

**DRAFT Meeting Notes**  
**Lewis River License Implementation**  
**Aquatic Coordination Committee (ACC) Meeting**  
**June 8, 2006**  
**Ariel, WA**

**ACC Participants Present (18)**

Byron Amerson, Stillwater Sciences  
 Craig Burley, WDFW  
 Jim Byrne, WDFW  
 Clifford Casseseka, Yakama Nation  
 Diana Gritten-MacDonald, Cowlitz PUD (via teleconference)  
 Adam Haspiel, USDA Forest Service  
 Erik Lesko, PacifiCorp Energy  
 Kaitlin Lovell, Trout Unlimited (via teleconference)  
 Tammy Mackey, American Rivers and Trout Unlimited  
 Jim Malinowski, Fish First  
 Kimberly McCune, PacifiCorp Energy  
 Todd Olson, PacifiCorp Energy  
 Steve Ralph, Stillwater Sciences  
 Frank Shrier, PacifiCorp Energy  
 Karen Thompson, USDA Forest Service (via teleconference)  
 Richard Turner, NMFS  
 John Weinheimer, WDFW  
 Shannon Wills, Cowlitz Indian Tribe (via teleconference)

**Calendar:**

June 14, 2006	TCC Meeting & Devils Backbone site visit	Merwin Hydro
June 23, 2006	ACC Meeting – Cle Elum Hatchery site visit	Cle Elum, WA
July 12, 2006	TCC Meeting	Merwin Hydro
July 13, 2006	ACC Meeting	Merwin Hydro

<b>Assignments from June 8th Meeting:</b>	<b>Status:</b>
McCune: Post Stillwater Sciences presentation to the Lewis River website.	Complete – 6/12/06
Olson: Create a visual schematic illustrating how the pieces fit together and how the mile stones are achieved in order to reach the tentative decisions the H&S Subgroup have been discussing such as, scale analysis, number of natural origin spring chinook and introduction of natural origin fish into the hatchery.	Complete – 6/20/06
Lesko: Provide a general overview to the ACC via email as to the status of the hatchery upgrades at the next ACC meeting.	Complete – 7/13/06
Casseseka: to respond back to McCune regarding the H&S Subgroup participating in a site visit on 6/23/06 to Cle Elum Hatchery.	Complete – 6/14/06

<b>Assignments from May 11th Meeting:</b>	<b>Status:</b>
McCune: Email the “revised” draft 4/13/06 meeting notes to all ACC participants for a 7-day review process.	Complete – 5/17/06
PacifiCorp to follow-up with YN on Supplementation Plan	Complete – 5/15/06
Olson: Review the Settlement Agreement to identify specific articles that require the completed H&S Plan for implementation of the articles and to use this analysis to determine the completion data of the H&S Plan.	Complete – 6/8/06

## **Opening, Review of Agenda and Meeting Notes**

Todd Olson (PacifiCorp Energy) called the meeting to order at 9:10am and conducted a review of the Agenda for the day. He requested a round table introduction of all attendees. Olson requested any comments and/or changes to the ACC 5/11/06 draft meeting notes. Craig Burley (WDFW) requested an addition and clarification on page 4 relating Section 3.3.1 Steelhead - Supplementation Strategy to read as follows:

*The ACC agreed to modify the second paragraph as follows, **but reserve the right for further modification:***

Olson reviewed with the ACC the Response to Burley request – 5/11/06 ACC Meeting document (see **Attachment A**). All changes were approved by the ACC at 9:25am.

## **Spawning Gravel Evaluation (Stillwater Sciences)**

Byron Amerson and Steve Ralph (Stillwater Sciences) conducted an overview of the Spawning Gravel Evaluation which included a PowerPoint presentation, which can be located on the Lewis River website at:

<http://www.pacificorp.com/Article/Article61767.html>

The overview included the following:

Introduction and background - Study required under the terms of the Lewis River Hydroelectric Project Settlement Agreement, Section 7.2

Study Elements of the Evaluation, the Study Area, and Key Findings.

