

Lewis River Fish Passage Subcommittee Meeting

Agenda

Thursday December 14, 2023

12:30 to 4:00 pm

Teams

Introductions, Review Agenda and Meeting Notes	All
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Meeting notes (September, October, November)	
Updates - FERC and PacifiCorp Team	Olson
Design Comment Matrix	All
60% Design Presentation - Introduction	Olson
Yale Downstream Facility	
Yale Upstream Facility	
Swift Upstream Facility	
FPS Next Steps - 60% Design Documents	Karchesky
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Location of DocumentsFormat for Sending CommentsComment Period	
Next FPS meeting – January 11th Teams	All
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Agenda	
Adjourn	

Microsoft Teams meeting

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Or call in (audio only)

+1 563-275-5003,,970831390#

Phone Conference ID: 970 831 390#

FINAL Meeting Notes
Lewis River License Implementation
Fish Passage Subcommittee Meeting
December 14, 2023
12:30 PM – 4:00 PM
MS Teams Meeting

Attendees

Christina Donehower – Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Doug Robison – WDFW
Kayla Jensen McMahan – Cowlitz PUD	Pad Smith – WDFW
Beth Bendickson – PacifiCorp	Dave Price – NOAA
Jeremiah Doyle – PacifiCorp	Melissa Jundt – NOAA
Nathan Higa – PacifiCorp	Jeffrey Garnett – USFWS
Chris Karchesky – PacifiCorp	Keely Murdoch – Yakama Nation Fisheries
Erik Lesko – PacifiCorp	Peter Christensen – Kleinschmidt
Todd Olson – PacifiCorp	Brad Johnson – Kleinschmidt
Enrique Ochoa – PacifiCorp	Dana Postlewait – Kleinschmidt
Jonathan Stumpf – Trout Unlimited	Zach Taylor – Kleinschmidt
Bryce Glaser – WDFW	Chris Boyd – QRS Consulting
Josua Holowatz – WDFW	Marty McKay – Art Anderson
Peggy Miller – WDFW	William Zimmerman – QRS Consulting

Introductions, Review Agenda and Meeting Notes

Bryce Glaser, WDFW, reviewed the meeting agenda. Beth Bendickson, PacifiCorp, will send out the September and October meeting notes for 7-Day review.

Updates – FERC

Todd Olson, PacifiCorp, reiterated that the Utilities submitted the Elements of Lewis River Future Fish Passage to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on November 7, 2023. FERC has yet to respond to the submittal. Olson then introduced Enrique Ochoa who is replacing Eric Hansen, who retired from PacifiCorp last week. Ochoa will be the project manager for the Yale Downstream project. Olson also noted that the Design Comment Matrix will be used as a running matrix for “all things Lewis River Fish Passage.” Chris Karchesky, PacifiCorp, followed up by stating that the Comment Matrix has been established and there has already been some comments/questions submitted regarding the 60% design, as well as on the Yale Behavior Study.

Design Team Updates

60% Design Presentation – Introduction

Yale Downstream: Brad Johnson, Kleinschmidt, gave an overview on the Yale Lake Downstream Migrant Collection and Passage presentation and also the brief goals for the project. Peter Christensen, Kleinschmidt, walked through the Fish Collection and Capture presentation. Johnson then walked through the Overall Fish Sorting & Handling Layout presentation, and Marty McKay, Art Anderson, walked through the FSC Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering presentation.

Comments

Josua Holowatz, WDFW, asked “Since fry are separated from juvenile-sized fish, is there the capability to identify and enumerate fry prior to being pumped back to reservoir?” Johnson said there is a lot of flexibility in what could be done, it could be a main line release directly back to the reservoir, or also incorporate a fry holding tank similar to the Swift FSC. Karchesky followed up by saying he anticipate that it will have an ability to hold fish prior to being released back to the reservoir, although design element that needs to be developed more, although again, we have a lot of flexibility it what could be done.

Yale Upstream: Chris Boyd, QRS, walked through the Yale Upstream Fish Passage Preliminary Design Review presentation.

Comments

Pad Smith, WDFW, asked about the hydraulics out in front of the facility entrance as well as the eddy that formed while the powerhouse was generating. He wondered if there was flexibility to think of an alternate or possible second entrance location. He went on to say we are investing a lot to build it and there does not seem to be too much adaptability at that location. Boyd responded that the Design Team had not considered what design elements would need to be considered if a second entrance would be needed in the future and it was something to think about. He also added that because the tailrace was relatively small and any level of generation would likely attract any fish to the downstream side of the powerhouse where the water was less turbulent. It was also in a good location when the powerhouse was off as it would represent the only attraction flow around. We feel that fish are going to find it. Smith added, maybe consider a future entrance on the downstream face of the facility. Boyd said he would have to think about it as it might be doable; it’s a fair question. Melissa Jundt, NOAA, added that she also wanted to bring up the issue of potential draft tube injury though more discussion on this topic was needed.

