewuch weir is complete, but access to the land still needs to be secured from WDFW. Kirk Truscott agreed to check on the letter needed from WDFW for this access.

Shane Bickford informed the Committees that the Twisp screen was currently not adequate to serve freshet events; thus, the screen has been re-designed to include reconstructing the intake, burying the pipeline, pouring concrete, and providing stainless screens on an incline.

The expected completion date for this work is the end of January 2005, in time for the rearing season.

### **IX Allocation of Methow Fish Hatchery Production (Shane Bickford)**

Shane Bickford updated the Committees on the allocation of Methow production. The original allocation included 550,000 smolts among the three PUDs (Chelan, Douglas, and Grant), but due to higher than expected levels of BKD, the program is expected to only be able to raise 350,000 smolts. The original vs. current allocations are as follows:

<b>PUD</b>	<b>Original fish allocation</b>	<b>Current fish allocation</b>
Douglas	61,000	42,000
Grant	201,000	126,000
Chelan	288,000	182,000

Tom Scribner asked for an update on the handling of high ELISA fish in terms of facility capacity. Shane Bickford responded that this year's situation of 60 percent high ELISA is unusual, and that the facility had been designed to manage various years of fry for the "average" ELISA results (15 to 20 percent). Tom Scribner commented that he was concerned because of the outstanding issues of meeting mitigation goals.

### **X Definitions for Chelan PUD M&E Plan (Chuck Peven)**

Chuck Peven reviewed with the Committees the definitions being used in the Chelan M&E Plan as follows (see Agenda Attachment C):

1. The proposed definition and measurement of long-term fitness was accepted.
2. The proposed wording for wild or naturally produced or natural origin fish was selected as "naturally produced."
3. The proposed wording of summer/fall, summer, late-run chinook was selected as "summer/fall."
4. The Committees discussed the following points regarding selecting and defining reference streams:
  - The Entiat comes closest to a reference stream, but the Committees still have not reached consensus regarding what a reference stream is or whether this is even a valid question. They are not at a point to clarify this issue; there are ongoing studies being conducted by the USFWS in the Entiat (Brian Cates'

group) that should help resolve this. The Committees may want to view these streams as a “point of reference” versus a “control” for M&E purposed.

- The Regional Technical Team is coordinating a regional forum to discuss M&E.
5. A study on naturally-produced fish to determine stray rates could be part of a regional effort to PIT tag juvenile migrants and radio-tag adults. The efficacy of this study could be affected by observed smolt-adult survival as well as stray rates. Natural stray rates are considered to be <20 percent within the ESU and <30 percent outside the ESU.
  6. Chuck Peven vetted the issue of the Committees’ comfort level with determining carrying capacity escapement levels. Currently, carrying capacity escapement is defined by using spawning escapement levels as correlated with available habitat. The Committees discussed the idea that it may be difficult to define carrying capacity in this way.

#### **XI Chiwawa Water Study Update (Chuck Peven)**

Chuck Peven updated the Committees that following the end of 2004, there will be a more detailed discussion of this study.

#### **XII WDFW Request List (Shaun Seaman)**

Shaun Seaman updated the Committees that Chelan PUD has been preparing a prioritization of these requests and is currently in the process of securing agreement with WDFW in terms of activities and schedule. These improvements are a mix of actions from the Facilities Evaluation Report and O&M work, and some of these activities will include feasibility studies. This list will be sent out before the next meeting.

#### **XIII Other Issues (Mike Schiewe)**

There were no other Committee meeting issues. The next meeting will be held Wednesday, January 26, 2005 in Wenatchee.

#### **List of Meeting Minute Attachments**

Attachment A: Meeting Attendees

Attachment B: Snow-Murdoch Presentation (.ppt)

Attachment C: Hatchery Mitigation Strategies (.ppt)

**Attachment A  
List of Attendees**

---

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Michael Schiewe *	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Ali Wick	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Jerry Marco *	Colville Tribes (by conference call)
Bob Clubb	Douglas PUD
Shane Bickford	Douglas PUD
Rick Klinge *	Douglas PUD
Shaun Seaman*	Chelan PUD
Chuck Peven	Chelan PUD
Scott Buehn	Chelan PUD
Tom Scribner	Yakama Nation (by conference call)
Chris Carlson	Grant PUD
Kirk Truscott *	WDFW
Rick Stilwater	WDFW
Andrew Murdoch	WDFW
Charlie Snow	WDFW
Brian Cates *	USFWS
Kristine Petersen *	NOAA Fisheries
Dick Nason	Dick Nason Consulting
Erich Wolf	Sapere Consulting, Inc.
Kevin Kytola	Sapere Consulting, Inc.

\* Denotes Hatchery Committees member



Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.  
1423 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Suite 300  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
Phone 206.287.9130  
Fax 206.287.9131

## Final Memorandum

---

**To:** Wells, Rocky Reach, and Rock Island HCP Hatchery Committees

**From:** Michael Schiewe, Chair, HCP Hatchery Committees

**CC:** Chuck Peven, Bob Rogers, Jim Gray, John Penny, Rick Stilwater, Erich Wolf, Scott Buehn, Ali Wick, Chris Carlson

**Date:** February 17, 2005

**Re:** Final Minutes of January 26, 2005 HCP Hatchery Committees Meeting

---

The Wells, Rocky Reach, Rock Island Dams Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP) Hatchery Committees met at the Chelan PUD Fish and Wildlife Building in Wenatchee, Washington on January 26, 2005 from 9:30 am to 2:00 pm. Attendees are listed in Attachment A to these Meeting Minutes.

### **ACTION ITEM SUMMARY**

- Kris Petersen agreed to check on an updated users' guide for the All-H Analyzer Model and will send this to the Committees (Item IV). [Update: Petersen notified the Committees that no new user users' guide is available at this time].
- Mike Schiewe will coordinate with Bruce Suzomoto to find out what information/data would be useful for Suzomoto's proposed demonstration of the All-H Analyzer at the March HC meeting. Mike Schiewe will pass this information on to Kirk Truscott (Item IV).
- Using information provided by Mike Schiewe, Kirk Truscott agreed to contact Andy Appleby at Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) regarding data needed for a presentation on the All-H Analyzer (Item IV).
- Kirk Truscott will provide 2005 broodstock objectives and protocols at the next meeting, with the goal of approval at the March or April meeting (Item VI).
- Kirk Truscott agreed to provide to Chelan PUD a written list of comments for the Chiwawa Water Study report (Item IX).
- Chuck Peven, Kris Petersen, and Kirk Truscott agreed to conduct an email discussion and update the Committees on the schedule and deadlines for the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and Mitigation and Enhancement (M&E) Reports (Item XI).



- Mike Schiewe agreed to draft a proposed agenda and speakers list for the upcoming Mid-Columbia Forum and to send this to Committees members (Item XII, 1).
- Kris Petersen agreed to email the link to the Federal Register listing for the Colville smolt trap application in the Okanagan when it is posted (Item XII, 3).
- Ali Wick agreed to email Kirk Truscott as to what is needed for the Hatchery Production tables in the Annual Reports (Item XII, 5).

## **DECISION POINT SUMMARY**

- Committee members approved the Statement of Agreement: Sockeye Split—Rock Island, with no amendments (Item II).
- Committee members approved the Statement of Agreement: Hatchery Facilities Evaluation subject to a minor addition (Item III [Update: approved by email consensus February 4, 2005]).

### **I Welcome and Meeting Minutes Approval (Mike Schiewe)**

See Attachment A to these Meeting Minutes for the list of attendees.

Mike Schiewe opened the meeting by asking for approval of the December Meeting Minutes. Shaun Seaman recommended minor changes to the Meeting Minutes, and the Meeting Minutes were approved subject to these changes (Ali Wick will send out final Meeting Minutes by email [sent out January 27]).

### **II Statement of Agreement: Sockeye Split—Rock Island (Mike Schiewe)**

Mike Schiewe opened this discussion by updating the Committees that the Statement of Agreement for the sockeye split for the Rock Island HCP between Wenatchee and Okanagan Basins had been sent to the Committees for review. The Committees approved the Statement of Agreement with no amendments (Attachment B to these Meeting Minutes).

### **III Statement of Agreement: Hatchery Facilities Evaluation Report (Shaun Seaman)**

Shaun Seaman introduced this Statement of Agreement for the Hatchery Facilities Evaluation. Kirk Truscott recommended that a third bullet should be added to the section on water feasibilities studies indicating that a study is need at Chelan Falls Hatchery. The

Committees approved the Statement of Agreement subject to this amendment (Attachment C to these Meeting Minutes [approved by email February 4, 2005]).

#### **IV All-H Analyzer Model Overview (Kris Petersen)**

Kris Petersen gave a brief introduction to the Committees regarding this tool that models all “H’s” (hatchery, harvest, hydropower, and habitat). The All-H Analyzer was developed by Lars Mobernd as part of the Hatchery Scientific Review Group (HSRG) process in Puget Sound. Unlike EDT, it is an open source Excel spreadsheet model. The model may be useful for informing decisions regarding hatchery and harvest actions. Because Bruce Suzomoto may give a presentation on this at the meeting in March, Kris Petersen agreed to check on an updated users’ guide and will send this to the Committees. Mike Schiewe will coordinate with Suzomoto to find out what information/data and assumptions would be used during this presentation that would demonstrate the model. Mike Schiewe will pass this information on to Kirk Truscott. Using this information, Truscott agreed to contact Andy Appleby at WDFW regarding the data needed for Suzomoto’s presentation. This presentation will likely consist of the morning session of a regular Hatchery Committees meeting; additional staff of Committees members may attend.

#### **V HCP Website (Mike Schiewe)**

Mike Schiewe updated the Committees that the Coordinating Committees had discussed the proposed content and users for a potential HCP website containing Chelan and Douglas PUD HCP information. The Coordinating Committees discussed potential documents to be hosted in separate password-protected and publicly-accessible sections. The password-protected section might contain: calendar, draft items, meeting agendas, Meeting Minutes, attachments, and Statements of Agreements. The public site might contain: final Meeting Minutes, final reports, and HCP history documents and filings. The Coordinating Committees discussed the possibility of Anchor organizing/hosting this service and Mike Schiewe will be checking into this arrangement. Chris Carlson mentioned that Grant PUD may be interested in linking their site into this information.

#### **VI 2005 Broodstock Collection Objectives and Protocols (Kirk Truscott)**

Kirk Truscott led a discussion on the schedule for providing 2005 broodstock objectives and protocols; proposed objectives and protocols will be provided as a draft at the February

meeting, with the goal of approval at the March or April meeting. Chuck Peven mentioned that Chelan and Grant PUD are in the process of assessing Grant PUD's production plans in light of Chelan PUD's potential Chiwawa improvements. Mike Schiewe suggested that Grant PUD invite Chelan and Douglas PUDs the Priest Rapids Hatchery Committee meetings to keep abreast of their progress. Mike Schiewe also verified with Truscott and Kris Petersen that the ESA permits require broodstock protocols.

#### **VII Prioritized WDFW Potential Improvements List (Shaun Seaman)**

Shaun Seaman updated the group that the WDFW Potential Improvements List has been circulated. Items have been categorized into a descending priority by the letters A, B, and C, but have not been prioritized further within these categories. Some items in this list are being actively addressed, and some of these improvements may be subject to Requests for Feasibility Analysis (RFAs). Seaman encouraged the Committees to review this list off-line and address questions or concerns to Chuck Peven. Feasibility studies for some of the items are currently being planned, and due dates for these studies will be prepared and revised as objectives are set and understood for the various activities.

#### **VIII Wenatchee Basin Coho Mitigation (Shaun Seaman)**

Mike Schiewe indicated that the HCPs require the Committees to address the topic of coho mitigation in a phased approach. Phase 1 is to evaluate whether a hatchery program and/or naturally-reproducing population exists; and Phase 2 is to establish appropriate means to satisfy the 7% hatchery compensation program. The HCP provides further information regarding actions necessary for the PUD if warranted. The Committees discussed the fact that the Yakama Nation's (YN) program currently releases about 1 million coho smolts in the Wenatchee basin. The YN is currently proposing to begin a phased-up approach to develop local broodstock and start releasing in other streams within the Wenatchee Basin. As part of the YN's BPA program, they have developed a Technical Working Group, to oversee the program on a technical basis. This group has seen the YN's proposal and is evaluating whether to endorse it or not. There is an upcoming meeting on February 17 in Leavenworth that Mike Schiewe will attend. The Committees agreed to revisit this topic at future meetings.

## **IX 2005 Chiwawa River Hatchery Water Supply Study (Chuck Peven)**

Chuck Peven provided Committees members prior to the meeting, with a hard copy of the 2004 Chiwawa River Hatchery Water Supply Study report, prepared by Chelan PUD. Kris Petersen commented that biological appropriateness should be the first criteria for selecting options for the hatchery water supply. Chuck Peven responded that this was first taken into account in initiating the study. Peven stated that Chelan PUD attempted to meet this goal by evaluating options regarding groundwater and by mixing with Wenatchee River water. Kirk Truscott commented that groundwater options may have been dismissed too early in the process, and asked for clarification on these options. To this end, Bill Christman (of Chelan PUD) joined the meeting to answer questions.

Christman updated the Committees that the groundwater capacity nearby is inadequate to serve the facility. Christman also clarified that temperature differentials between Chiwawa River water and groundwater given in the report refer to temperatures close to the surface during non-frazil ice periods. Viable options in the report were selected with the objective of minimizing use of Wenatchee River water to maintain fish health and homing fidelity. It may be possible to use some groundwater, but Wenatchee River water would still be needed as a backup option. In the report, the estimated percent of water hitting the screen (if water is added just before the screen) was based on a conservative judgment because the Chiwawa intake site is shallow, high-gradient, and close to the water surface.

Chelan PUD will review temperature data in order to check on the temperature differentials between groundwater and surface water. To aid in this effort, Truscott agreed to provide Chelan PUD with a written list of comments for this report.

## **X Turtle Rock Conversion (Chuck Peven)**

Chuck Peven updated the Committees that he had discussed with Heather Bartlett about whether the YN is in agreement with the Turtle Rock conversion from subyearlings to yearlings, as proposed by WDFW and Senator Linda Evans Parlette. The YN are in agreement with conversion of the Turtle Rock program as part of the 2005-2007 bridge agreement in regards to U.S. vs. Oregon. Chelan PUD is now looking at the technical feasibility and Operations and Maintenance (O&M) needs for the future. Senator Parlette is interested in helping find funds to help this conversion. Chuck Peven agreed to continue

being the point of contact through Dennis Beich (WDFW) for Senator Parlette; he will communicate an estimate of this cost through Mr. Beich.

## **XI ESA and Mitigation and Enhancement Reports (Kris Petersen)**

Kris Petersen introduced this topic by stating that the objective of these reports is to fulfill ESA and M&E needs in one document. Kirk Truscott indicated that draft outlines for these reports have been sent to NOAA Fisheries, Chelan PUD, and Douglas PUD for review. Kris Petersen noted that tables will be required showing release and tagging history, and Chuck Peven verified that he is currently working with Andrew Murdoch to prepare this. Peven, Petersen, and Truscott agreed to conduct an email discussion to determine the schedules and deadlines for these reports; they will update the Committees on these dates. These reports will likely appear in the HCP Annual Reports as a technical memorandum.