Two methods were reviewed; The Field Approach and Modeling & Analysis. Stillwater Sciences responded to ACC questions as to how they determined where the spawning areas were. Aerial photograph by David Smith & Associates was reviewed which was used to generate high-resolution field maps, facies mapping & Pebble counts, spawning habitat mapping and tracer rock placement.

Modeling and analysis approach was discussed to include digitize facies and spawning habitat in a GIS, EASI model to develop sediment rating curve and escape model to determine degree of habitat limitation for Chinook salmon.

The key findings include spawning habitat is likely limiting the local Chinook salmon population, available spawning gravel does not appear to be diminished in the upper

reach, and spawning gravel appears to be stable. Stillwater Sciences indicated that the preponderance of the river bed is rather coarse and that fish are appearing to spawn in the upper half even though the lower half has suitable spawning areas. A question was asked and clarified by Stillwater that although spawning habitat is limited, adding more gravel would not necessarily increase the spawning area. This is an effect of the confined canyon geomorphology rather than hydro project affects.

The square footage of spawning areas in the upper reach was reviewed. The total area is reduced by 27% because of pervasive spawning dunes. Stillwater Sciences provided more detail relating to EASI Modeling to include the average annual sediment transport, which is illustrated in the PowerPoint presentation.

Stillwater also reviewed escape modeling, limited habitat below the dam, escapement, salmon life history modeling, and increase utilization of existing habitat.

The spawning habitat monitoring schedule was discussed in detail to include the sediment rating curve, the 4 year return interval flood, detailed mapping of spawning habitat area at index sites and critical area loss in spawning area will trigger gravel augmentation.

The ACC was informed that a critical area loss in spawning area should trigger gravel augmentation, which is a management (ACC) decision. First the ACC should determine what percentage of loss is acceptable before augmentation is necessary. Following monitoring, the ACC then is to determine if gravel augmentation is to be implemented.. Stillwater will need to conduct further field monitoring for the next two seasons prior to being able to recommend an augmentation trigger.

Stillwater communicated that there are three (3) options relating to gravel augmentation:

Option 1

- Add average annual volume of gravel just below Merwin Dam and allow the river to naturally route.

Option 2

- Rebuild spawning riffles at areas identified as critically diminished in area.

Option 3 – Preemptive Enhancement

- Expand the spawning area just below Merwin Dam at RM 19.5.
- Immediately enhances available spawning area.
- Acts as a reservoir of gravel for downstream routing if a large flood event occurs.

Break <10:40am>

Reconvene <10:50am>

## **Hatchery & Supplementation Plan Discussion**

Frank Shrier (PacifiCorp Energy) reviewed the H&S Plan Subgroup activities with the ACC and discussed the presentation presented by Andy Appleby – Hatchery Reform Implementation: All-H Analyzer (AHA), which can be located on the Lewis River website at <http://www.pacificorp.com/Article/Article61767.html>

Olson communicated that the intent of the Subgroup was to address the issue of integrated vs. segregated, so the group still needs to agree how to deal with the issue of supplementation.

Shrier informed the ACC that the topic of integrated vs. segregated is not clear cut and is still requiring significant discussion, although the overall goal is an integrated program for the long term.

Olson provided a handout of where he thought ACC members were on some of the current issues. The handout included the following:

#### 1. Transportation of adult fish upstream of Swift reservoir

SA article 8.5.3 Adult Salmonids – “...the Licensees shall provide for the transport and release of supplementation stocks of adult spring Chinook, coho, and steelhead above Swift No. 1 as directed by the ACC....The ACC, subject to the approval of the Services, may recommend discontinuing or recommencing the supplementation of such supplementation stocks, provided that any such recommendations are biologically based and not contrary to the goals of the ESA.” (SA page 67)

#### **SPCH:**

H&S Plan – Initially transport minimum of 2,000 adult hatchery SPCH (when available) per year. (H&S Plan page 17) Later, transport any Natural Origin Returns (NORs) and only transport additional hatchery fish if NORs numbers are low. 65 of the NORs will be needed each year as broodstock for juvenile supplementation program (page 18). NORs will not be used as hatchery production broodstock (page 21).

