

## Lewis River Fish Passage Subcommittee Meeting

### Agenda

Thursday January 12, 2023

2:30 to 4:30 pm

Teams

---

2:30	<b>Introductions, Review Agenda and Approve Meeting Notes</b>	All
2:45	<b>Design Team Updates &amp; Any Initial Comments on 30% designs</b>	Hansen/Higa/All
3:15	<b>Draft "Elements of Fish Passage" – version Nov 17, 2022</b> <b>Response to comments</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>List of remaining topics – approach and timelines for resolution</li></ul>	Todd Olson / All
4:00	<b>Alternative Analysis - Objectives/Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Revisit Objectives/Criteria</li><li>Discuss content provided at 30% design review presentations</li><li>Identify next steps for finalizing Obj/Criteria and Alternative Analysis</li></ul>	All
4:25	<b>Next FPS meeting – February 9<sup>th</sup></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Agenda</li></ul>	All
4:30	<b>Adjourn</b>	

---

**FINAL Meeting Notes**  
**Lewis River License Implementation**  
**ACC Fish Passage Subcommittee Meeting**  
**January 12, 2023**  
**2:30 pm – 4:30 pm**  
**MS Teams Meeting**

Attendees

Bridget Moran – American Rivers	Jim Byrne – Trout Unlimited
Christina Donehower – Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Danny Didricksen – WDFW
Amanda Froberg – Cowlitz PUD	Bryce Glaser – WDFW
Steve Manlow – LCFRB	Josua Holowatz – WDFW
Melissa Jundt – NOAA	Peggy Miller – WDFW
Beth Bendickson – PacifiCorp	Erin Peterson – WDFW
Eric Hansen – PacifiCorp	Pad Smith – WDFW
Nathan Higa – PacifiCorp	Joshua Jones – USDA-FS
Chris Karchesky – PacifiCorp	Jeffrey Garnett – USFWS
Erik Lesko - PacifiCorp	Bill Sharp – Yakama Nation Fisheries
Todd Olson – PacifiCorp	

---

**Introductions, Review Agenda and Meeting Notes**

Bryce Glaser, WDFW, briefly reviewed the meeting agenda. Beth Bendickson, PacifiCorp, will send out the September, October, and November 2022 meeting notes for final approval. If no additional comments are received in seven days, they will be considered final.

**Design Team Updates and Initial Comments on 30% Designs**

Eric Hansen, PacifiCorp, provided an update on the Yale downstream fish passage facility. In general, the 30% design establishes what we are designing and where it is being built. The design is progressing toward 60%. It's a fine tune of the 30% design [cuts/fills, confirming foundation, to drill structural pile or not (pile at FSC), finding ways to streamline the design thus reducing costs (less steel, quicker/better way to sort and transport fish, etc.)]. More fish behavior studies may be needed. The 60% drawings are due by year end 2023. That design set could include 100 plus different drawings dependent on location. Fabrication of the new FSC facility is likely to be at Saddle Dam Park as described in the technical memorandum. If the ACC could focus and agree on this location, it would be great. The second location is downstream of Yale Park near to the old launch ramp site.

Nathan Higa, PacifiCorp, provided an update on Yale and Swift upstream facilities. They are refining things now and finalizing some of the design studies. They are starting to work on proposed geotechnical investigation and laying out a plan for the borings to be able to design the

foundation. Yale and Swift facilities are on a parallel path with Swift lagging by about a month. He said they are on track to meet the 60%, 90%, and 100% design dates.

Chris Karchesky, PacifiCorp, mentioned that he had received a few requests for a site visit, and asked if folks were interested putting together a group tour sometime in February. Bryce asked about a tour before the 30% Design 45-day review period ends. Chris said a larger onsite group meeting might not be able to happen before the 45-day review period but if there are smaller numbers of folks that wanted to come out for review purposes, that could work. For the larger group with the design team, it might be good to have it be in February. Chris said Bryce's plan was a good one and asked if folks wanted an informal meeting (individual or group), were they amenable to that? If folks did want to come for a site visit, they should work with Chris. The site visits could be tailored to each group. A more formal meeting with design team would be good to have later on.

Chris also gave a quick review of the Yale 2022 Fish Behavioral Study. The information they gathered last spring was beneficial. He noted that fish released in the upper reservoir do make it down to the future collection area near the intake to Yale Dam. Results of the study also showed that surface attraction (spill events, high generation events) were important influencers on fish behavior. Chris noted that the design team is planned another fish behavior study in spring 2023. One of the things they are doing in 2023 is looking at the evaluations done in 2022 and moving forward with more resolution in the forebay area. PacifiCorp is temporarily suspending study work in Swift in 2023, and we have the opportunity to focus the 2023 Yale study around fish behavior in the Yale forebay. Last year we focused on one species; coho. The 2023 study will include juvenile steelhead and spring Chinook as well. Similar to the 2022 study, all fish will be collected and tagged at the Swift FSC and released at the head of Yale Reservoir. Because we are using spring Chinook, the study will start in early spring. Chris is putting together a scope of work and will send it out to the Aquatic Technical Subgroup (ATS) for review, sometime next week. The subgroup will report back to the FPS with any comments.