## **XII Other Issues (Mike Schiewe)**

### **1 Mid-Columbia Forum (Mike Schiewe)**

Mike Schiewe updated the Committees that the Coordinating Committees had previously agreed to host a Mid-Columbia Forum a couple of times a year (likely late March and November), and had set the first meeting date for Tuesday, March 29 at the Convention Center in Wenatchee, for 5 to 6 hours (times TBA). Meeting topics will likely be three-fold: 1) fish passage/No Net Impact (NNI); 2) hatchery issues; and 3) tributary issues, to include history, completed studies, plans for the coming year, and agreements made for these topics. Discussions may be hosted by a lead person, supported by a panel of Committees members for these topics. Potential invitees may include HCP signatories, HCP non-signatories, PUD commissioners, Washington Department of Ecology, the Northwest Power Planning Council, watershed councils, the Bonneville Power Administration, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Salmon Recovery Funding Board, the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board, Technical Recovery Teams, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, U.S. Forest Service, Okanagan Nation Alliance, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Nature Conservancy, among others. Mike Schiewe agreed to draft a proposed agenda and speakers list and to send this to Committees members; this agenda will be sent to HCP non-signatories for review and comment before finalization.

**2      *Updates on WDFW Facilities*      *(Rick Stilwater/Kirk Truscott)***

Kris Petersen asked for an update on WDFW's plans to switch back to Chiwawa River water at the Chiwawa facility. Rick Stilwater responded that WDFW is following standard protocols, and are watching environmental conditions closely and will make the switch according to conditions. Stilwater also updated the Committees that there is currently an ice dam above the shake wall at Similkameen Ponds. Also, the Twisp Trap will be ready for fish this year, as pond screen work should be completed by March 1.

Kirk Truscott updated the Committees that access issues for the planned work at the Chewuch Trap are being dealt with on the Interagency Committee (IAC) level, and that access will have to be obtained by land acquisition or by permit.

Kirk Truscott updated the Committees that WDFW would like to initiate a discussion with the Colville Tribes on summer chinook rearing results at Bonaparte Ponds, possibly at the February meeting.

**3      *Colville Smolt Trap in Okanagan*      *(Kris Petersen)***

Kris Petersen updated the Committees that the permit application for smolt-trapping in the Okanagan is part of the basin-wide monitoring program. This application will be posted in the Federal Register for public comment. Operations proposed are similar to existing smolt traps with data to be shared among interested parties. WDFW is on board with the proposed application. Petersen agreed to email the link to the Federal Register listing when it is posted.

**4      *PUD Report Formats*      *(Shaun Seaman)***

Shaun Seaman updated the Committees that to improve efficiency, update and summary reports from Chelan PUD that are prepared on a repetitive basis will be created as technical memos or addenda referencing the original document. Shane Bickford indicated that Douglas PUD currently follows this pattern as well.

**5      *HCP Annual Reports      (Mike Schiewe)***

Mike Schiewe updated the group that these reports are in progress. Ali Wick agreed to email Kirk Truscott as to what is needed for the Hatchery Production tables in the Annual Reports.

**6      *Next Meeting***

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, February 16, 2005 in Wenatchee.

**List of Meeting Minute Attachments**

Attachment A: List of Attendees

Attachment B: Statement of Agreement—Sockeye Split

Attachment C: Statement of Agreement—Facilities Evaluation Report

**Attachment A**  
**List of Attendees**

---

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Michael Schiewe *	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Ali Wick	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Shaun Seaman*	Chelan PUD
Chuck Peven	Chelan PUD
Scott Buehn	Chelan PUD
Jim Gray	Chelan PUD
Bill Christman	Chelan PUD
Jerry Marco *	Colville Tribes (by conference call)
Rick Klinge *	Douglas PUD
Chris Carlson	Grant PUD
Kristine Petersen *	NOAA Fisheries
Erich Wolf	Sapere Consulting, Inc.
Brian Cates *	USFWS
Kirk Truscott *	WDFW
Rick Stilwater	WDFW
Bob Rogers	WDFW
John Penny	WDFW

\* Denotes Hatchery Committees member



---

**APPENDIX C**  
**HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN TRIBUTARY COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

---

HCP TRIBUTARY COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL  
July 8, 2004

Meeting Report  
By D. Rohr and Associates

On Thursday, July 8, 2004, the HCP Tributary Committee met by conference call. Those in attendance were as follows:

Dennis Beich, WDFW  
David Morgan, USFWS  
Chris Fischer, Colville Tribes  
Dale Bambrick, NOAA Fisheries  
Keith Truscott, Chelan PUD  
Bob Clubb, Douglas PUD  
Shane Bickford, Douglas PUD  
Rick Klinge, Douglas PUD  
Dennis Rohr, D. Rohr and Associates  
Richelle Beck, D. Rohr and Associates

Rohr began the discussion with a review of where the Coordinating Committee (CC) was on the chair position process. Bugert is the number one choice of the Tributary Committee and the CC is moving ahead with that recommendation. Rohr will be talking with Bugert once he returns from his vacation. The Tributary Committee's second choice was Scheiwe. If Bugert turns the position down, the CC will discuss Schiewe as the next option. Rohr will keep the committee advised.

A FERC process update was provided. Truscott explained on June 21, FERC issued the order approving the HCP's for Rocky Reach, Rock Island, and Wells to incorporate into their licensing. However, there are a few major issues that the signatory parties would like to address with FERC in a re-hearing. First, FERC neglected to have the HCP's supercede the existing settlement agreements. Second, they left the Mid-Columbia Coordinating Committee in place. The parties are looking for some clarification. They do not want a dual process. Comments on the order and a request for a re-hearing are due by July 21. The attorney's and signatory parties are discussing the options and deciding on how they want to coordinate the response.

Rohr suggested the group discuss the issue of involving outside parties to participate in some of the Tributary Committee discussions. For example, there is an Entiat Watershed workgroup that has expressed interest in receiving some tributary funds. They have been asking how they should proceed in addressing this issue with the Tributary Committee. The Tributary Committee responded they are not yet prepared to make decisions on how disbursement of funds will be handled. A permanent chair would need to be in position before these discussions could take place. The group agreed that public involvement is not required in the HCP's. Any inclusion would have to be tightly controlled. However, they also agreed it would be foolish to fully insulate the group from the public. It might

be a good idea to develop some talking points for future meetings. In the meantime, no responses will be provided to outside interests.

Rohr will keep everyone advised regarding the chair position. The next meeting of this group is in late August (time and date should be added here since it wasn't provided in the discussion). If a conference call is needed in the meantime, the participants will be notified.

**HCP TRIBUTARY COMMITTEE  
MEETING NOTES, 31 AUGUST 2004**

**Members Present:** Dale Bambrick (NOAA-F), Dennis Beich (WDFW), Chris Fisher (Colville Tribes), Rick Klinge (Douglas PUD), Keith Truscott (Chelan PUD), Bob Bugert (Committee Chair).

**Members Absent:** David Morgan (USFWS).

**Others Present:** Bill Towey (Colville Tribes), Mark Miller (USFWS), Dick Nason (Chelan PUD Consultant), Bill Dobbins (Douglas PUD), Bob Clubb (Douglas PUD) Shane Bickford (Douglas PUD).

---

1. Format for Meeting Agendas and Notes

Bugert initiated the meeting by reviewing the format for meeting agendas, briefing papers, and notes. As directed in the HCP Settlement Agreement, the chair will distribute the meeting notice and agenda ten days prior to the meeting. The notice and agenda will outline matters to be addressed and voted on during the meeting. For key issues that the committee must address at a meeting, the chair will develop briefing papers to allow productive deliberations by the committee during the meeting. Agenda items requiring a formal committee decision or vote will be noted on the pre-meeting agenda.

Within a week after the meeting, the chair will distribute draft notes of the meeting to all committee members (and non-members) who attended the meeting and to committee members who were unable to attend. After a one-week review period by committee members, the chair will distribute the final meeting notes, based on the comments and corrections provided by committee members.

2. Rock Island and Rocky Reach Funding

Keith Truscott described the procedure for installment of Plan Species Account funds from the Rock Island and Rocky Reach agreements. Keith noted that each of the three agreements have subtle, but important differences that the committee should be aware of. The language in the Rock Island and Rocky Reach agreements and concomitant FERC orders stipulate that the funds be distributed ninety (90) days after the order, which was received on 21 June 2004. Therefore, the first installment is to be provided on or near 19 September 2004. Bob Clubb said that, per the Wells Settlement Agreement and FERC Order, Douglas PUD will make available roughly \$2.2 million dollars (which was adjusted for inflation from the \$1,980,000 in 1998 dollars) 90 days after the effective date of the agreement. Bob Clubb further noted that Douglas PUD established an account for the funds.

Keith said the signatories to this agreement, excluding Chelan and Douglas PUDs (hereafter called the Joint Fishery Parties, or JFP), may elect for Chelan PUD to contribute, in advance, any of the annual payments to be made during the first fifteen years of the agreement, provided that (1) each annual payment shall be adjusted for inflation, (2) the total adjusted amount shall be reduced to present value by the actual

discount rate and reduced by the PUD's annual cost of financing, and (3) each election shall be for a minimum of three annual payments.

If the JFP wished to receive an annual contribution, it would be provided 31 January of each year. Therefore, if the default arrangement stipulated in the Chelan PUD agreements would provide the committee its first allocation on or about 19 September 2004, followed by 31 January 2005.

Dale asked what would be the process if the JFP wished to front load. Keith responded that 30 days would be the minimum time period to enable the PUD to respond. The request needs to be made in writing to the chairman. Another option would be to place money into the account, yet not spend it immediately. Keith said that the funds would be discounted for future years if that option is chosen by the JFP. In 1998 dollars, the Rocky Reach funds are \$229,800 per year, and the Rock Island funds are \$485,200 per year. Keith said he would update to 2004 dollars and notify the committee.

Keith requested some form of communication from the JFP by the next meeting (22 September), so that Chelan PUD can plan accordingly. He again stressed that the annual contribution on 31 January will be automatic, yet the JFP must put in a request if they wish to receive a different funding arrangement.

Dale Bambrick asked Chelan PUD to describe the intent of the funding process for the Tributary Fund. Dick Nason said the intent was to establish an annual fund with flexibility for subsequent periodic allocations. The JFP could then request funds when they anticipate a large expenditure. The agreements do not stipulate the relative allocation of funds to each tributary, yet each agreement does specify a geographic description that funding from each agreement is limited to. Funds from the Wells Settlement Agreement would be directed toward the Columbia River watershed from the Wells tailrace to Chief Joseph tailrace and the Methow and Okanogan watersheds. Rocky Reach and Rock Island funds could be directed towards the Columbia River watershed from Rock Island tailrace to Chief Joseph tailrace and the Okanogan, Methow, Entiat, and Wenatchee River watersheds.

Bob Bugert noted that many projects now submitted for funding by the Washington State Salmon Recovery Funding Board are the result of several years of pre-project planning, engineering, and development. This presumably would be similar for projects submitted to the Tributary Committee. The committee should be able to anticipate pending large-scale projects and request funds from Chelan PUD.

Bob Clubb added that no more than \$80,000 per year can be used for administration, staffing and consultants, publications, landowner assistance, expert help, or public education without the unanimous vote of the Tributary Committee. Also, a one-time contribution of \$200,000 per project (\$600,000 total) is provided to evaluate the effectiveness of protection and restoration projects that have been implemented. This is separate from the three plan species accounts established to mitigate for project impacts. Shane Bickford said that the intent of this fund was to conduct implementation

monitoring of projects funded with monies from the plan species accounts. The implementation monitoring completed with the assessment dollars would likely be tied into the Agreements' 2013 "check in" date for No Net Impact.

Keith suggest that the "default" one-year allocation be set, allowing for the Committee to set up policies and procedures. Dale Bambrick concurred, and suggested that the committee hold off on a request for additional dollars. At this time, the members concurred with this suggestion, although no formal decision was made.

### 3. Near-Term Priorities

The committee discussed what issues should be addressed in the next six months, and of these issues, which ones should be considered a priority. The priority issues (with initial committee perspectives) are discussed briefly below:

#### *a. Committee decision making and operating procedures*

As specified in each Settlement Agreement, the Tributary Committee shall act by unanimous vote of those members present in person or by phone for the vote and shall develop its own rules of process. Abstention does not prevent a unanimous vote. If a member or their designated representative cannot be present for an agenda item to be voted upon at a Tributary Committee meeting, that member or representative must notify the chair of the Committee. The chair of the Committee shall delay a vote on that issue for up to five business days. A party may invoke this right only once per delayed agenda item. Committee members may designate an alternate, either in written form or in an email to the chair. The chair will maintain records on how decisions were made. If there is a dissenting vote on an issue by the Tributary Committee, then any committee member may raise the issue to the Coordinating Committee for resolution

The committee wanted formal procedures be established for specific matters such as project solicitation, review, and awarding procedures. They asked the chair to develop draft Operating Procedures for review and discussion at the next meeting.

#### *b. Participation by non-signatories, stakeholders, and experts.*

At this time, the committee envisioned different levels of participation by non-signatories, depending on the status of the party and the circumstances of the committee deliberations. Each is briefly discussed below:

- The committee may formally invite a non-signatory party that has federally-designated status as a fisheries co-manager, and is directly affected by the proceedings. This benefits the committee through increased coordination and sharing of expertise. These parties would not be allowed to participate in voting.
- The committee may request limited participation of a non-signatory party that is indirectly affected by the Tributary Committee (such as a Watershed Planning Unit or state designated Lead Entity). Similar to non-signing co-managers, these parties would not be allowed to have voting authority.

- The committee may ask technical experts to serve in an advisory capacity to the Tributary Committee. At certain times, the participation of fluvial geomorphologists, hydrologists, engineers, and others with technical expertise may be necessary for knowledgeable deliberations of the committee. The committee may solicit the participation of non-voting experts on an *ad hoc* basis.

Again, the committee recognized the need for a formal and unambiguous procedure for participation by non-signatories, and asked the chair to draft some language for discussion and eventual adoption.

*c. Communications*

The committee agreed on the need to set up a well defined process for public involvement and communications. There appears to be a general agreement on the need to manage participation by outside entities in Tributary Committee deliberations. At this time, the general consensus of the committee was to have closed meetings, yet be open by invitation to specific stakeholders, based on unanimous decision by the Tributary Committee. This might include participation by the Yakama Nation, as described above, following formal direction from the HCP Coordinating and possibly the HCP Policy committees.

Dale suggested that the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB) be an appropriate entity for public participation. Dennis Beich expressed concerns that the UCSRB does not provide adequate representation of watershed groups and other stakeholders that would be affected by committee decisions.

Keith Truscott proposed two avenues for increasing public involvement: 1) a web site for promulgation of Tributary Committee proceedings and deliberations, and 2) a large annual or semi-annual meeting to all stakeholders to present the annual work plan and the beginning of a fiscal year. At this time, the committee members concurred with this approach, yet no formal decision was made.

Keith Truscott recommended further discussion on this matter following input from the Executive/Policy leadership with regard to public involvement.

Rick Klinge and Chris Fisher both expressed that they would like the Tributary Committee to be less encumbered than other funding organizations, such as BPA. All members agreed on the need for a streamlined, agile approach.

4. Next Steps

The next meeting of the Tributary Committee will be 10:00 to 3:00 on Wednesday, 22 September 2004 at Chelan PUD Headquarters in Wenatchee. Dale Bambrick notified the committee that he cannot make this meeting, yet will designate Dennis Carlson as his proxy. Subsequent meetings will be on 19 November and 9 December 2004.