Yakama Nation – Oppose placing hatchery SPCH adults in upper watershed.

NMFS – Place hatchery SPCH adults in upper watershed until Fish Collection Efficiency (FCE) for SPCH meet minimum goals set by ACC. Once FCE minimum is met, maximize the release of naturally produced adults while retaining 20% NORs (or what ever meets percent natural integration goals) for hatchery broodstock. Supplementation juveniles should be marked to identify and transport returning adults to upper basin.

#### **Coho:**

H&S Plan – Initially release 9,000 Type S coho adults (when available) that have returned to the hatchery above Swift reservoir. Later, preferentially transport adults that have originated above Swift to back above the Project. To reach minimum total adult number of 9,000 fish, supplement NORs/supplementation returns with hatchery fish. NORs will not be incorporated into hatchery broodstock.

Yakama Nation – Okay to place natural origin and/or hatchery Coho and Steelhead adults in upper watershed. Natural origin preferred.

NMFS – Place hatchery Type-S coho adults in upper watershed until Fish Collection Efficiency (FCE) for coho meet minimum goals set by ACC. Once FCE minimum is met, maximize the release of naturally produced adults while retaining 20% NORs for hatchery broodstock.

#### 2. Transportation of juvenile fish upstream of Swift reservoir

SA article 8.5.1 Juvenile Salmonids Above Swift No. 1 Dam. “The Licensees shall, for the

*purpose of supplementation, provide for the transport of juvenile anadromous salmonids to acclimation sites selected pursuant to Section 8.8.1, for the following periods of time:*

*(1) Spring Chinook and Steelhead. The Licensees shall provide the means to supplement juvenile spring Chinook and steelhead for a period of 15 years commencing upon completion of the Swift Downstream Facility pursuant to Section 4.4.1; and*

*(2) Coho. The Licensees shall provide the means to supplement juvenile coho salmon for a period of 9 years commencing upon completion of the Swift Downstream Facility.*

**SPCH:**

H&S Plan – Use fish returning to hatchery as initial broodstock to provide 100,000 juveniles for supplementation to upper basin. Later use marked adults returning from supplementation program or NOR's as broodstock.

Yakama Nation – Agree with starting supplementation program with 100,000 juvenile SPCH.

NMFS – Use fish returning from supplementation program for supplementation broodstock.

**Coho:**

H&S Plan – No supplementation of juvenile coho to upper basin.

Yakama Nation – No need to supplement juvenile coho or steelhead.

NMFS – No release of juvenile coho into upper basin.

There was considerable discussion regarding NMFSs recommendations on hatchery spring chinook. Olson asked Kaitlin Lovell (Trout Unlimited) to review NMFSs comments via email regarding the H&S discussion. Lovell responded as follows:

-----Original Message-----

From: Kaitlin Lovell [<mailto:KLovell@tu.org>]  
Sent: Wednesday, June 07, 2006 12:50 PM  
To: Olson, Todd; Tammy M; Shrier, Frank  
Cc: Brett Swift; Kate Miller; McCune, Kimberly  
Subject: RE: June ACC meeting H&S discussion

Thanks Todd,

As we discussed at the subgroup meeting, our position depends on some fundamental questions and answers that are still unresolved. We are assuming that in fact there are wild Spring Chinook in the system still, whereas WDFW is assuming there is not. It became clearer during the subgroup meeting that until we know what's in the system, and roughly how many, our position on which fish at which life stage may change or differ with other groups. For example, if there are relatively higher numbers of wild Spring Chinook in the system (i.e. more than 200 or so), we would advocate just passing the wild adults and not any hatchery fish above the barriers once the FPE improves (until then we would suggest leaving them alone since they've survived up to this point). We would then have to look at how the juvenile supplementation would work with that proposal. If however, there are only a few wild Spring Chinook in the system, it might make sense to repeat the approach we discussed for Steelhead. If there are no wild Spring Chinook in the system, then we would consider passing the adult hatchery fish to "naturalize" them over time and would consider the juvenile program accordingly. So really, I don't know that we can agree to any approach without an answer to the fundamental question about what's actually in the

system now. Is it expected that the ACC will come to some agreement on this at the meeting tomorrow?