Smith then asked about future considerations for lamprey passage, and whether the new configuration accommodated for to possibility of lamprey passage in the future. Karchesky mentioned that lamprey passage considerations do present some challenges. Where the Design Team are able to make accommodation for lamprey they have (i.e., round ladder edges and walls, no floor diffusers, identifying potential locations for trap-box) but without them in the system it makes it difficult to determine where to focus efforts. Jundt, NOAA, also mentioned that added lamprey passage is challenging and often times requires adaptive management. Olson said it will be something we need to go back and look at it. Looking through a fish perspective, if a lamprey came through, what would happen? How does the facility respond to lamprey? Glaser said he

recognizes there is no requirement for lamprey passage in the Settlement Agreement but we should have adaptability for the future. The capture/handling process for lamprey is different. One idea is to make sure there is space (real estate) set aside if it were to be a future need. It's good to think ahead. Karchesky said it was a good point and one that the design team is considering, although so much of the work done at other facilities has been through adaptive management and focusing on areas where fish congregate. This is something that Karchesky was aware of the work that PGE had done at Willamette Falls which has a large number of lamprey. Developing lamprey passage is different than that of salmon and steelhead. Karchesky also reminded the group that this topic was included in the 30% Design comments so it has been in the conversation. We'll keep sight of it.

Jeff Garnett, USFWS, echoed the comments from Smith and Glaser, and said he has similar feelings. On the 30% design, USFWS made comments to that end – to making sure the facility was lamprey friendly and that the space allows lamprey. He said he would continue to make those comments going forward.

Swift Upstream: Will Zimmerman, QRS, gave an overview on the Swift Upstream Fish Passage Preliminary Design Review presentation.

Comments

Jundt asked about the background on the sizing of the 8x8 fish ladder pools. What is the pool to pool differential? She said that she had seeing hydraulic galloping occur with more-square pool sizes and recommended considering an 8x12 configuration. Zimmerman responded that he would need to go back and look at the ladder configuration/arrangement and see if that size would be doable. Jundt added that it might not be a big deal and would be fine but it might be better safe than sorry and something to consider, to go slightly larger.

Holowatz asked about the water supply from the power canal. Is the upstream end screened? There are fish (hatchery trout) in the power canal. If it's not screened, would trout then pass into the reservoir? Zimmerman replied, no, it's hydraulic and acts the same as it does now. If fish go in they would be passed out through the velocity barrier. Holowatz then asked about whether the flows through the pipe are currently enough. Zimmerman replied that the flows stipulated in Settlement Agreement would be sufficient.

FPS Next Steps - 60% Design Documents

Location of Documents: The presentations from this meeting will be uploaded to the project website: <https://www.lewisriverfishpassage.com/>.

Format for Sending Comments: Please use the comment and response matrix for tracking comments and design team responses. Bendickson will send it out to the group in the next few days.

Comment Period: Review comments should be submitted to Chris Karchesky and Beth Bendickson) by February 19, 2024. The official review period starts January 5, 2024.

Olson noted we are now at the point of when we need folks to comment that they're comfortable with the designs or not; is it ok for the design team to move on to the fine details of the 90% design? Glaser said it might be good to check in regarding comments on the presentations at the

next meeting. He thinks there is a formal 60% design review with WDFW and NOAA called out in the Settlement Agreement.

Dana Postlewait, Kleinschmidt, to Glaser, these are good questions. There was a lot of information presented here. From a fish handling and infrastructure perspective, we feel we're at a good point. We are using 3D models. If folks have questions or need clarification, maybe do that at the January 2024 meeting. The next phase is where we're moving towards designs for getting the projects permitted and out to construction bid. We're twelve years down the road from the Swift FSC and have learned a lot.

Peggy Miller, WDFW, said there was a lot of information shared that wasn't in the presentation slides and was disappointed that the presentation was not recorded. Olson replied that if she had specific questions, please let the team know and they can respond.

Garnett thanked everyone for the presentation. He said it was helpful. He reiterated Glaser's and Miller's comment in that we can provide some comments but the details we provide will mirror what we were provided with. He was hoping to get similar details as we did on the 30% design.

Olson added that if there are other things people have questions on, we would be glad to discuss. Glaser added that if there are specific questions on modelling or the design sheets being considered, from a 60% design review comment standpoint, or if there are additional information needs, we'll get back to you. He also stated this presentation was really helpful to see the progress made. He thanked everyone for their time and he also thanked the design teams who have been working hard on this.

As far as items for the next meeting, Olson said if anyone wants something on the agenda, to let him, Glaser or Miller know.

Lastly, Miller said we previously talked about the January meeting perhaps being in person but said that due to not wanting to fight any potential weather issues, it will be on MS Teams.

Next FPS Meeting: January 11, 2024

Action Items from December 14, 2023	Status
Beth Bendickson will send out the September and October meeting notes for 7-Day review.	Complete
Beth Bendickson will send out the 30% to 60% Design Comment Matrix.	Complete
Review and provide 30% to 60% Design Comments to Chris Karchesky and Beth Bendickson by February 19, 2024.	

Action Items from November 9, 2023	Status
Review and provide comments on the draft September 14, 2023 meeting notes.	Ongoing
Review and provide comments on the draft October 12, 2023 meeting notes.	Ongoing

Review and submit comments on the Yale Downstream Fish Behavior Study Report to Chris Karchesky by December 8, 2023.	Complete
Bryce Glaser will populate the comment matrix and send it to Karchesky.	Complete
Bryce Glaser will take a harder look through the Elements Document and pull out items to work on going forward.	

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Meeting Materials

- Agenda