Meeting notes by Bob Bugert ([Bob.Bugert@charter.net](mailto:Bob.Bugert@charter.net)).

**HCP TRIBUTARY COMMITTEES  
MEETING NOTES, 22 September 2004**

**Members Present:** David Morgan (USFWS), Dennis Beich (WDFW), Chris Fisher (Colville Tribes), Rick Klinge (Douglas PUD), Keith Truscott (Chelan PUD), Bob Bugert (Committee Chair).

**Members Absent:** Dale Bambrick (NOAA-F); Dennis Carlson served as alternate

**Others Present:** Bob Clubb (Douglas PUD) Shane Bickford (Douglas PUD).

---

1. Procedures for information distribution

Bob Bugert requested direction from the Committees on procedures for distribution of agendas, draft and final meeting minutes, and work products being developed by the Committees.

The group concurred that draft minutes will go only to Tributary committee (those in attendance and not). Comments by members to the draft notes will be sent to the chair, who will then incorporate suggested changes to the minutes. For issues of significant disagreement, he will include the draft notes in the next meeting agenda for deliberations by the committees. The chair will then distribute final minutes all HCP committee members. Likewise, draft work products will remain within the Tributary Committees until completed and approved.

The chair will solicit input from committee members on agenda items, and will submit a tentative agenda for the meeting. Members will amend the agenda by unanimous vote at that meeting.

Dennis Beich suggested that the Tributary Committees make the final products available to any party on request. Keith Truscott concurred, suggesting that a web site would be helpful for stakeholder awareness of Tributary Committee deliberations. Bob Clubb said that there may be policy direction from the Coordinating Committees on the final approach for this. The Tributary Committees will not act on this matter at this time.

2. Review and Discussion of Draft Operating Procedures

The Committees reviewed the 8 September draft operating procedures. Attached is the current draft, based on the discussions held. The group identified a couple salient issues to those procedures, which are described below:

Dennis Beich asked about the need for separate tributary committees for each settlement agreement. Rick Klinge responded that this will enable better tracking of fund allocations for each agreement, particularly when the Douglas HCP funds are to be applied only for projects upstream of Wells Dam. This will help each PUD establish a clear line in balance sheets on the distribution of funds from each Plan Species Account.



---

Dave Morgan said the current language in the draft Operating Procedures about USFWS as a voting member is ambiguous. He asked the committees if there were advantages to getting clarification from USFWS on its voting policies. The group responded that this was clearly advantageous to the committees, and asked David to explore this issue and report back to the committees.

The group discussed whether to include small tributaries that flow directly into the Columbia River in the scope of the Tributary Fund. Many members saw the need to include these smaller streams, if they had projects with biological merit. Keith Truscott will confer with others in Chelan PUD on inclusion of smaller tributaries in the Tributary Fund, and report back to the group.

### 3. Review and Discussion of Draft Funding Policies

The Tributary Committees reviewed the 8 September draft policies for funding projects. Rick Klinge mentioned that during their internal review of the draft, it became apparent to Douglas PUD that some policies may not be consistent with rules established by the State Auditor related to disbursement of public funds. Keith Truscott said that this may be an issue for Chelan PUD as well. Douglas PUD will meet with their treasurer and representatives from the State Attorney's General Office to get clarification on state rules for awarding contracts.

Both Rick and Keith asked the committees to be mindful of these issues during the development of the Tributary Committees' funding policies. Some policies agreed to during this meeting may have to be reconsidered when the PUDs' get input from their treasurers and others.

The group had significant and productive discussions about the role of matches in funding deliberations, minimum award amounts, technical review, eligibility criteria, and coordination with other funding processes. Attached is the current draft, based on those discussions.

### 4. Procedures for Project Application and Review

The group began discussions about project application forms and review criteria. Many members expressed concerns about the cumbersome application procedures used by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board and the Northwest Power Planning and Conservation Council. Recognizing the need to coordinate funding with these processes, the committees saw the advantages of having a similar, but hopefully simpler, application process. Chris Fisher recommended that we consider the application forms developed by the NOAA-Fisheries Community Based Habitat Restoration Program. The group asked the chair to assemble a draft application form based on these models.

The group also began discussions about technical review of project proposals. Shane Bickford described the technical review procedures used by the Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team. He suggested that the Tributary Committees use the same (or a similar) process to get recommendations on the technical merit of proposed projects. Dennis Beich concurred, noting that this simplifies and strengthens the process—both for

project sponsors and the committees—by using established technical review procedures. The group was interested in this proposal, but was not prepared to take action on this. They asked the chair to assemble information on this technical review process for the next meeting.

5. Public Outreach and Participation

Dennis Carlson distributed a letter from NOAA-F responding to an inquiry from a stakeholder regarding the Tributary Fund. The group concurred on the need for a proactive approach to address stakeholder concerns; yet felt it prudent to hold off until the deliberations on non-signatory participation by the Coordinating Committee is completed.

6. Next Steps

The next meeting of the Tributary Committee will be 10:00 to 3:00 on Wednesday, 24 November 2004 in Wenatchee. The following meeting will tentatively be on 16 December 2004 (PLEASE NOTE THESE DATE CHANGES!). The tentative agenda for the November meeting includes four topics:

- Continued review of draft Operating Procedures
- Continued review of draft Funding Policies,
- Initial review of draft Application Forms, and
- Description of current technical review procedures.

Meeting notes by Bob Bugert ([Bob.Bugert@charter.net](mailto:Bob.Bugert@charter.net)).

**HCP TRIBUTARY COMMITTEE  
CONFERENCE CALL NOTES, 25 OCTOBER 2004**

**Members Present:** Dale Bambrick (NOAA-F), Dennis Beich (WDFW), Chris Fisher (Colville Tribes), Rick Klinge (Douglas PUD), Keith Truscott (Chelan PUD), Bob Bugert (Committee Chair).

**Members Absent:** David Morgan (USFWS).

**Others Present:** Bob Clubb (Douglas PUD).

---

At the request of Chelan PUD, the Tributary Committees held a conference call to discuss a potential partnership with Chelan County, who is undertaking a public outreach strategy as part of the salmon recovery plan. The county has funds from the Salmon Recovery Funding Board to conduct public meetings under the three-county coordinated effort of the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB). Keith Truscott informed the group that Chelan County has hired a consultant to assist them in this effort, and suggested that this may be a good opportunity to provide information consistent with the Tributary Committees' goals and activities during these outreach sessions.

Dennis Beich said that the Tributary Committees do not have much substantive information to provide at this time, and was concerned that the consultant may provide misinformation to the community. Rick Klinge concurred, suggesting that we defer the public outreach until a later date, when products are available. Keith agreed, and further stated that the Committee should consider this as an opportunity to supply the County with the correct information about the Tributary Committees progress/process to avoid misinformation being inadvertently passed on at County meetings. Dennis Beich suggested that the chair develop a one-page briefing sheet on the status of the Fund and Committees. Keith felt that this may be the safest approach. He suggested that we ask the County not to actively promote the Fund, yet to have the briefing sheet available if stakeholders have questions.

The group asked Bob Bugert to prepare a sheet for review and comment by the Tributary Committees. Once the briefing sheet is approved, he will submit it to Chelan, Douglas, and Okanogan Counties (each of whom are carrying out public outreach at this time through the UCSRB). He will stress to the counties to refrain from actively promoting the Tributary Fund, yet to provide this briefing sheet if so requested by stakeholders.

Meeting notes by Bob Bugert ([Bob.Bugert@charter.net](mailto:Bob.Bugert@charter.net)).

**HCP TRIBUTARY COMMITTEES  
MEETING NOTES, 24 November 2004**

**Members Present:** Dale Bambrick (NOAA-F), Dennis Beich (WDFW), Rick Klinge (Douglas PUD), Keith Truscott (Chelan PUD), Bob Bugert (Committee Chair).

**Members Absent:** Chris Fisher (Colville Tribes), David Morgan (USFWS)

**Others Present:** Shane Bickford (Douglas PUD), Bob Clubb (Douglas PUD), Dick Nason (Chelan PUD Consultant).

---

1. Review and Discussion of Draft Operating Procedures.

The Committees reviewed the 10 November *draft* operating procedures. It appears that this product is at a stage that it could be adopted at the 16 December meeting. However, there remains some uncertainty about how the Committees will coordinate with local processes and stakeholders within the Fund's geographic area. The group will resume those discussions at the next meeting.

The Committees had productive discussions on the benefits and detriments of four scenarios for local coordination and communication: 1) having all regularly scheduled meetings open to the public, 2) opening to the public only those meetings when funding decisions are made, 3) using the proposed Mid-Columbia Forum as the vehicle for external communication, or 4) relying primarily on a web-based approach for distribution of information. The Committees reviewed the language from the recent FERC decision on the Mid-Columbia Forum and Mid-Columbia Proceedings to get some ideas on the appropriate means for coordination.

David Morgan was unable to attend this meeting, but relayed to the group through Bob that USFWS will maintain its current status as non-voting representative to the Tributary Committees. David said this issue can be revisited from time to time if the Committees feel there is a compelling need.

2. Review and Discussion of Draft Funding Policies.

The Tributary Committees reviewed the 10 November *draft* policies for funding projects. At this time, the Committees have agreed to the development of a two-tiered funding package: 1) a general salmon habitat fund, which will have a detailed application and review process to fund large-scale projects, and 2) a small-projects fund, which will target those groups that typically do not have the expertise or resources to carry out large scale projects. This latter fund will have a relatively simple application package, employ a short-term review and decision period, and be limited to projects costing \$25,000 or less. There will be no upper limit to the general fund. It will have a capability to support very large and complex projects in stages, and make limited funds available for initial project design and scoping.

Bob distributed the *draft* Upper Columbia Biological Strategy as an example of a technical framework for making decisions on project applications. The Committees will probably use this strategy, and request technical reviews of most projects by the Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team (RTT—the developers of the biological strategy), but have not formally voted on this approach at this time. The Committees may decide not to solicit the input of the RTT for some projects (most likely those in the small projects fund). Bob reported to the Committees that

the RTT (or a subcommittee to the RTT) is willing to provide these reviews. The Committees will not rely on reviews of projects by citizens' committees.

At this time, the Committees will not require matching funds from the project applicant to qualify for funding, although the Committees will consider the type and amount of match available when deciding whether to fund a given project. The Committees will make a pre-proposal application process available for sponsors of very large projects, which should reduce the up-front work load for the sponsors, RTT, and the Committees.

The Committees reviewed the *draft* timeline for completion of milestones. At this time, the goal is to have the funding policies adopted by February, allowing the Committees to solicit project applications in March, with a due date of 30 September 2005.

3. Procedures for Review of Products and Interim Public Outreach.

Bob asked for direction on the review of products by the Committees. The Committees agreed that Bob should assist in developing and updating products that remain internal to the group—this should expedite the completion of products. It was agreed that final review and approval of products by Committee members will take place prior to distribution to entities external to the Committees.

Bob also asked direction on whether to solicit input from selected groups (particularly other funding organizations) on the *draft* funding policies. The group indicated that he should gather information germane to the functions of the Committees, yet not distribute the draft products at this time. The Committees clarified what meetings the chair should attend at a regular schedule to represent the Tributary Committees. Bob expects that regular attendance at local forums will not be necessary, yet he should participate in the RTT if the Committees elect to use them for review of project applications.

4. Next Steps.

The next meeting of the Tributary Committee will be 9:00 to 3:00 on Thursday, 16 December 2004—location to be announced. Dale notified the group that he (or his proxy) will be unable to attend this meeting. The tentative agenda for the December meeting includes four topics:

- Adoption of the draft Operating Procedures,
- Adoption of the technical review procedures.
- Continued review of draft Funding Policies, and
- Initial discussion of developing a web site for the Fund.

Beginning January 2005, the Committees will regularly meet from 9:00 to 3:00 on the second Thursday of each Month. The January meeting is therefore 13 January—location to be announced.

Meeting notes by Bob Bugert ([Bob.Bugert@charter.net](mailto:Bob.Bugert@charter.net)).

**HCP TRIBUTARY COMMITTEES  
MEETING NOTES, 16 December 2004**

**Members Present:** Dennis Beich (WDFW), Rick Klinge (Douglas PUD), David Morgan (USFWS), Keith Truscott (Chelan PUD), Bob Bugert (Committee Chair)

**Members Absent:** Chris Fisher (Colville Tribes), Dale Bambrick (NOAA-F)

**Others Present:** Bob Clubb (Douglas PUD), Russell Langshaw (Grant PUD)

---

1. Update on Grant PUD's activities

Russell Langshaw introduced himself as Grant PUD's appointment to attend the Tributary Committees' meetings as a non-voting participant. He will be the main point of contact for this group, with Tom Dresser as his alternate. He briefly reviewed the status of the Biological Opinion for the Priest Rapids Project. Grant PUD expects the BiOp to be approved by FERC in the near future. A major effort for Grant PUD is the new turbine installation, which is nearing completion. They will then initiate survival studies, to refine their levels of compensation. Work on captive brood and acclimation sites for Nason Creek and White River is underway. They have formed their Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee and are forming their Habitat Committee, which will disburse funds for habitat protection and restoration, similar to the HCP Tributary Committees. Russell said they will probably refer to the products the Tributary Committees are now developing in setting up their own operating procedures, funding policies, and other products.

2. Update on discussions related to Mid-Columbia Forum

Bob Clubb said that FERC ruled on the PUDs' request for a rehearing. The ruling provided direction concerning issues raised in the June 21, 2004 order approving the HCPs. Bob said that FERC dissolved the Mid-Columbia Coordinating Committee and did not require the PUDs to participate in the proposed Mid-Columbia Forum. However, in a filing to FERC, NOAA Fisheries proposed that the Mid-Columbia Forum be used as a formal means to increase coordination of management entities within the region and the other parties to the HCP agreed to participate. It should be a useful tool to improve communication with non-signatories to the HCP.

Bob said the HCP Coordinating Committees may not envision a need for quarterly meetings of the forum, but recognized that the Tributary Committees may be able to use this forum for public outreach to stakeholders. He believed the Coordinating Committees will be amenable to the scheduling of the forum if the Tributary Committees have specific timing needs for public outreach and participation. As an example, the Tributary Committee may announce its request for proposals in March, which may be the appropriate time to sponsor the first forum.

3. Update on PUD discussions with State auditors

Rick Klinge reviewed the discussions of Douglas PUD with the State Auditor's Office (SAO). He distributed the meeting minutes that serve as the PUD's understanding of their discussions with the SAO. The understanding is that the PUDs are required to use their competitive bid and contract approval process only if the Plan Species Account funds are spent on District owned property. Similarly, only those projects that are ultimately owned by the Districts would go through the standard procedures of the Districts. This provides the Tributary Committee with increased latitude on how the funds can be disbursed. The SAO also determined that since the

funds are part of special concessions regarding their FERC license, they essentially are no longer District money, which allows a different approach for administration of these funds. The funds are now the responsibility of the Tributary Committees, not the Districts, and therefore do not need to be approved by the PUD Commission. However, as stipulated in the Settlement Agreements, the Districts will still provide financial reports on the Plan Species Accounts to the Tributary Committees and FERC. Last, the SAO determined that the meetings of the Tributary Committees are not subject to the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act, allowing the Committees some latitude on how to conduct their meetings.