Also, coho did come up at the subgroup meeting and there was confusion and discussion over the different Type S and Type N programs and approaches.

So I don't know if this makes it more helpful or less helpful for us to call in tomorrow. If it would be helpful, I can try to call in if that's a possibility.

Thanks,  
Kaitlin.

Jim Byrne (WDFW) asked for clarification of the term “wild” to ensure that ACC participants are all talking about the same thing.

The ACC agreed that naturally produced progeny whether the parents are wild or not, is considered a “wild” fish.

Clifford Casseseka (Yakama Nation) expressed to the ACC that they want only naturally produced coho, steelhead and spring chinook in the upper watershed.

Shrier – what we’re trying to do is build a natural adaptation to something closer to fitness before the dams went in.

General discussion took place regarding improving the fitness of hatchery fish by introducing natural origin fish into the hatchery as a way of looking at an integrated hatchery stock.

Burley would like the number of natural origin spring chinook in the watershed reviewed to confirm that our assumptions are correct. Lovell concurred. WDFW will take the responsibility to gather that information.

Olson asked Casseseka to respond back to Kimberly McCune (PacifiCorp Energy) regarding the H&S Subgroup and interested ACC members participating in a site visit to Cle Elum Hatchery on 6/23/06. The key topics for discussion at the next H&S Subgroup meeting are:

- NMFS Memo, dated 5/24/06
- Integration vs. segregation
- Supplementation
- Hatchery remodel

Burley suggested creating a visual schematic of how all the pieces fit together and how the milestones are achieved in order to reach the tentative decisions we have been discussing such as, scale analysis, number of natural origin spring chinook and introduction of natural origin fish into the hatchery.

Shrier suggested putting together a schematic on the white board during lunch as a starting point. Burley would like to spend time mapping out the proposal from the 5/30/06 meeting.

Lesko would like to see the current plan side by side with the suggested new plan so the ACC can see the differences.

Olson said that PacifiCorp Energy will create such a schematic for the ACC review at the next meeting. In addition, Olson suggested that the next meeting should take place at the Cle Elum Hatchery to understand the tribal supplementation program. Casseseka suggested we gather the data from the 5/30/06 meeting and then meet at the Cle Elum Hatchery on 6/23/06 for a tour to integrate the data then go forward.

## **Study Updates**

Shrier provided the following study updates:

*Yale Entrainment Study* – Operating under normal scenario.

*Merwin Tailrace Behavior Study* – Tagged 50 Chinook, got back 26 and 1 was caught in a commercial fishery in the Columbia River zone 3.

*Limiting Factors Analysis* – Comments were due from the ACC on 5/26/06.

*Hatchery Upgrades* – Proposing to re-build pond 15, then ponds 13 & 14 the following year. Erik Lesko (PacifiCorp Energy) asked Michelle Day (NMFS) if she has any objections. Day responded with the following email:

---

*From: Michelle Day [mailto:Michelle.Day@noaa.gov]  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2006 11:06 AM  
To: Lesko, Erik  
Subject: Re: Lewis River Hatchery Ladder*

*Erik,  
I am alright with the ladder shut down. Given the timing of reintroduction into the upper basin (years away), I don't see any impact to listed fish from having a ladder shut down next year (but if this were to be when we are reintroducing fish into the upper basin, there may be concerns).  
Thank you for the inquiry,  
-Michelle*