Todd asked if anyone had any additional comments or first impressions to share as they start to review the 30% design. Melissa Jundt, NOAA, said she has had some conversations with Chris, and Bryce, and the group. She gave her initial feedback at the last meeting. She'll be updating Bonnie Shorin of NMFS. She said the biggest thing would be the no-touch sorting for both of the upstream facilities. If we can avoid repeat handling of the fish, and also eliminating some of the high intensity fish sorting activities would be preferred. She felt the design team did a really great job on the Technical Memorandums. She did feel that more information was needed on the use of the "fish pump" for moving juvenile fish from the Yale FSC to the intermediate sorting barge. She recommended perhaps another technical memorandum devoted to this topic and providing justification/rational for its use should be considered. She said she would put her comments into the comment matrix as part of the 45-day review period.

Bryce appreciated the level of detail and said it was helpful and clarified a lot of things he had been thinking about. The technical memos were very detailed and they have staff going through them. The 30% materials cover a lot of ground and also cover some of the questions this group has had. Todd added that we all review through different lenses (engineer, etc.) and he appreciates everyone's review and attention to detail on the material.

## Draft “Elements of Fish Passage” Version November 17, 2022 Response to Comments

Todd said we are making good process on this document. He received three sets of comments (Cowlitz Indian Tribe, WDFW, and LCFRB). In general, those three entities didn't have any specific language edits at this time. There was clearly an interest not to define the facility type for Merwin downstream fish passage. The suggestion is to do a thoughtful alternative analysis that would lead to a facility alternative that the design team could move forward on. The item of concern was that the sizing of the facilities and ability to handle increasing numbers of fish as populations are expected to expand. Todd noted he will be preparing a comment/response matrix. The Utilities would like a 2032 completion date for Merwin downstream. For the Utilities, the question is how can we meet the interest of everyone and also reach consensus on things? He will soon sit down with management (new V.P.) to review status.

Bryce said we need to figure out how to capture group decision and position on the Alternative Analysis as part of the Draft Elements document. An Alternative Analysis should be prepared for the Merwin downstream facility. Until the Analysis is complete, the Draft Elements document should not assume a bypass facility and marking strategy. Regarding expansion of upstream fish facilities and their capacity, WDFW hasn't landed on this one yet. He has some thoughts on it. A piece he didn't hear about was the Kokanee mitigation. The Draft Elements document states Kokanee studies would be implemented five years prior to Merwin downstream facility construction. WDFW advocates starting earlier. The last piece is habitat conservation fund discussion (ACC level discussion). Including the compensatory mitigation component in this Draft Elements document was related to delays in construction/operation of Yale downstream and Swift and Yale upstream facilities up to this point, not future delays of the Merwin downstream facility. Todd appreciated Bryce going through those points.

Bryce said he had a few other ideas and wanted to see if they made sense to others. Out of the list, there are two pressing items to move to the front of list for getting resolution. The ACC goal was to try to have all the topics resolved and having the Elements Document finalized by April 30, 2023. This would include wrapping up the current Alternative Analysis. If there are concerns, we should try to resolve them now as we move from 30% to 60% design. The second piece would be landing on a modelling number for expansion of facilities. These two would be pertinent to design. The other items aren't as pressing and we would have a little more time for them. Steve Manlow, LCFRB, and Jeff Garnett, USFWS, added that these two priorities make sense to them. Bryce asked how to properly size and maybe we could get the ATS involved. There are relatively simple Excel sheet modeling exercises we could do. What does the buffer around the fish modelling numbers look like and how would we resolve it? He said one approach would be to resolve it at the ATS level, or maybe a subgroup could discuss it and bring it back to this group. Chris asked Bryce if he had had a chance to look at the technical memorandum which considered size of facility. Bryce had not. Chris said there was quite a lot of work and literature in that memo (how facilities were design, fish collection buffer, functional vs uncontrolled capacity) and suggested folks review that technical memorandum first. Todd said he could work with Chris on it and will suggest some revised language for the Elements Document. Chris added that he believed the information was in the Design Criteria Technical Memorandum for each facility (-001) but that he would confirm it. Bryce said he would take a look at it. Chris said if there are any questions, to give him a call. Todd asked everyone to please review Technical Memorandums and then we can have a conversation (small group of interested parties) around it, or should we make it an agenda item for the February meeting? Melissa said she would like to be involved in it. Steve (LCFRB)

would also like to be in the loop on it, as well as Jim Byrne (Trout Unlimited), Christina Donehower (Cowlitz Indian Tribe) and Bill Sharp (Yakama Nation Fisheries) all share Steve's suggestion of keeping them in the loop. Bryce suggested adding it to the February 2023 agenda for discussion. Todd will circle back with and work with Chris to come up with some proposed language for the Elements Document. Bryce suggested Todd talk to PacifiCorp management and then come back to the ACC with proposals for mitigation. Bryce (to Todd) added that on the Merwin downstream piece, are you're ok with Alternative Analysis but still identifying the delay to 2032 and coupling with it with the spillway modification? Todd said the Utilities recognize the delay to 2032 is a "must have" from the parties but he can't say we're "open to it (compensatory mitigation) or we support it," but it's what's on the table. Bryce said that was fair and helpful.