4. Review of the *Draft Operating Procedures*

The group reviewed the 29 November *draft* Operating Procedures for the Tributary Committees. Members made minor changes to the document. The outstanding issue for the committees to deliberate was when to conduct business in an open process—and on what issues. The decision on this issue was pending the direction on the FERC order related to the Mid-Columbia Forum, described in Section 2, and the interpretation of the SAO, discussed in Section 3. The group came to agreement on the language for conducting business, and the use of the forum as an avenue for communication with regional stakeholders. At this time, the group concurred that all decisions on funding will be held in a closed executive session. The Tributary Committees also agreed to reserve the right to hold closed sessions on other issues, when necessary. The Committees expect to further discuss this approach—and to adopt the Operating Procedures—at the 13 January meeting, when a full quorum is expected to be present.

5. Initial discussion of means to allocate funds by subbasin

Keith Truscott initiated a discussion about establishing a framework for allocation of funds to specific areas within the Upper Columbia Region. At this time, the language in the *draft* Operating Procedures and Funding Policies does not stipulate the relative allocation of funds to each tributary, yet each does specify a geographic description that funding from each Plan is limited to (i.e., funds from the Well account is to be disbursed only to subbasins upstream of that project, while funds from Rock Island and Rocky Reach can be spent on subbasins upstream of Rock Island Dam). After some deliberation, the group decided to keep the current language intact, and perhaps revisit this issue in the future if there is a compelling need.

6. Review the *Draft Funding Policies*

The committee reviewed the 16 December *draft* Funding Policies and clarified the language on several procedural issues related to project review and selection. The group intends to have a *draft* document that is suitable for distribution to selected parties (other funding organizations and key project sponsors) after the January meeting. At the February meeting, the committees will then review the comments made by these organizations. Two salient issues discussed were:

- There is a need for tighter language in the document on contract administration. Bugert will work with the two districts to develop the policy for review by the committees at the January meeting.
- The revised cycle for the General Salmon Habitat Program would be: announcements in March; proposal submission workshop in April; the pre-proposal workshop in July; proposals due in September; and awards announced in January 2006.

Bugert introduced the notion of leasing agricultural lands as an additional tool for protection of habitat. He mentioned that the Institute for Rural Innovation and Stewardship is conducting research on the feasibility of leasing riparian lands for environmental benefit in Chelan County. The group discussed the advantages and disadvantages of using this approach in lieu of

acquisition. There was not support by the committees toward this idea. The idea would be presented again latter to the full Tributary Committees for further discussion.

7. Update on discussions with other funding organizations

Bob Bugert explained the recent deliberations of the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) regarding the development of a “small projects program.” Acknowledging the need for a small projects program, the SRFB is providing grants of \$300,000 to qualified groups to manage and award small grants (less than \$10,000) for habitat restoration. In November, the SRFB discussed with Bugert the potential for the Tributary Committees to receive funds from the SRFB administer these grants. Bugert notified the SRFB that the Committees were not prepared to undertake this activity at this time. It appears however, that the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB) may accept this grant and provide small grants to project sponsors in roughly the same geographic area as the Tributary Committees. Bugert said he will work with the UCSRB to ensure coordination and common approaches for project selection and funding.

8. Web site design

Keith Truscott distributed a template for a web site that describes the status and function of the Tributary Committees. The group discussed placing the meeting agendas, notes, products developed by the committees, and materials that addresses frequently asked questions by project sponsors. In general, the group felt comfortable with this approach, but deferred action until January. Rick Klinge said he is not sure if Douglas PUD would develop a specific web site for the Wells Tributary Committee. If so, the two districts could have potential links between each other. Keith will have a more detailed draft for review and discussion at the January meeting.

9. Next Steps.

The next meeting of the Tributary Committee will be 9:00 to 3:00 on Thursday, 13 January 2005—location to be announced. The tentative agenda for the January meeting includes six topics (please note: the first three will be Action Items that the committees will decide upon):

- Adoption of the *draft* Operating Procedures;
- Adoption of the Upper Columbia Biological Strategy as technical basis for review of project merit;
- Adoption of the RTT as the technical review team for the committees;
- Use of the Mid-Columbia Forum as a means to engage stakeholders;
- Continued review of draft Funding Policies, and
- Continued discussion of a web site for the Fund.

Meeting notes by Bob Bugert ([Bob.Bugert@charter.net](mailto:Bob.Bugert@charter.net))



---

**APPENDIX D**  
**LIST OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

---

---

## Wells Dam Mid-Columbia HCP Committees

### Coordinating Committee

Name	Organization
Michael Schiewe (Chair)	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Jerry Marco	Colville Tribes
Shane Bickford	Douglas PUD
Ritchie Graves	NOAA Fisheries
Brian Cates	USFWS
Bill Tweit	WDFW
Carmen Andonaegui	

### Hatchery Committee

Name	Organization
Michael Schiewe (Chair)	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Jerry Marco	Colville Tribes
Rick Klinge	Douglas PUD
Kristine Petersen	NOAA Fisheries
Brian Cates	USFWS
Kirk Truscott	WDFW

### Tributary Committee

Name	Organization
Bob Bugert (Chair)	Consultant
Chris Fisher	Colville Tribes
Rick Klinge	Douglas PUD
Dale Bambrick	NOAA Fisheries
David Morgan	USFWS
Dennis Beich	WDFW

### Policy Committee

Name	Organization
Michael Schiewe (Facilitator)	Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
Joe Peone	Colville Tribes
Bob Clubb	Douglas PUD
Keith Kirkendall	NOAA Fisheries
Mark Miller	USFWS
Jeff Koenings Bill Tweit	WDFW

---

---

**APPENDIX E**  
**FERC ORDER APPROVING THE HCP**

---

107 FERC ¶ 61,283  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Pat Wood, III, Chairman;  
Nora Mead Brownell, and Joseph T. Kelliher.

Public Utility District No. 1 of  
Douglas County, Washington

Project No. 2149-106

ORDER AMENDING LICENSE

(Issued June 21, 2004)

1. This order approves the application of Public Utility District No. 1 of Douglas County, Washington (Douglas), to amend the license for the Wells Project No. 2149 in order to implement the terms of an Anadromous Fish Settlement and Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) designed to protect Mid-Columbia River Basin salmonids, in particular threatened and endangered species. The Wells HCP and HCPs for two other Mid-Columbia River licensed projects licensed to P.U.D. No. 1 Chelan County, Washington (Chelan) were approved in a companion order issued today (Master Order).<sup>1</sup> These orders will serve the public interest by putting into place a long-term program to aid in the recovery of the endangered species and help to prevent other salmonids from becoming listed.

**Background**

2. The long history of the Columbia River anadromous fishery problem and the efforts of many actors to resolve issues specific to the Mid-Columbia River Basin are summarized in the Master Order and need not be repeated here. It suffices to say that there are four major hydroelectric projects comprising five dams on the Mid-Columbia River, all of which are under Commission license. In order from upstream to downstream they are Wells, Chelan's Rocky Reach and Rock Island Projects, and Public

---

<sup>1</sup> Public Utility District No. 1 of Chelan County, WA, et al., 107 FERC ¶ 61,280 . Separate orders amending the licenses for Chelan's Rocky Reach Project No. 2145 and Rock Island Project No. 943 to implement project-specific HCPs are also being issued today. Public Utility District No. 1 of Chelan County, WA, 107 FERC ¶ 61,281 (Rocky Reach) and ¶ 61,282 (Rock Island).

Utility District No. 2 of Grant County Washington's (Grant) Wanapum-Priest Rapids Project No. 2114 (consisting of Wanapum and Priest Rapids Dams). In the late 1980's, the Commission commenced what has become known as the Mid-Columbia proceeding, in an effort to resolve anadromous fish issues for the licensed Mid-Columbia projects. Project-specific agreements were negotiated for Rock Island and Wells, which are conditions of those licenses. The Rocky Reach license has been amended to authorize installation of permanent downstream fish passage facilities. Grant is currently required to release interim spill flows from Wanapum-Priest Rapids to assist downstream migration.

3. As these events were unfolding, two species of Columbia River salmonids were federally listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).<sup>2</sup> In the early 1990s, discussion commenced among the licensees, National Marine Fisheries Service within the U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA Fisheries), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Indian tribes, and others, with the intention of developing long-term plans for the recovery of the listed salmonids and to prevent further listings (HCPs). HCP Agreements were reached for Wells, Rocky Reach, and Rock Island. Applications for approval of the HCPs and for incidental take permits<sup>3</sup> pursuant to ESA section 10 were filed by Chelan with respect to Rocky Reach and Rock Island, and by Douglas with respect to Wells. NOAA Fisheries granted the requested approvals and permits.

4. Chelan and Douglas also filed separate applications with the Commission for approval of the project-specific HCPs and for amendment of the Rocky Reach, Rock Island, and Wells licenses to incorporate those documents into the appropriate licenses as special articles. The applications are opposed by the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Indian Nation, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, the Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission, and American Rivers.

5. The Master Order addresses the objections of these parties and concludes that the HCPs are in the public interest and should be approved. We incorporate that discussion here by reference. Consistent with the Master Order, this order amends the Wells license to incorporate the HCPs.

6. Also, the FWS issued a Biological Opinion pursuant to ESA section 7 regarding the effects of the projects with respect to various federally-listed threatened and

---

<sup>2</sup> 42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> An incidental take permit exempts the permittee from the prohibition on taking of threatened or endangered species of section 9 of the ESA (16 U.S.C. § 1538).

Project No. 2149-106

- 3 -

endangered species. FWS found that incorporating the HCPs into the licenses is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the endangered bull trout, but did find that the operation of the three projects under the HCPs would result in incidental take of bull trout. Its Biological Opinion thus includes an incidental take statement with respect to each project, including Reasonable and Prudent Measures (RPMs) and associated Terms and Conditions for implementing the RPMs. The RPMs and Terms and Conditions for Rocky Reach are attached to this order, which also adds new license articles requiring them to be implemented.

7. Finally, a minor modification is made to require the licensee to prepare a map indicating the areas which might be affected by implementation of the HCP.

The Commission orders:

(A) The application of Public Utility District No. 1 of Douglas County, Washington, for approval of the Wells Project No. 2149 Anadromous Fish Agreement and Habitat Conservation Plan, and for its adoption as an amendment to the project license, is granted.

(B) The following new article is added to the project license:

Article 59. (a) The licensee shall carry out its obligations as set forth in the Anadromous Fish Agreement and Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP Agreement) for the Wells Hydroelectric Project No. 2149 filed with the Commission on November 24, 2003, and as approved by the Commission at 107 FERC ¶ 61,280 and ¶ 61,283. Further, the licensee shall file with the Commission (1) the final annual and comprehensive progress reports developed pursuant to the HCP Agreement; and (2) the final results of all studies and testing pursuant to the HCP Agreement.

(b) Prior to taking any action pursuant to the HCP Agreement that requires a change in the authorized project facilities or operations not specifically identified in the HCP Agreement, the licensee shall file a license amendment application.

(c) The licensee shall file design drawings prior to the implementation of any modification or addition to project works that is necessary to implement the HCP Agreement. The licensee shall file such design drawings for Commission approval at least 90 days prior to the start of construction or modification. The licensee will file as-built drawings with the Commission within 6 months after completion of construction or modification.

(C) Article 60 is added to the project license, to read as follows:

Article 60. The licensee, prior to the commencement of any ground-disturbing activity at the Project site or on non-federal lands pursuant to the Tributary Conservation Plan provisions of the Habitat Conservation Plan Agreement approved by the Commission at 107 FERC ¶ 61,280 and ¶ 61,283, shall consult with the Washington State Historical Preservation Officer (SHPO) and potentially affected Indian tribes about the need for a cultural resources survey. For this purpose, the licensee shall within 90 days prepare and provide to the SHPO and potentially affected Indian tribes a map delineating the Area of Potential Effect as defined in 36 C.F.R. § 800.16(d), and the map shall include potential geographical scope of actions under the Tributary Conservation Plan. If any previously unrecorded archeological or historical sites are discovered during the course of such survey or activity, ground-disturbing activity in the vicinity shall be halted, a qualified archeologist shall be consulted to determine the significance of the sites, and the licensee shall consult with the SHPO and tribes to develop a mitigation plan for the protection of significant archeological or historical resources. The Commission reserves authority to resolve any disputes between the licensee and the consulted entities.

(D) New Article 61 is added to the Project license, to read as follows:

*Article 61. Bull Trout – Reasonable and Prudent Measures and Terms and Conditions.* (a) Within six months of the issuance of the order amending license issued at 107 FERC ¶ 61,283 (2004), the licensee shall file for Commission approval a plan to implement the Reasonable and Prudent Measures and associated Terms and Conditions said order. The plan shall include provision for the annual report required by Article 412. The plan shall be prepared in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NOAA Fisheries, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and interested Indian tribes.

(b) The licensee shall include with the plan documentation of consultation, copies of comments and recommendations on the completed plan after it has been prepared and provided to the consulted entities, and specific descriptions of how the entities' comments and recommendations are accommodated by the plan. The licensee shall allow a minimum of 30 days for the entities to comment and to make recommendations before filing the plan with the Commission. If the licensee does not adopt a recommendation, the filing shall include the licensee's reason's based on project-specific information.

Project No. 2149-106

- 5 -

(c) The Commission reserves the right to require changes to the plan. The plan shall not be implemented until the licensee is notified by the Commission that the plan is approved. Upon approval of the plan, the licensee shall implement the plan, including any changes required by the Commission.

(E) New Article 62 is added to the project license, to read as follows:

Article 62. *Annual Reports -- Implementation of Reasonable and Prudent Measures.* (a) The licensee shall prepare and file with the Commission an annual report describing the impacts of the Reasonable and Prudent Measures and associated Terms and Conditions prescribed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for the protection of bull trout. The report shall also be submitted to the Central Washington Field Office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and shall list and describe any adverse effects resulting from project activities on bull trout, including the number and life stages of individuals affected.

(b) Upon locating a dead, injured, or sick endangered or threatened species specimen, the licensee shall initially notify the Central Washington Field Office (Wenatchee, Washington; telephone 509-664-0658) within 48 hours. The licensee shall take care in handling sick or injured specimens to ensure effective treatment and care or the handling of dead specimens to preserve biological material in the best possible state for later analysis of cause of death. In conjunction with the care of sick or injured endangered species or preservation of biological materials from a dead animal, the licensee shall carry out instructions provided by the Service to ensure that evidence intrinsic to the specimen is not unnecessarily disturbed.

(F) New Article 63 is added to the project license, to read as follows:

Article 63. *Reservation of Authority – Bull Trout Recovery Plan.* Authority is reserved to the Commission to require the licensee to carry out specified measures for the purpose of participating in the development and implementation of a bull trout recovery plan.

By the Commission. Commissioner Kelly not participating.

( S E A L )

Linda Mitry,  
Acting Secretary.



## APPENDIX

### U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE REASONABLE AND PRUDENT MEASURES AND IMPLEMENTING TERMS AND CONDITIONS REGARDING BULL TROUT

#### Reasonable and Prudent Measures

RPM 1. The Licensee to develop and implement, in coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), appropriate measures to reduce impediments to up and downstream passage of adult and juvenile bull trout at Wells Dam and its associated reservoir system. Should measures to reduce impediments to up- and downstream passage of bull trout warrant consideration of additional modifications to facilities or operations, as determined by the Service in consultation with the Commission and the Licensee, the Service will work with the Commission and the Licensee to insure that these measures are implemented, as appropriate, or recommend that the Commission reinitiate consultation if necessary.