*Lesko, Erik wrote the following on 4/20/2006 4:08 PM:  
Hi Michelle - I have a question related to our hatchery upgrades that we are planning next year. In regards to reconstructing ponds 13 and 14 at Lewis River hatchery, we may need to shut the ladder down at the hatchery during the early summer for 2 to 3 months. The timing of this is planned to have minimal effects on species. The ladder would probably be closed at the tail end of the spring chinook run timing and coho and steelhead would be unaffected.*

*I would like to get some confirmation from NMFS that it is okay to shut the ladder down for this short construction period. I am available to discuss further if necessary.*

*Thank you.*

*Erik Lesko  
(503) 813-6624*

Burley asked for a general overview as to the status of the remodel at the next meeting. The ACC could then look at the potential pros and cons so the entire ACC is up to speed. PacifiCorp will try to get something to the ACC via email then perhaps discuss at the July meeting, time permitting.

### **Merwin Sorting Facility Design**

Letter of notification mailed to the ACC and Engineering Subgroup on May 15, 2006 that PacifiCorp is proceeding with 30% design work.

### **Bull Trout 2005 Annual Report and 2006 Monitoring Plan**

PacifiCorp submitted the 2005 Annual Report and 2006 Monitoring Plan to the FERC on 4/12/06. The Settlement Agreement indicates that the ACC is to be included in Consultation, however it was an oversight that all participants were not a part of the initial preparation. McCune provided copies of both reports to all ACC attendees and mailed hard copies to those not present on 6/12/06.

### **Agenda items for July 13, 2006**

- Supplementation Discussion
- Integration vs. segregation

The ACC agreed to meet on 6/23/06 for a site visit to Cle Elum. Casseseka will confirm the details.

### **Next Scheduled Meetings**

June 23, 2006	July 13, 2006
Cle Elum Hatchery	Merwin Hydro Facility
Cle Elum, Washington	Ariel, WA
10:00am - TBD	9:00am – 3:00pm

**Meeting Adjourned at 12:45p.m.**

### **Handouts**

- o Final Agenda
- o Draft Meeting Notes 5/11/06
- o Hatchery & Supplementation Plan Discussion Points from May 30, 2006 Subgroup Meeting
- o Response to Burley request – 5/11/06 ACC Meeting
- o Bull Trout 2005 Annual Report & 2006 Monitoring Plan – March 2006



## Attachment A

### Response to Burley request -- 5/11/06 ACC meeting:

*Burley asked that PacifiCorp Energy staff review the Settlement Agreement to identify specific articles that require the completed H&S Plan for implementation of the articles and to use this analysis to determine the completion data of the H&S Plan. The ACC can then use this information to back plan a schedule for completing the H&S Plan.*

The Licensees shall transition from the hatchery program set forth in Articles 50 and 51 of the 1983 Merwin license, as amended, to implementing the Hatchery and Supplementation Plan as soon as practicable after Issuance of the New License(s) for the Merwin Project or the Swift Projects, whichever occurs earlier, provided that supplementation will commence as provided in Section 8.5. – Pg 61

When finalized, the Licensees shall submit the Hatchery and Supplementation Plan to WDFW and NOAA Fisheries for consideration in their development of applicable hatchery genetic management plans (“HGMPs”). – Pg 61

The Licensees shall provide for the implementation of the Hatchery and Supplementation Plan through an annual plan (“Annual Operating Plan”). The Annual Operating Plan shall be consistent with the Hatchery and Supplementation Plan. The Licensees, in Consultation with the hatchery managers and with the approval of the Services, shall develop the initial Annual Operating Plan as part of the Hatchery and Supplementation Plan. The Licensees shall develop subsequent Annual Operating Plans in Consultation with the hatchery managers and subject to the approval of the Services. – Pg 62

On an annual basis, the Licensees shall provide to the ACC for review and comment a report compiling all information gathered pursuant to implementation of the Hatchery and Supplementation Plan. The report also will include recommendations for ongoing management of the Hatchery and Supplementation Program. – Pg 63

The Licensees shall provide for the implementation of the following Juvenile Production targets (“Juvenile Production Targets”) when the Hatchery and Supplementation Program commences. – Pg 65