## **Alternative Analysis – Objectives/Criteria**

### Revisit Objectives/Criteria

Bryce asked the group if we could work on an approach to finalize the next steps and to find out if the information is good to establish the right path or does there need to be more formality on it. He said that Bridget Moran, American Rivers, suggested there some nice tables to layout a matrix framework similar to what was done on the Skagit, and walked through ways to document pros and cons. Bryce's thought we could perhaps walk through Alternative Analysis tables and add them into the Elements Document to capture the work we did to come to consensus (assuming we can) on the type of facilities chosen and would take the Draft Elements document to the ACC for approval. That is one way to demonstrate we've done our due diligence and then document it for the record. Steve wanted to provide a few higher elevation thoughts and said they have gone back and dug through the technical memos and revisited the presentations that went along with them. The criteria we've been talking about is in the technical memos and the overall decisions seem to be pretty well documented in the presentation and technical memos. He asked if there was a need for a more concise synthesis for the record, kind of what Bridget was working on. He said he wasn't seeing a lot of holes in the criteria and the conclusion. They haven't gone through all the technical memos yet but they've done a good run through as far as looking at different alternatives. Jeff echoed what Steve said. When you start turning over rocks, it's there and the more he looks, the more he sees it there. He agrees it would be a good exercise to look back at the objectives document and making sure that what is proposed fits everyone's objectives going forward. He would advocate, though, for abbreviated review rather than Skagit, for the sake of time. Bridget appreciated this conversation. She said she clarified that we don't want to put together a 1,000 page document like Skagit. It is helpful, though, to have the information all in one place. Maybe we need a comprehensive document to have it all laid out. Bryce agreed that we don't want to make it to the Skagit level. If we pulled out the objectives in technical memos and cross walk them to the list of our team objectives, and then summarize it in the Elements Document, it could be a clean way without a huge effort. Summarizing the information from the technical memos into a clearer. single document. Todd said the design team put together matrices that already have some of the information in it. Like Jeff was saying, if you have specific criteria you should make sure that has been looked it. If there is an objective that you want considered, add it to the table and then say, "ok how does this fit." Bryce said those are useful to get us started but could we somehow capture the criteria and summarize it into a more digestible format? He generally felt the same way as Steve did. He has more comfort that things have been covered but more work is needed to crosswalk it all. He doesn't want to create more work for himself or others but also feels it's important that we've captured in the Elements Document that the approach was justified. He's

trying to figure out the best way to do that for us now and for future readers. Todd asked Bryce that in trying to figure out the next steps, would you use the table that Steve provided (Key Criteria)? Bryce said it could be spreadsheet first then the table later. We could put the list of alternatives from the matrices down one side and list objectives. He's wondering if someone from the design group could look through the memos and see if there anything else. Steve liked that approach - crosswalk and seeing what's missing and what needs to be added. From a time standpoint, unless there are others that feel there should be more analysis, this synthesis could come at a later point. It might take a little more time to put something like this together unless there is a pressing need. Todd added that it's more of getting the criteria into the table to show everyone did their due diligence. It doesn't have to happen by tomorrow, but we should be timely in getting it done.

Bryce said his biggest concern was to provide comments on 30% designs and the question was if there was a big red flag on one of the approaches that could cause the design team to move away from a Yale floating surface collector, then we would need to address it soon. They are getting pretty comfortable with the preferred alternative as they work through the technical memos. Melissa said she was comfortable with the large-scale approach, but still had some items that she what more information on and wanted to consider further. She did not feel that anything at this point would be considered a change to 30% design.

Identify next steps for finalizing objectives/criteria and Alternative Analysis

Todd appreciated the feedback. The Utilities totally understand there will be input to concept and design, (e.g. where are we going to put this and what is the size of the fish entrance, etc.). He wanted to make sure everyone is agreeable to the facility concepts and no one is thinking it needs to be something else. Bryce said there seems to be some agreement that a little more documentation and summarization would be a good next step but he's also hearing that it's not critical that it happen in the next week. Bryce and Todd will share notes and put together a draft table over the next few weeks to share with the group.

<b>Action Items from January 12, 2023</b>	<b>Status</b>
Beth will send out September, October, and November meeting notes. If no further comments after 7-day review period, the notes will be finalized.	Complete

<b>Action Items from December 8, 2022</b>	<b>Status</b>
Continue review of Design Elements (Due Date: December 22, 2022)	Complete

<b>Action Items from October 13, 2022</b>	<b>Status</b>
Jeff Garnett will share a master/PhD document about bull trout criteria with the group.	

Next meeting: February 9, 2023

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.