RPM 2. The Licensee shall design a monitoring program to (1) detect adverse effects resulting from the proposed action, (2) assess the actual level of incidental take in comparison with the anticipated incidental take level documented in the biological opinion, (3) detect when the level of anticipated incidental take is exceeded, and (4) determine the effectiveness of reasonable and prudent measures and their implementing terms and conditions. Specifically, the program shall be designed to monitor the abundance, distribution, and timing of adult and juvenile bull trout utilizing Rocky Reach Dam and its associated reservoir system. Implementation of this monitoring program shall begin no later than May 1, 2005. If information from the monitoring efforts warrants consideration of additional modifications to facilities or operations for the minimization of project effects on bull trout, as determined by the Service in consultation with the Commission and the Licensee, the Service will work with the Commission and the Licensee to insure these measures are implemented, as appropriate, or recommend that the Commission reinitiate consultation if necessary.

#### Terms and Conditions

1. To implement RPM 1, the Licensee shall develop, in coordination with the Service, a prioritized list of monitoring efforts necessary to evaluate the effects of the Project on the up- and downstream passage needs of bull trout at Wells Dam by February 28, 2005. Based on that prioritized list, the Licensee shall initiate studies to evaluate the up- and downstream passage needs for bull trout at Rocky Reach Dam and to assess the Project

Project No. 2149-106

- 7 -

impacts on those passage needs. If the information from these studies warrants consideration of modifications to facilities or operations to reduce the take of bull trout, as determined by the Service in consultation with the Commission and the Licensee, then the Service will work with the Commission and the Licensee to ensure that these measures are implemented, as appropriate, or recommend that the Commission reinitiate consultation if necessary.

2. To implement RPM 1, the Licensee shall, in coordination with the Service, develop a prioritized list of monitoring efforts necessary to determine the extent of bull trout entrainment through the turbines at Rocky Reach Dam by February 28, 2005. If the studies contained in the prioritized list are determined by the Service, in consultation with the Commission and the Licensee, to be feasible, the Licensee shall be required to assess the extent of bull trout entrainment through the turbines at Rocky Reach Dam. If entrainment is determined to be significant, the Licensee will be required to explore techniques to minimize bull trout entrainment through the turbines.

3. To implement RPM 2, the Licensee shall, in coordination with the Service, develop and implement a comprehensive bull trout monitoring program, that includes the presence of a sufficient number of radio-tagged (or other appropriate tracking technology) bull trout, to enable monitoring of bull trout utilizing Rocky Reach Dam and its associated reservoir system and tracking of the incidental take exemptions stated above.

4. During the interim period between the Commission' issuance of an order amending the Project license to include these RPMs and Terms and Conditions and the implementation of the monitoring plan called for in RPM 2, the Licensee shall implement the following action items; specifically:

1. Extend the fish ladder monitoring period to assess adult bull trout use of existing fishways outside of the traditional migratory timeframes.
2. Continue coordinated telemetry monitoring of radio-tagged bull trout.
3. Compile project operational data linked to timeframes when adult migratory bull trout pass project powerhouses and/or spill gates.
4. Cost share funding with the Service for analysis of genetic samples from fluvial bull trout sampled during the first year of the Mid-Columbia Bull Trout Study.

Project No. 2149-106

- 8 -

5. Participate in a coordinated effort with the Service to increase the informational database for adult bull trout that utilize the Methow/Twisp river system.

If the level of incidental take on which these RMPs and Terms and Conditions is exceeded, such incidental take represents new information requiring reinitiation of consultation and review of the reasonable and prudent measures provided.

---

**APPENDIX F**  
**FALL-BACK SUMMARIES**

---

**Wells HCP Coordinating Committee**  
**Fallback Rate and Fate Summary (1992-2002)**  
Summary of fallback rates and fates for radio-tagged fished  
monitored at Wells Dam

**DEFINITIONS:**

Defined categories of fallback:

**Voluntary-Fallback:** A radio-tagged fish is defined as a “voluntary” fallback when it has fallen back over Wells Dam and is later detected entering a downstream tributary, the Wells Hatchery or is collected for broodstock.

**Reascend-Fallback:** A radio-tagged fish is defined as a “reascend” fallback fish when it has fallen back over Wells Dam and has either been detected exiting the fish ladder or has been later observed upstream of Wells Dam.

**Unknown-Fallback: 1992-1998.** A radio-tagged fish is defined as an “unknown” fallback when it has fallen back over Wells Dam and was never observed again primarily resulting from limited monitoring efforts in downstream tributaries and hatcheries. Due to limited off-site monitoring during the 1992-1998 telemetry studies, unknown-fallback fish include fish that reascended the dam undetected, spawned in areas not monitored by the study or spawned in the mainstem sometime after monitoring was terminated for the year. This category also includes fish that died, regurgitated their tag or had a radio-tag malfunction prior to reascending the dam.

**Involuntary-Fallback: 1999-2002.** A radio-tagged fish is defined as an “involuntary” fallback when it has fallen back over Wells Dam and has not been detected spawning downstream, has not entered the Wells Hatchery or been collected for brood stock, has not reascended the dam or whose life history is not conducive to utilizing the mainstem Columbia River for spawning (ie. only summer/fall have been observed spawning in the tailraces of Columbia River dams). This category of fallback also contains fish, monitored during the 1999 – 2002 studies, that regurgitated their tag, died in deep water habitat, spawned in the mainstem or had radio-tag malfunctions prior to re-ascending the dam.

**RESULTS:**

**1992 Sockeye (NMFS)**

In 1992, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) conducted a radio-telemetry study to determine migration rates and timing of adult sockeye salmon (*Oncorhynchus nerka*) between Rocky Reach Dam and Wells Dam and to the spawning grounds in British Columbia, Canada. Particular emphasis was placed on quantifying travel times at Well Dam and migratory delays at the mouth of the Okanogan River. Fish were trapped and tagged at Rocky Reach Dam and tracking began on 9 July when the first tagged fish

was released. This study did not include mobile or fixed station monitoring downstream of Wells Dam.

Species	No. fish In Study	No. fish passing Wells Dam	Voluntary	Involuntary	Reascend	Reascend 2x	Unknown
Sockeye	96	69	0	0	6	2	1 (1%)

Nine (13%) of the 69 fish that passed Wells Dam fell back once. Of the nine fish that fell back over the dam, eight fish successfully reascended the dam including two fish that fell back over the dam twice. One of the nine fish that fell back at Wells Dam moved downstream and outside of the monitoring area. This one fish was categorized as having an unknown fate. All of the sockeye salmon that fell back over Wells Dam in 1992 occurred during periods of forced spill. Spill occurred at Wells Dam during 1-27 July in 1992. The spill rate ranged from 66 to 114 kcfs.

### **1993 Spring, Summer, Fall Chinook (NMFS)**

In 1993, the NMFS funded by the mid-Columbia PUDs (Grant, Chelan, and Douglas), conducted a radio-telemetry research study to document adult fish passage through the mid-Columbia river hydro-facilities. Studies were designed to determine migration rates, passage success, dam-passage behavior, fallback rates, and final destinations of adult spring, summer, and fall chinook salmonids (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) in the main stem and tributaries of the mid-Columbia River. Adult chinook were trapped, tagged and released at John Day (RM 215.6), Priest Rapids (RM 397.1), and Rocky Reach Dam (RM 473.7). A total of 742 spring, 426 summer, and 279 fall chinook were radio-tagged and released during the study. Fixed monitoring stations were established at all of the mid-Columbia River dams (Wanapum, Priest Rapids, Rock Island, Rocky Reach, and Wells Dam) as well as all of the major Columbia River tributaries (John Day, Snake, Yakima, Wenatchee, Methow, and Okanogan river).

Species	No. fish in study	No. fish passing Wells Dam	Voluntary	Involuntary	Reascend	Unknown
Spring	742	56	2	0	0	0
Summer	426	98	4	0	6	4 (4%)
Fall	279	52	3	0	1	7 (13%)

At Wells Dam, two (4%) spring chinook fell back over the dam. Both fish were subsequently detected entering and ultimately spawning in the Entiat River. Both of these fish were categorized as voluntary fallbacks at Wells Dam. No involuntary, reascend or unknown spring chinook fallbacks were document during the 1993 study.

Fourteen summer chinook fell back over Wells Dam. Six of these fish reascended the dam and were last detected upstream of the project. Of the six fish that reascended the dam, three entered the Methow, two entered the Okanogan, and one was captured below Chief Joseph Dam. The eight remaining fallback fish were documented in known spawning locations downstream of the dam including the Wenatchee (1), Entiat (1), Wells Hatchery (2), and Wells tailrace (4). Four (4%) of the run was categorized as voluntary fallbacks (Wenatchee, Entiat and Wells Hatchery) and four (4%) were categorized as unknown fallbacks (Rocky Reach pool).

Eleven fall chinook fallbacks were observed at Wells Dam in 1993. One of the eleven fish reascended Wells Dam and was later observed entering the Okanogan River. Ten of the 11 fallbacks remained below the dam with all but one of the fish found in a known spawning location or was harvested. Six of the eleven fish or (12%) of the radio-tagged fish were documented as remaining in the Wells tailrace, three or (6%) of the tagged population entered the Wells Hatchery, and one or (2%) of the tagged fish was harvested downstream of Wells Dam.

### **1993 Spring, Summer, Fall Chinook Re-analysis (LGL Limited)**

In response to concerns regarding substantial data monitoring gaps in Lotek receivers at Wells Dam during the 1993 Mid-Columbia Chinook Radio Telemetry Study, Douglas PUD retained LGL Limited to conduct an independent analysis of the 1993 chinook study and database. The receiver data were critically examined in detail to identify potential receiver configuration problems, periods where data were missing or when the receivers were not recording, background noise levels, and other factors that could influence the detection of tagged chinook and produce spurious records. In total, 68 mobile tracking records and 5434 fixed station receiver records were identified as spurious and excluded from the analysis. LGL's reanalysis identified substantial discrepancies in the original 1993 study. While detailed examination of these discrepancies using the available data have identified some deficiencies in the 1993 study, reasons for any of the discrepancies, without obtaining the original data showing last detection locations for each tagged fish (basis for numbers presented in the 1993 study), cannot be confidently assessed. Unfortunately, NMFS was unable to provide any additional information.

Since the 1993 report, a large spawning concentration of summer and fall chinook has been observed in the Wells tailrace. Between 440 and 990 redds were estimated to be present in the Wells tailrace in 1999. This discovery may explain the higher percentages of summer and fall chinook last detected in the Wells tailrace relative to spring chinook (Rensel 2000) and may explain the fate of summer and fall chinook fallbacks that are categorized as "unknown" in the table above.

### **1997 Sockeye and Summer Chinook (LGL Limited)**

Radio-tagged adult sockeye and summer chinook were monitored in 1997 to assess passage at Wells Dam and to qualitatively estimate escapement to the spawning ground

in the Upper Okanogan River. Of the 577 sockeye and 335 summer chinook that were radio-tagged at Bonneville Dam, 41% and 27% were tracked to Wells Dam, respectively.

Species	No. fish in study	No. fish passing Wells Dam	Voluntary Fallbacks	Involuntary Fallbacks	Reascend	Unknown
Sockeye	577	229	1	0	5	2 (1%)
Summer chinook	335	59	5	0	2	2 (3%)

Of the eight radio-tagged sockeye that fell back below Wells Dam, 5 reascended the project and were tracked to a known spawning area in the upper Okanogan River, two (unknown) fish were last detected in the Rocky Reach reservoir, and one (voluntary) fish was last located below Rocky Reach Dam. Five of the fallback events occurred between 13 and 26 July when the total flow at Wells Dam ranged between 180 and 236 kcfs and spilling ranged between 10 and 57 kcfs

Nine summer chinook fell back over Wells Dam in 1997. Two of the nine fish reascended the dam and were later tracked to spawning destinations upstream of the dam. Of the remaining seven fish, two (3%) were last located in the tailrace of Wells Dam and were categorized as having an unknown fate. Voluntary fallbacks included three (5%) fish tracked to the Wells Hatchery, one fish tracked below Rocky Reach Dam (2%), and one fish tracked to the Wenatchee River (2%).

Four of the summer chinook fallback events occurred between 20 July and 2 August when total flow (135 to 182 kcfs) and spill (9 to 13 kcfs) were high. Of the 9 fallbacks, only one was detected during a non-spilling event (1 September) at Wells Dam. However, it is possible that this fish may have fallen back during a spill period due to a 26 day difference between the last date of detection above the dam and the first date of detection below the dam.

### **1998 Summer Chinook (LGL Limited)**

In 1998, Douglas PUD retained LGL Limited to determine the effect of fishway entrance gate configuration on the time it takes adult summer chinook to pass the project; and secondarily, to assess if broodstock trapping operations in the fishway cause a significant increase in passage time through the project. As part of a separate adult passage study being conducted by the Army Corps of engineers, 279 summer chinook were radio-tagged at Bonneville dam. Based on previous data, an estimated 27% (75) of the summer chinook radio-tagged at Bonneville Dam would reach Wells Dam. The total number of radio-tagged summer chinook detected at Wells Dam was 81.



Species	No. fish in study	No. fish passing Wells Dam	Voluntary Fallbacks	Involuntary Fallbacks	Reascend	Unknown
Summer chinook	279	46	0	0	0	8

At Wells Dam, eight (17%) summer chinook fallbacks were observed. Because this study was limited to monitoring at the dam, and was completed by the end of August, no conclusive assignment to either the voluntary, involuntary or reascend categories could be made. Due to the short duration of this study and the uncertain final fate for all eight fish, all eight fish were assigned to the unknown fallback category.

All fallbacks occurred during spill periods, 7 from 28 July to 15 August when spillway flows ranged from 8-19 kcfs and 1 fish fell back during a brief spill period on 21 August.

### **1999 Steelhead (LGL Limited)**

Radio-telemetry technology was used to assess the upstream and downstream migration of adult steelhead past five dams on the mid-Columbia River and to spawning locations. Tags were placed in 395 steelhead captured at Priest Rapids Dam and released downstream of the project. Detections of tagged adult steelhead at fixed stations monitoring mainstem Columbia River locations from the Hanford Reach to Wells Dam and all major mid-Columbia tributaries were used to estimate passage times and fallback rates. Mobile tracking consisted of periodic boat and aerial surveys throughout the study area during the study period.

Species	No. fish in study	No. fish passing Wells Dam	Voluntary Fallbacks	Involuntary Fallbacks	Reascend	Unknown
Steelhead	395	162	6	1 (1%)	4	n/a

Fish in this study were categorized as voluntary fallback, involuntary fallback, or reascend. Voluntary fallbacks were defined as steelhead that were last tracked to tributaries or reaches below, but not adjacent to the fallback dam. Involuntary fallbacks were defined as steelhead that were last tracked to reaches immediately below the fallback dam. Reascended steelhead were defined as steelhead last tracked to locations above the fallback dam. Because of the comprehensive nature of this study the final fate of virtually every fish was determined. This resulted in no fish being assigned to the unknown fallback category.

At Wells Dam, a total of 11 (7%) fallbacks were observed. Six of the 11 steelhead were categorized as voluntary fallbacks as two of these fish were last detected in the Entiat

River and two last detected below Tumwater Dam on the Wenatchee River. The two remaining voluntary fallbacks were last detected in the Wanupum (1) and Rock Island (1) pools. One (1%) involuntary fallback was last detected in the Rocky Reach pool. All four of the steelhead that fallback and reascended the dam were later detected entering either the Methow River (2) or the Okanogan River (2). Three of the 11 fallbacks events, during this study, were observed during forced spill events that took place in July and August.

**2001 Steelhead (LGL Limited)**

The success of the 1999 steelhead study, along with some outstanding questions regarding post-spawning behavior and year-to-year variation in migratory success, led to an agreement to repeat the study in 2001-2002. A total of 396 steelhead were captured and tagged at Priest Rapids Dam between July and October, 2001. Tracking methodology and criteria to determine type of fallback was similar to that in the 1999 steelhead study.

Species	No. fish in study	No. fish passing Wells Dam	Voluntary Fallbacks	Involuntary Fallbacks	Reascend	Unknown
Steelhead	396	252	17	3 (1%)	10	n/a

At Wells Dam, 30 (12%) fallbacks were observed. Seventeen of these fallbacks were voluntary with steelhead detected entering the Wells Hatchery (9), the Snake River (1), below Tumwater Dam on the Wenatchee River (3), entering the Entiat River (2), in the Priest Rapids pool (1), and in the Wanapum pool (1). Ten of the 17 fallback steelhead reascended Wells Dam and eight of these fish were detected entering the Methow, one was detected entering the Okanogan, and one steelhead was last detected in the Chief Joseph Dam tailrace. Three (1%) involuntary fallbacks were observed and all three were last detected in the Rocky Reach pool. Eight of the 30 fallback events, observed during this study, were associated with spill events that took place between the months of July and August.

**BETWEEN-YEAR COMPARISON OF RESULTS BY SPECIES:**

A total of six radio-telemetry studies were implemented at the Wells Hydroelectric Project between 1992 and 2002 to characterize a suite of questions regarding fish passage, migration rates, dam-passage behavior, and escapement of adult fish in the mainstem and tributaries of the mid-Columbia River. It is important to note that fallback rates and the specific fates of these fish were often not the main objective of these studies. In some cases, prior to 1997 in particular, information collected were insufficient to assign particular fates to fish that fell back through Wells Dam leaving it uncertain as to whether these fish were to be identified as voluntary or involuntary fallbacks. In several other cases, the numbers of tagged fish in the study that reached and passed Wells Dam were too small to make meaningful conclusions about fallback rates and final fate

assignments. A minimum of two studies were done for each species with the notable exception of spring chinook that were only studies with sufficient sample size in 1993.

A by-species summary of all of the studies has been prepared to provide a between-year comparison in results, any information available that could be used to clarify the results (project operations, etc.), and recommendations regarding which study should be used to more accurately represent fallback rates at Wells Dam are presented below.

### **Sockeye**

Sockeye salmon characteristically pass Wells Dam during periods of spill (July and August) and are destined primarily for the upper Okanogan River. Sockeye also return to the Wenatchee River and small numbers have been found in the Methow River. It is difficult to categorize fish that did not reascend Wells Dam as fallback fish when there is the possibility that these fish are overshoots from the Wenatchee and may be destined for tributaries below the project. In the 1992 study, the ultimate fates of these fish could not be assigned given the limited scope and parameters covered in the study design. This should be considered when comparing the 1992 and 1997 sockeye fallback rates.

The 1992 NMFS study observed a total of 69 unique passage events and 9 fallback events with 8 of these fish reascending the ladder and one fish disappearing downstream. Given this information, the sockeye fallback rate for the 1992 study is 13% (9/69). However, the biological effect of fallback was negligible as all but one of the fallbacks successfully reascended the project. Unfortunately, the fate of the one fish ( $1/69 = 1\%$ ), that did not reascend Wells Dam, is unknown as the last detected was in the Rocky Reach pool. However, because the study was not designed to monitor fish downstream of Wells Dam, the downstream fate of this fish could not be determined. It is likely that this fish was an overshoot from the Wenatchee basin. All fallback events occurred during periods of spill ranging from 66-114 kcfs at Wells Dam.

The 1997 LGL study observed a total of 229 sockeye passing Wells Dam. Even though the study was conducted during an extremely high spill year, a total of eight sockeye fell back over the project, for an average of 3% (8/229) for the run over Wells Dam. Five of the eight fish reascended the dam and entered the Okanogan River. Two of the remaining fallback fish were last detected in the Rocky Reach reservoir ( $2/229 = 1\%$ ) with the remaining fish located downstream of Rocky Reach Dam assigned to the voluntary fallback category. Specific fates for two of these three fish could not be assigned and as such were classified as unknown. The fallback rate for the tagged sockeye population migrating over Wells Dam in 1997 was 3.5% (8/229). However, all but two of the eight fish were assigned to either the voluntary or reascend categories leaving two fish or (1%) of the run to be assigned to the unknown category.

### **Spring Chinook**

One spring chinook radio-telemetry study has been implemented at Wells Dam. Spring chinook that pass Wells Dam are headed for the Methow River, however, the Wenatchee and Entiat River systems also have adult fish returning of this run-type.

The 1993 NMFS study tagged a total of 742 spring chinook with 56 of these fish passing over Wells Dam. Two fallback events were observed with both fish subsequently being detected entered the Entiat River. Fallback rates for spring chinook based upon the NMFS 1993 chinook telemetry study are 3.6% (2/56). The biological significances of fallback for spring chinook appears to be negligible as both fish voluntary fell back over the dam, successfully survived the fallback event and successfully entered the Entiat River.

### **Summer/Fall Chinook**

Three studies have been conducted to examine fish passage issues at Wells Dam with summer/fall chinook salmon. Summer/fall chinook that pass Wells Dam are headed for either the Methow or Okanogan Rivers. However, the Wenatchee, Entiat River and Chelan river systems also have runs of summer/fall chinook. Summer/fall chinook are collected as broodstock at the Wells Hatchery just below Wells Dam, are collected for broodstock in the east ladder and spawn in the tailrace of the dam. In addition, in recent years a large recreational fishery has also existed for this run-type.

The 1993 NMFS study tagged 426 summer chinook with 98 of these tagged fish passing over Wells Dam. In total, 14 summer chinook fallbacks were observed at Wells Dam. Six of these fish reascended the ladder, four other fish were last detected in know spawning locations downstream of the project: Wenatchee (1), Entiat (1), and Wells Hatchery (2) with the four remaining fish last detected in the tailrace where they could have spawned, been a fallback mortality or experienced a tag failure/regurgitation event. Fallback rates for the 1993 summer chinook study were 14% (14/98).

The 1993 NMFS study tagged a total of 279 fall chinook and 52 of these fish passed Wells Dam. Eleven fallbacks were observed with only one fish reascending the ladder. The other ten fallback fish remained in the tailrace (6), entered the Wells Hatchery (3), or were harvested downstream of the project (1). Fallback rates at Wells Dam for fall chinook during the 1993 fall chinook study were 21.2% (11/51).

The 1997 LGL study tagged 335 summer chinook and 59 of these fish passed Wells Dam. Nine summer chinook fallbacks were detected at Wells Dam. Two of these fallback fish reascended the ladder and were tracked to upstream spawning destinations. The remaining seven fish were last detected at the Wells Hatchery trap (3), below Rocky Reach Dam (1), entering the Wenatchee River (1), and in the Wells tailrace (2). All but one fallback event occurred during spill events at Wells Dam. The fallback rate for the 1997 summer chinook study was 15.3% (9/59).

The 1998 LGL study tagged 279 fish and 46 of these fish passed Wells Dam. Eight summer chinook fallbacks were observed at Wells Dam and all were last detected in the tailrace. Fallback rate for the 1998 summer chinook study was 17.4% (8/46). However, it is important to note that during the 1998 summer chinook study the objective of the study was to determine the effect of fishway entrance gate configuration on passage time. As a result, the study ended in August 1998 and did not allow for sufficient monitoring to determine the fates off fallback fish.

### **Steelhead**

Two studies were conducted to examine fish passage issues at Wells Dam for steelhead salmon. Steelhead that pass Wells Dam are destined for the Methow and Okanogan rivers. Other mid-Columbia River tributaries that have runs of steelhead are the Wenatchee and Entiat rivers.

The 1999 LGL Limited study tagged 395 steelhead at Priest Rapids Dam with 162 fish passing Wells Dam. A total of 11 fallbacks were observed with six fallbacks classified as voluntary (fish tracked to downstream tributaries or reservoirs below Rocky Reach Dam). Four steelhead reascended the ladder and were tracked to tributaries above Wells Dam. Only one tagged steelhead could not be assigned a fate outside of the Wells tailrace. The fallback rate for the 1999-2000 steelhead study was 6.8% (11/162).

The 2001 LGL Limited study tagged 396 steelhead at Priest Rapids Dam with 252 fish passing Wells Dam. A total of 30 fallbacks were observed with 17 fallbacks classified as voluntary (fish tracked to downstream tributaries or reservoirs below Rocky Reach Dam). Ten steelhead fallbacks reascended the ladder and remained upstream of the project. Three tagged steelhead could not be assigned a fate outside of the immediate Wells tailrace. The fallback rate for the 2001-2002 steelhead study was 11.9% (30/252).

### **DISCUSSION**

#### **Sockeye:**

It is recommended that the 1997 LGL study be used as the primary assessment tool for adult sockeye fallback at Wells Dam. Total fallback at Wells Dam was estimated to be 3.5% with an unknown assignment rate of 1% of the entire tagged population over the dam. This level of fallback and missing fish does not pose a biologically significant impact on adult sockeye passing Wells Dam. Further, the maximum impact estimate based upon the 1997 study (1%) is less than half that allowed under the terms of the Wells HCP.

#### **Spring Chinook:**

It is recommended that the 1993 NMFS study be used as the primary assessment tool for spring chinook fallback at Wells Dam. Total fallback at the dam was estimated to be 3.6% with an unknown assignment of 0% of the tagged run over the dam. This level of fallback and missing fish does not pose an impact on the Upper Columbia River spring

chinook ESU, because both of the fish that fell back were destined for the Entiat River the biological significance of fallback at Wells Dam is estimated to be negligible.

#### Summer/Fall Chinook:

For the three studies, total fallback for the summer chinook component of the summer/fall chinook run at Wells dam was estimated to range from 14% to 17.4%. For the two studies that determine the fate of fallbacks, the unknown assignment rate for summer chinook fallbacks ranged from 3% to 4%. Due to the close proximity and association of the Wells and Turtle Rock hatcheries and the close association with the Wells tailrace and Chelan Falls chinook spawning populations, the biological significance of the 3-4% of the summer chinook that disappeared after falling back over Wells Dam could not be directly ascertained. However, the observed level of unknown fallbacks is, not surprisingly, higher for this population compared to sockeye, steelhead and spring chinook.

Fallback for the fall component of the summer/fall chinook run was only assessed during the 1993 NMFS study and was estimated to be 21.2% with an unknown assignment of 11.5% of the tagged run over the dam. Although fallback for summer/fall chinook is relatively high compared to other species studied at Wells Dam, the biological significance of these rates are difficult to quantify given the fact that this run-type has been observed spawning in large numbers below Wells Dam, in the tailrace and at Chelan Falls. In fact, for all three of the summer/fall chinook studies, fish categorized into "unknown assignment" consisted entirely of fish last detected in the Wells Dam tailrace and as such, the possibility that these fish are tailrace spawners, should be considered when viewing these results.

It is recommended that the 1993 NMFS and the 1997 LGL study be used as the primary assessment tool for summer chinook fallback (14% to 15.3%) and that the 1993 NMFS study be used as the primary assessment tool for fall chinook fallback (21.2%) noting that the unknown assignment was high and that the biological significance of these assignments is difficult to quantify given the life-history and proximity of hatcheries to the area of interest.

#### Steelhead:

It is recommended that both the 1999 LGL study and the 2001 LGL study be used as the primary assessment tool for steelhead fallback at Wells Dam. Total fallback at the dam was estimated to range from 6.8% to 11.9% with an involuntary fallback assignment ranging from 0.6% to 1.2% of the tagged run over the dam. This level of fallback and missing fish does not pose an impact on the Upper Columbia River ESU. Many of the radio-tagged steelhead that fallback at the dam were of hatchery origin, destined for tributaries downstream of Wells Dam or were successful at reascending the ladder and were later tracked to tributaries upstream of the project. The biological significance of fallback over the entire steelhead run at Wells Dam is estimated to be negligible and averages less than half the level allowed under the terms of the Wells HCP.

Study	Species	Release Size	Total Passing Wells	No. Fallback	Fallback Rate	Comments
NMFS-1992	Sockeye	96	69	9	13%	96 tagged at Rocky Reach. All fallback occurred during periods of forced spill.
NMFS-1993*	Spring Chinook	742	56	2	4%	Fish tagged at multiple dams. Both fish spawned in the Entiat River.
NMFS-1993*	Summer Chinook	426	98	14	14%	4/14 detected in Entiat/Wenatchee or Wells Hatchery.
NMFS-1993*	Fall Chinook	279	52	11	21%	3/11 retained for brood stock at Wells Hatchery.
LGL-1997	Sockeye	577 (236)	229	8	4%	577 tagged at Bonneville. 3/8 reascend
LGL-1997	Summer Chinook	335 (91)	59	9	15%	335 tagged at Bonneville. 7/9 reascend.
LGL-1997	Spring Chinook	680 (7)	5	2	40%	Possibly a result of high flows. 2/2 did not reascend.
LGL-1997	Steelhead	975 (20*)	16	1	6%	*5 of these fish were tagged during previous years study at Bonneville (fall of 1996). 1/
LGL-1998	Summer Chinook	279 (81)	46	8	2%	
LGL-1999	Steelhead	395 (195)	162	11	7%	6/11 voluntary. 4/11 reascended. 1/11 involuntary.
LGL-2001	Steelhead	396 (274)	252	30	12%	17/30 voluntary. 10/30 reascended. 3/30 involuntary.

\* The final fate of fish tagged during the 1993 study was found to be in error based upon a re-analysis conducted by LGL Limited and NOAA Fisheries. A reference for the re-analysis is Wainwright et al., 2001.

<b>Species</b>	<b>Study</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Passing Wells</b>	<b>Fallback</b>	<b>Rate</b>
Sockeye	NMFS-1992	96	69	9	13%
Sockeye	LGL-1997	577 (236)	229	8	3.5%
<hr/>					
*Spring Chinook	NMFS-1993	742	56	2	3.6%
<hr/>					
*Summer Chinook	NMFS-1993	426	98	14	14.3%
Summer Chinook	LGL-1997	335 (91)	59	9	15.3%
Summer Chinook	LGL-1998	279 (81)	46	8	1.7%
<b>Combined</b>			<b>203</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>15.3%</b>
<hr/>					
*Fall Chinook	NMFS-1993	279	52	11	21.2%
<hr/>					
<b>Combined</b>					
Steelhead	LGL-1997	975 (20*)	16	1	6.3%
Steelhead	LGL-1999	395 (195)	162	11	6.8%
Steelhead	LGL-2001	396 (274)	252	30	11.9%



---

**APPENDIX G**  
**STATE AUDITOR MEETING**

---

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Wells HCP Coordinating Committee  
Grant PUD

FROM: Shane Bickford

DATE: January 7, 2005

SUBJECT: Summary of Discussions with the State Auditor's Office re: HCP  
committee funding procedures.

---

The meeting between Douglas PUD staff and the State Auditor's Office was held on November 13, 2004 at the Douglas PUD Board Room. Individuals present during the meeting included: Scott Renick, State Auditor's Office, SAO; Tamara Kirchner, SAO; Bob Clubb, Douglas PUD; Shane Bickford, Douglas PUD and Wyatt Scheibner, Douglas PUD.

A summary of the pertinent questions answered during the meeting include the follow set of issues.

Q1: Are projects paid in whole or in part from the Plan Species Account (PSA) considered public works?

A1: Scott drew an analogy with the Wenatchee Civic Center, which was not built by the City and was funded with non-City dollars. Since it was built on City-owned land, however, Dept of L&I considered it to be owned by the City and therefore subject to prevailing wage, etc. (Chap 39 RCW public works requirements). The City was required, after the fact, to make additional payments to contractors in order to comply with prevailing wage laws. The point of the analogy was to show that compliance with public works requirements is the responsibility of the owner of the property.

The owner of the property being funded with PSA money has responsibility to comply with public works (such as bidding and prevailing wage) requirements, *if* that owner is subject to the public works requirements. Therefore the only time the District must ensure compliance with public works requirements is when it will own the property being funded with PSA money. For an example we mentioned that the Committee might authorize funding to have a fence built on private land, for the purpose of keeping cattle out of a stream, and simply pay the landowner to build the fence. Scott said there would be no public works issues because the fence wouldn't be owned by the District – it would be owned by the landowner because it would be built on his land. We also asked whether the Committee could authorize payment to a land trust for the purpose of buying land or easements, with the understanding the land or easements would be owned by the trust rather than the District. Scott thought that would be okay under the HCP and that SAO would have no objection.

Q2: Who owns the money in the PSA?

A2: The money in the PSA is no longer District money, because the District can't get it back unless the HCP folds or is dissolved. Consideration, in the form of concessions regarding Wells relicensing and limits on amounts the District must spend on the plan species, has been received in exchange for the District's contribution to the PSA.

Q3: Does the District's Board of Commissions need to directly approve each of the projects selected by the Tributary Committee?

A3: No. As mention above, the money allocated to the PSA is no longer District money. The Tributary Committee has sole responsibility for funding and account allocation decisions, and those decisions can't be overridden by the District Commission. However, because payments from the PSA will be administered through the District's accounting system, the payment vouchers and related warrants will still be subject to the District's standard administrative approval process.

Q4: Does the Open Public Meetings Act apply to meetings of the Tributary Committee?

A4: No, unless a quorum of District Commissioners is present. The HCP gives no indication of a desire for the meetings to be public, and the District's one representative on the Committee doesn't trigger application of the Act.

Q5: Should the funds in the PSA be reported on the District's balance sheet?

A5: No, because they aren't District funds. They should be disclosed in the notes to the financial statements, though. Since Section 7.3.7.2 of the HCP requires the District to annually provide financial reports of PSA activity to the Committee, the District will have to keep an accounting of the PSA. This is a service the District will perform for the Committee. The costs associated with this service could be reimbursed by the PSA as part of the administrative and staffing costs referred to in Section 7.3.7.1.

Q6: Does the Tributary Committee have a financial reporting and/or audit requirement?

A6: No, unless it is specified in the HCP or is required by FERC or some other federal agency. The State Auditor's Office would not audit the Committee or require financial statements from it.

Q7: May the Committee provide funding from the PSA on a "matching" basis, for projects which it approves?

A7: Yes. The guidelines regarding compliance with public works requirements would still apply, depending upon ownership of the property or improvement.

---

**APPENDIX H**  
**GRANT-DOUGLAS PUD HATCHERY AGREEMENT**

---

## INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT is made by and between PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1 OF DOUGLAS COUNTY, WASHINGTON ("Douglas"), and PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 2 OF GRANT COUNTY WASHINGTON ("Grant").

### Recitals:

A. Public utility districts are authorized, pursuant to RCW Chapter 39.34 to enter into Cooperative Agreements.

B. Grant desires to utilize the Wells and Methow fish hatcheries owned by Douglas and operated by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to rear salmonid fish as set forth in Exhibit A attached hereto.

C. Douglas is willing to allow the use of excess rearing capacity at said fish hatcheries on the terms and conditions contained in this Agreement.

NOW THEREFORE; in consideration of the mutual promises and covenant contained herein, the parties agree as follows:

### 1. TERM.

This Agreement shall remain in full force and effect until terminated by written notice issued to the other party at least twelve months in advance of the date of termination. This Agreement is to take effect on the day and year that both Grant and Douglas sign the Agreement. This Agreement shall be renewed every ten years (starting in 2013) with the annual hatchery budget detailing shared costs updated annually following at least one annual meeting between Grant, Douglas and Chelan. The terms of this Agreement can be adjusted annually upon the consent of both Grant and Douglas.

### 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Agreement is to provide for the limited use of Douglas' Wells and Methow fish hatcheries by Grant and Grant's payment of costs related thereto. Both parties agree that through utilization of this Interlocal Agreement, savings to the customers of both utility districts will be achieved.

3. OWNERSHIP AND PRIORITY OF USE.

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between the Parties, Douglas shall retain full ownership of the Wells and Methow fish hatcheries. Any use of Douglas' fish hatcheries provided herein is subject to and expressly contingent on the availability of excess rearing capacity which is not necessary for Douglas' fulfillment of any outstanding obligations it may have relating to the use of said hatcheries to fulfill Douglas' existing agreements and obligations to third parties.

Grant shall have the right to utilize excess rearing capacity only at the Wells and Methow fish hatcheries in accordance with terms of this Agreement.

4. SERVICES PROVIDED BY DOUGLAS.

Douglas will allow Grant use of excess rearing capacity at the Wells and Methow fish hatcheries and perform certain other services as more fully described in Exhibit A which is attached hereto. In consideration of the same, Grant shall make payment to Douglas consistent with the provisions of this Agreement including Exhibit A.

5. FACILITY UTILIZATION RATE.

Grant's Facility Utilization Rate shall be calculated by dividing Grant's reserved capacity (poundage) in each of Douglas's applicable hatchery programs by the estimated total hatchery capacity available during any given brood year.

Example: Methow Hatchery Spring Chinook Production

Chelan	19,200
Douglas	4,067
<u>Grant</u>	<u>13,400</u>
TOTAL	36,667

Grant's Facility Utilization Rate =  $13,400/36,667 = 36.5\%$

There are three categories of costs which together will determine the total costs Grant will pay to Douglas for hatchery facilities used under this Agreement. The cost categories are as follows:

6. CATEGORIES OF COSTS.

The following Categories of Costs are mutually exclusive and shall be allocated to each of the five rearing groups to the extent feasible.

A. **Annual Hatchery Costs.** The Annual Hatchery Costs include hatchery operations, evaluations, maintenance, studies and all other annual non-capital costs. Grant's Annual Hatchery Costs will be calculated by multiplying Grant's Facility Utilization Rate, for each of the five rearing groups, times each rearing groups applicable Annual Hatchery Costs. Grant's pro-rated share of the Annual Hatchery Costs will be subject to a XX% administrative overhead rate. Grant's pro-rated share of the Annual Hatchery Costs plus overhead will be referred to as Grant's Annual Hatchery Costs.

B. **Annual Capital Facility Costs.** The Annual Capital Facility Costs are based upon Douglas' accrued capital investments in the Wells and in the Methow fish hatcheries. Grant's proportionate share of the accrued Annual Capital Facility Costs are referred to as the Annual Facility Access Fee. Grant's Annual Facility Access Fee will be calculated by multiplying Grant's Facility Utilization Rate for each of the five rearing groups times the applicable hatchery facilities Annual Capital Facility Costs. Annual Capital Facility Costs shall mean all of the accumulated capital costs of the hatcheries with such costs amortized over a 30 year period and applying a 5% interest rate.

C. **Additional Annual Capital Costs.** Should future capital hatchery improvements become necessary and funded by Douglas, Grant will be required to reimburse Douglas for Grant's share of those costs. Grant's share of those costs will be known as Grant's Additional Capital Costs and will be calculated by using the following formulas: 1) if funded by bond proceeds, Grant's Facility Utilization Rate will be multiplied by the cost of the modifications, additions, renewals, replacements, betterments or improvements plus any applicable interest and financing costs amortized over the remaining life of the bond or bonds used to fund the item; 2) if not funded by bond proceeds, Grant's Facility Utilization Rate will be multiplied by the cost of the modifications, additions, renewals, replacements, betterments or improvements. Any other costs not included in A and/or B shall be included into the calculation of Grant's Additional Capital Costs.

To the extent that future capital costs are anticipated, Douglas will provide Grant with notification of the anticipated costs, as indicated in Section 8. Unless Grant decides to terminate this Agreement, Grant will be required to make payments of their share of the Additional Capital Costs, as specified above and Grant will, in exchange, receive Reserved Capacity in an amount agreed to by the parties.

## 7. GRANT'S USE OF EXCESS HATCHERY CAPACITY.

There are five groups of fish for which rearing capacity could potentially be provided in accordance with the terms of this Agreement. Determination as to which groups will be reared during any particular year shall be made as provided herein. The agreed upon capacity for use by Grant shall be the Reserved Capacity.

- a. Group 1 includes access to Douglas's excess rearing capacity at the Wells Fish Hatchery (125,000 fish). The Group 1 strategy only provides fish to Grant for annual survival studies. Because all of the survival study fish must be reared and marked separately from the existing Wells Fish Hatchery summer chinook and steelhead programs, there are separate and distinct costs associated with the implementation of Group 1 compared to the implementation of Groups 2 or 3 (rearing summer chinook or steelhead in common with Douglas fish). Table 1 (attached) includes the current estimates of the Annual Facility Access Fee, Annual Hatchery Costs and Grant's Additional Capital Costs associated with the implementation of Group 1 (summer chinook). Group 1 summer chinook cannot be raised in addition to Group 2 summer chinook and similarly Group 1 steelhead cannot be raised in addition to Group 3 steelhead without additional improvements and modifications to the existing hatchery programs.
- b. Group 2 includes providing rearing capacity for up to 200,000 yearling summer chinook. The estimated Annual Hatchery Costs associated with implementing this group of fish is based upon the assumption that all of Group 2 fish will be raised in common with Douglas's yearling summer chinook. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the estimated Annual Facility Access Fee, Annual Hatchery Costs and Grant's Additional Capital Costs to raise Group 2 fish. Group 2 fish cannot be raised in addition to Group 1 fish.
- c. Group 3 includes providing rearing capacity for up to 131,000 yearling steelhead. The estimated Annual Hatchery Costs associated with implementing this group of fish is based upon the assumption that all of Group 3 fish will be raised in common with Douglas's fish. Table 3 provides a breakdown of the estimated Annual Facility Access Fee, Annual Hatchery Costs and Grant's Additional Capital Costs to raise Group 3 fish.
- d. Group 4 includes providing rearing capacity for up to 201,000 yearling spring chinook. The Annual Hatchery Costs associated with implementing this group of fish is based upon the assumption that all of the Group 4 fish will be raised in common with Douglas's fish. Table 4 provides a breakdown of the estimated Annual Facility Access Fee, Annual Hatchery Costs and Grant's Additional Capital Costs to raise Group 4 fish.



e. Group 5 includes providing rearing capacity for as many as 188,000 additional yearling spring chinook. The Annual Hatchery Costs associated with implementing this group of fish is based upon the assumption that all of Group 5 fish will be raised in common with Douglas's fish. Table 5 provides a breakdown of the estimated Annual Facility Access Fee, Annual Hatchery Costs and Grant's Additional Capital Costs to raise Group 5 fish. However, Table 5 does not including an estimate of the future capital improvement costs that will be required to provide adequate rearing conditions for Group 5 fish at the Methow Fish Hatchery.

8. NOTIFICATION.

A. Notification to Douglas.

At least once each year during the term of this agreement and at least 6 months prior to brood collection, Grant shall provide written notification to Douglas of the Group or Groups of fish that Grant would like to rear at the Wells and Methow hatcheries.

B. Notification to Grant.

Douglas shall within 60 days of receiving such notification respond in writing as to the availability of its hatcheries to accommodate Grant's request. Pursuant to Section 6.C., Douglas shall notify Grant prior to October 1<sup>st</sup> of each year of any new capital construction projects that could significantly increase the following year's estimate of Grant's Additional Capital Costs.

9. GRANT'S PAYMENT OF COSTS.

Douglas agrees to make available excess rearing capacity described in Section 7 and as set forth in Tables 1-5 of this Agreement. The estimated Annual Hatchery Costs contained in Tables 1-5 include estimates of the Annual Hatchery Costs, Annual Facility Access Fee and Additional Capital Costs for a single 12 month period beginning September 1, 2003.

The invoice containing the Annual Facility Access Fee will be submitted to Grant within 7 days following June 1<sup>st</sup> of each year that this Agreement is in effect with payment of this invoice due to Douglas by July 1<sup>st</sup> of that same year.<sup>1</sup>

Because the Wells Project fiscal year runs from September 1st to August 31st, quarterly invoices will be mailed to Grant at the end of each fiscal quarter. Invoices for one quarter of the estimated Annual Hatchery Costs and Grant's Additional Capital Costs, plus overhead for the Annual Hatchery Costs, will be

---

<sup>1</sup> During the first year of the Interlocal Agreement, Douglas will send Grant an invoice for the first year's Annual Facility Access Fee within ten days of the Agreement being approved by Grant, Douglas and the Wells HCP Hatchery Committee.

mailed to Grant within 7 days following December 1st, March 1st, June 1st and September 1st of each year that this Agreement is in effect. Within 120 days following the end of the Wells Project fiscal year, usually in time for the following year's first quarter invoice (December 1st invoice), Douglas will compare the estimated Annual Hatchery Costs billed to Grant versus the actual Annual Hatchery Costs received. If the estimated Annual Hatchery Costs are greater than the actual costs incurred, then the difference between the estimated and actual costs will be credited to Grant. Grant's credit will be applied against Grant's next quarterly invoice(s). If the estimated Annual Hatchery Costs, billed to Grant, were less than the actual costs, the difference will be invoiced to Grant and Grant will be required to pay the invoice promptly. The Additional Capital Costs bill to Grant will be "trued-up" in the same manner as the Annual Hatchery Costs.<sup>2</sup>

#### 10. ANNUAL BUDGET MEETING.

Prior to the implementation of each year's hatchery program, representatives from Grant, Douglas and other Parties, as mutually agreed upon, will meet to discuss changes to the hatchery programs and to establish an annual budget for the following year's hatchery programs. The annual budget for implementing any of the five individual rearing programs will include Douglas's Annual Facility Access Fee, an estimate of that year's Additional Capital Costs, and will also include an estimate of the Annual Hatchery Costs (See Tables 1-5). Administrative overhead, at a rate of 15%, will be applied only to the Annual Hatchery Costs (operations, studies, and maintenance).

Should a short-fall in adult returns or adult brood collections limit the number of fish to something less than the excess hatchery capacities contained in this Agreement, then Grant's pro-rated share of the program will be adjusted to reflect the percentage of the overall hatchery program actually utilized to meet Grant's portion of the program. If no fish are available for Grant's portion of a particular program, then Grant will not be charged (pro rated share at zero) for any of the Annual Hatchery Costs. However, Grant will still be required to pay the Annual Facility Access Fee and any Additional Capital Costs incurred in order to maintain Reserve Capacity, under this Agreement.

---

<sup>2</sup> If payment in full for an invoice is not made, post-marked or received on or before 30 days after the invoice date, then a delayed-payment charge of 2% of the unpaid amount due will be added to the total amount due. Except as to any portion of an invoice which may in good faith be disputed by Grant, Douglas may, whenever any amount due remains unpaid for an additional 30 days (60 days after the invoice date), release Grant's fish and terminate this Agreement without further notice.

## 11. HATCHERY IMPROVEMENTS.

If either Grant or Douglas is required to make physical modifications or additions to the hatchery programs or acclimation ponds because of an individual requirement of either Grant or Douglas alone, then the costs of the modifications or additions will be entirely the responsibility of that party (Grant or Douglas) and will not be covered by this Agreement and will not be included in the budget developed under Section 10.

## 12. AVAILABLE CAPACITY ADJUSTMENTS.

The Wells HCP provides for periodic adjustments in the evaluation and hatchery compensation programs. Adjustments to hatchery production levels may occur after survival studies or in 2013 and every 10 years thereafter to achieve and maintain the HCP No Net Impact conditions. Unforeseen adjustments in hatchery production or program operations may impede the implementation of this Agreement in future years and may require Douglas to seek early termination or substantial modification to this Agreement.

Because of the numerous opportunities for adjusting hatchery programs, Douglas, Grant and other Parties, as mutually agreed upon, shall meet annually to discuss changes in the Annual Hatchery Costs, the Annual Facility Access Fees and Additional Capital Costs related to this Agreement. One-year advance written notice will be given to Grant if Douglas can no longer provide access to excess rearing capacity at the Methow or Wells hatchery programs. Conversely, Grant will be required to provide Douglas with one-year advance written notice should they wish to terminate this Agreement. However, should Grant terminate this Agreement early, Grant will be obligated to provide financial support to those fish being raised on Grant's behalf until those fish are either transferred to a non-Douglas hatchery facility or are released into the natural environment.

## 13. INDEMNITY

Grant and Douglas agree to hold each other harmless and indemnify one another for any acts of negligence committed or caused by one of them or their agents, consultants, employees or sub-contractors against the other or a third party including, but not limited to, property damage loss of fish and personal injury or death. Under no circumstances shall Douglas have any liability to Grant (whether in contract, tort or otherwise) for sickness of, injury to, or death of the salmonid fish which are the subject of this agreement.

14. ADMINISTRATION OF AGREEMENT.

This Agreement shall be jointly administered by a representative of Douglas and a representative of Grant, each of whom shall report to his/her board. Absent written notice by one party to the other, the administrators shall be: Douglas - Shane Bickford; Grant - Tom Dresser.

15. COUNTERPARTS.

This Agreement may be executed in multiple counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original and all of which together shall be deemed one and the same document.

16. AUTHORITY.

Each person signing this Agreement has the full authority of the entities on behalf of which they are signing to execute this Agreement and to bind those entities to the terms of this Agreement.

17. JURISDICTION AND VENUE.

This Agreement is made, executed under and is to be construed by the laws of the State of Washington. In the event of a suit, the undersigned agree that the venue for such suit shall be in the county where the defendant has its headquarters. Grant and Douglas stipulate that a visiting judge shall be assigned to the case so that a resident judge, who is also a customer of either Grant or Douglas, will not hear the case. The substantially prevailing party in any legal action herein shall be entitled to reasonable attorney fees and all reasonable costs, including, but not limited to, expert witness fees, and travel and lodging expenses.

18. EFFECT OF OTHER AGREEMENTS.

This Agreement shall not change or affect the responsibilities and obligations of Douglas's Wells HCP or the Douglas/Chelan Species Trade Agreement. The intent of this Agreement is to facilitate the efficient use of existing hatchery facilities toward meeting Grant's mitigation obligations as outlined in their long-term fish and relicensing agreements. Any modification of this Agreement or additional obligation assumed by either party in connection with this Agreement shall be binding only if evidenced in writing signed by each party or any authorized representative of each party. This Agreement constitutes the entire



# EXHIBIT A

Table 1. Estimated costs to Grant for access to surplus rearing capacity sufficient to rear 125,000 yearling summer chinook at the Wells Fish Hatchery for survival studies. The costs included in Table 1 are based upon the 2003-04 budget for the Wells Fish Hatchery and Wells complex hatchery evaluation.

Table 2. Estimated costs to Grant for access to surplus rearing capacity sufficient to rear 200,000 yearling summer chinook at the Wells Fish Hatchery. The costs included in Table 2 are based upon the 2003-04 budget for the Wells Fish Hatchery and the Wells complex hatchery evaluation.



Table 3. Estimated costs to Grant for access to surplus rearing capacity sufficient to rear 131,000 yearling summer steelhead at the Wells Fish Hatchery. The costs included in Table 3 are based upon the 2003-04 budget for the Wells Fish Hatchery, the Wells complex hatchery evaluation and the Methow Basin Natural Production Assessment Program.

Table 4. Estimated costs to Grant for access to surplus rearing capacity sufficient to rear 201,000 yearling spring chinook at the Methow Fish Hatchery. The costs included in Table 4 are based upon the 2003-04 budget for the Methow Fish Hatchery, the Wells complex hatchery evaluation and the Methow Basin Natural Production Assessment Program.

Table 5. Estimated costs to Grant for access to surplus rearing capacity sufficient to rear 188,000 yearling spring chinook at the Methow Fish Hatchery. The costs included in Table 5 are based upon the 2003-04 budget for the Methow Fish Hatchery, the Wells complex hatchery evaluation and the Methow Basin Natural Production Assessment Program.

---

**APPENDIX I**  
**WELLS SETTLEMENT**  
**COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES (MARCH 2004)**

---

**WELLS COORDINATING COMMITTEE  
MEETING SUMMARY  
March 31, 2004**

**Agreements Reached:**

- 1. The Committee approved the proposed 2004 Wells Juvenile Bypass Operating Plan.**
- 2. The Committee approved the current design for the Chewuch River broodstock collection facility minus the provision for chain-link fencing.**

=====  
**I. GENERAL MID-COLUMBIA ISSUES**

**A. Transition from the Mid-Columbia to the HCP Process**

Seaman reported on progress toward the transition from the Mid-Columbia Process to the HCP Process. Bickford stated that the only issue delaying FERC action on the HCP's is the completion of the FWS' biological opinion and incidental take statements for bull trout. He said the third week in May or first week in June could see the FERC send out license amendments for the three mid-Columbia projects covered by HCP Agreements. Should the bull trout consultation take more than two weeks to complete, then FERC approval of the HCP's could be delayed into early summer.

Lewis asked how coordination for the Grant PUD projects might be carried out since there are no HCP Agreements for Priest Rapids or Wanapum Dams. Hammond responded by saying that he didn't know how the coordination would take place but there were several possibilities. Graves said one option might be for the HCP Coordinating Committee and the Mid-Columbia Coordinating Committee to meet on the same day with one meeting following the other. This would appear to be one issue that will need to be addressed as the HCP Process comes on line.

**B. Steelhead Broodstock Protocol**

Woodin raised an issue concerning the 2003 brood steelhead egg take. He reported that do to a higher proportion of males in the broodstock collected in 2003, the egg take would end up approximately 100,000 eggs short. He said they are giving consideration to opening up the entrance channel to the Wells Hatchery for additional broodstock collection right away to make up for some of the shortage. Praye said about 40 female steelhead would be required to make up the shortfall. Woodin asked if the Committee had any concerns regarding the additional broodstock collection. There were no objections voiced by the Committee.

**C. Future Coordinating Committee Meetings**

The Committee discussed the possibility of a May 2004 Mid-Columbia tour and meeting. There was no decision made as to when the meeting and tour would take place. Hammond said Grant PUD would need a meeting of the Mid-Columbia Coordinating Committee in late June to discuss the results of the 2004 evaluation and consider whether or not to proceed with construction of a bypass. June 29 was suggested as the date for that meeting. Bickford said Douglas PUD wished to reschedule the meeting with the Canadians on the Okanagan Flow

Management Project which was originally scheduled for March 18 and subsequently cancelled due to meeting conflicts. The Canadian parties suggested June 2 or 3 for a meeting and expressed a willingness to travel to the Seattle area for the meeting. The Committee agreed to set June 3, 2004 as the date for a meeting with the Canadian parties.

**II. WELLS DAM**

**A. Wells Juvenile Bypass Operating Plan for 2004**

Bickford reviewed previous discussion concerning the 2004 Wells Juvenile Bypass Operating Plan. He reported that the proposed 2004 plan would be the same as the 2003 plan which had previously received Committee approval and which had functioned successfully. The proposed 2004 Operating Plan was discussed at the February 2, 2004 Wells Coordinating Committee. He said the Wells Settlement Agreement requires Committee approval and that is what is needed today. The Committee approved the proposed 2004 Wells Juvenile Bypass Operating Plan.

**B. Chewuch River Broodstock Trap Design**

Bickford reviewed the previous discussions concerning the design of a proposed Chewuch River broodstock collection facility which would represent a new effort to improve spring chinook broodstock collection in the Chewuch Basin. At the February 2, 2004 Wells Coordinating Committee meeting a location and design for the new collection facility was discussed. Woodin had raised questions regarding possible undermining of the weir under certain water conditions. Fish Pro revised the plans to address Woodin's concerns and the revised drawings were distributed to the Committee on 3/17/04. Bickford said that Douglas PUD had budgeted for construction and the necessary property acquisitions and leases had been secured. What is needed, at this point, is formal Committee approval. Nordlund expressed reservations concerning the addition of chain link fencing in the revised plans. He said he was concerned about the possibility of the fencing lifting off the bottom in places allowing fish to enter and become trapped under the fencing. There was discussion concerning the possibility of constructing a concrete sill across the river at the proposed trap site. There would be some benefits in terms of long-term operations but Bickford pointed out the prevailing sentiment among the property owners involved was to make the facility removable on an annual basis with no permanent structures in the streambed. Bickford said they would have to start over again in the property acquisition process to permit a permanent structure in the river. This would likely delay the whole process beyond 2005. Following this discussion, the Committee approved the revised design of the Chewuch River broodstock collection facility as long as the provision for chain link fencing was removed.

**C. Twisp River Broodstock Collection Trap Modifications**

Bickford said that all the necessary permits for modification of the Twisp River Trap have not been received. It is unlikely that the permits will be received in time for the work to be done prior to the beginning of the 2004 spring chinook broodstock collection period. He said the trap would be operated in the same configuration as used in 2003 which proved to be quite successful. Bickford said they hoped to receive the necessary permits in time for the modifications to be completed in time for the 2005 trapping season.

=====

**The next meeting of the Wells Coordinating Committee will be June 3, 2004 in the Seattle or Sea/Tac area.**

### **ATTENDANCE LIST**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>e-mail address</u>
Stuart Hammond	Grant County PUD	shammon@gcpud.org
Rod Woodin	Wash. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	woodirmw@dfw.com
Laura Praye	Wash. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	prayelp@dfw.wa.gov
Steve Lewis	US Fish and Wildlife Service	stephen_lewis@fws.gov
Ritchie Graves	NOAA Fisheries	ritchie.graves@noaa.gov
Bryan Nordlund	NOAA	bryan.nordlund@noaa.gov
Jerry Marco	Colville Tribe	jerry.marco@colvilletribes.com
Bob Heinith	CRIFC	heib@critfc.org
Shane Bickford	Douglas PUD	sbickford@dcnud.org
Chuck Peven	Chelan PUD	chuckp@chelanpud.org
Shaun Seaman	Chelan PUD	shaun@chelanpud.org
Mike Erho	The Committee	mike.erho@verizon.net

---

**APPENDIX J**  
**BYPASS OPERATIONS MEMORANDUM – SEPTEMBER 16, 2004**

---



Commissioners:  
MICHAEL DONEEN  
T. JAMES DAVIS  
LYNN M. HEMINGER



Chief Executive Officer/Manager:  
WILLIAM C. DOBBINS

Public Utility District No. 1 of Douglas County

1151 Valley Mall Parkway • East Wenatchee, Washington 98802-4497 • 509/884-7191 • FAX 509/884-0553

## Memorandum

TO: Wells HCP Coordinating Committee

FROM: Shane Bickford, Douglas PUD

DATE: September 16, 2004

SUBJECT: Summary of 2004 Bypass Operations at Wells Dam

The 2004 spring outmigration at Wells Dam consisted of natural stream-type fish spawned during brood year 2002 and 2003. Escapement of stream-type fish included a spring chinook natural escapement of 6,626 adults (Wells Count minus hatchery broodstock), a sockeye escapement of 10,768 adults (Wells Count) and a relatively large steelhead escapements of 18,528 in 2001 and 9,478 in 2002 (Wells Counts).

Hatchery releases above Wells Dam included yearling spring chinook releases from the Chewuch, Twisp and Methow Acclimation Ponds, from the Winthrop National Fish Hatchery and from the Colville's Okanogan spring chinook reintroduction program. Coho were released from the Winthrop National Fish Hatchery and summer chinook yearlings were released from the Carlton, Similkameen and Bonapart Acclimation Ponds. Hatchery summer steelhead were released throughout the Methow and Okanogan rivers. Hatchery steelhead released above Wells Dam originate from the Wells, Winthrop and Omak steelhead programs.

The summer outmigration that passed Wells Dam consisted entirely of naturally produced ocean-type summer/fall chinook spawned during brood year 2003. Natural escapement of summer / fall chinook in 2003 was the second largest return since dam counts began at Wells Dam with a combined total of 54,644 fish counted at Wells Dam.

The initiation and termination of the Wells bypass in 2004 was guided by the Wells HCP Coordinating Committee. Operation of the bypass system was strictly guided by the Bypass Operating Plan contained within Section 4.3 of the Wells HCP Agreement. The initiation and termination dates for the bypass system in 2004 were based upon 21 years of hydroacoustic and 14 years of species composition information collected on hatchery

and wild juvenile run patterns at Wells Dam. Based upon an analysis of the run-timing information at Wells Dam, the HCP Coordinating Committee agreed to initiate the Wells bypass system on April 12<sup>th</sup>. The analysis indicated that on average initiating the bypass system on April 12<sup>th</sup> would provide a non-turbine passage alternative for 95.5% of the spring migration. Similarly, shutting down the bypass system on August 26<sup>th</sup>, on average would provide bypass operation for 95% of the summer migration. The bypass system operated continuously during the transition period between the spring and summer juvenile fish migrations. For accounting purposes, the end to the 2004 spring bypass season was June 13<sup>th</sup> at 2400 hours and the beginning of the summer bypass season was June 14<sup>th</sup> at 0000 hours.

Flows at Wells Dam during the 2004 juvenile plan species migration (April – August) were at 86 percent of the twenty-year average. Operationally, all five bypass bays were available and were utilized at one time or another during the 2004 outmigration. Operation of the bypass system throughout the 2004 season was guided by the bypass operating criteria contained within Section 4.3 of the Wells HCP.

The spring bypass season started on April 12<sup>th</sup> at 0000 hours and run continuously through June 13<sup>th</sup> at 2400 hours. The spring bypass operated for a total of 63 days and utilized a total discharge of 1.1 MAF, or 8.1% of total project discharge. During the spring bypass operation, there was forced spill during 3 hours or 0.2% of the season.

Summer bypass started on June 14<sup>th</sup> at 0000 hours and ran until August 26<sup>th</sup> at 2400 hours, for a total of 74 days. There was 1.1 MAF or 6.9% of the total discharge dedicated to summer bypass. During the summer bypass operating period, there was no forced spill. The highest hourly discharge at the project occurred on June 29<sup>th</sup> at 1900 hours with 217 kcfs flowing through the project.