

McNary Fisheries Compensation Committee Meeting

Northern Wasco County PUD Conference Room

2345 River Road, The Dalles, Oregon 97058

Call in Number: 866-821-0968, passcode 7632055

Updated: 8/7/2014

AGENDA AND MINUTES

Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10 AM

Attending: Gary Fredricks-NMFS, Brian McIlraith-CRITFC, Rick Martinson-PUD, Korenna Colquitt-PUD. On the phone: Bob Rose-YIN, Julie Carter-CRITFC, Dave Wills-USFWS, Dan Rawding-WDFW, Erick VanDyke-ODFW.

1. New Proposals

- a. Jeremy Cram and Todd Miller, WDFW, Prioritizing restoration actions and identifying population limiting factors for spring Chinook and summer steelhead in the Tucannon River.

We will likely discuss and vote on the application today after we decide what constitutes mitigation.

This was brought up at the end of the meeting and we discussed it again after Dan had presented a short needs assessment. Comments focused on a need to resubmit the proposal with a sharper focus on mitigation. Dan said he would resubmit within the next week. Members would have time to review and then convene for a conference call on the 26th, 27th or 28th of this month. TO DO – set up doodle pool.

2. May meeting as well as June and July conference call minutes review and approval.

Approved w/o comment

3. Main Discussion – Is research mitigation?

Gary opened the discussion by reviewing why he voted against some recent proposals that seemed to be pure research with little hope of actual mitigation, and how those discussions begged for clarity on just what does constitute mitigation.

Julie then went over what she had prepared which was a review of the language in the Settlement Agreement and the criteria in search of some clarity and direction for the committee to build on.

Gary-1st criteria easiest to violate, based on his impressions, proposals lately have fallen short and WE have been inconsistent in requiring compliance with criteria 1.

Dave- agreed and added that we have been inconsistent, each to their own depending on affiliation and proposal.

Julie agreed and asked how we define mitigation, adding each member looks at proposals with different colored glasses based on their affiliation.

Rick and Gary talked briefly about the impact of the McNary project, addressing Julie's question of what are the effects of the turbine unit? Gary added that lamprey may be one of the more impacted species.

Dan added that he agreed with what Gary said about a research being ok if there is a "clear path to mitigation" Dan mentioned a desire to connect the dots, implying that research could do that thereby clarifying the path forward for mitigation work.

Gary added that he would like at least a 50/50 chance of real mitigation, need real potential.

Dan suggested it can be difficult to ID benefits so perhaps we need to lay out broad concepts we can agree on.

Gary responded that sounds too involved and that there needs to be a direct line, a fairly short line, to mitigation.

Rick commented that our fund may not be large enough to pay for the work needed to "connect the dots" Rick added that "connect the dots" suggested to him a multi-year component which several projects have had lately. Seems like it might be something to help the committee identify a research project.

Dan asked for some explanation of single vs multiyear projects.

Rick offered that a drawback of multiyear projects that came up in the past was the possibility of committing funds for out years may limit our ability to fund something we really like that comes in after the multiyear project.

Rick went on to suggest the idea of a check list made up of our criteria that we could use to evaluate proposals but

Dave diffused that idea by pointing out that the application does that.

Dan offered that he didn't think proponents really understood the emphasis on criteria 1, that they were not prioritized which prompted Gary to suggest we emphasize the 1st criteria by bolding it.

Julie agreed with Dan about the lack of priority in the criteria.

Gary then read through the criteria illustrating how important #1 is relative to most of the rest of them.

Bob Rose then added that it would be different if application required a unanimous vote to pass, a majority vote to pass allows for legit interpretation and that the criteria are just guidelines.

Gary and Julie both took issue with this saying they are more like laws and Julie adding that "Shall" is absolute.

Bob responded that if research can create a direct line to mitigation then it should be ok. He cited the Yakama lamprey tracking study/grant which identified passage barriers and led to mitigative work, concluding, "we don't want to lose

that”. Bob went on to suggest we adopt some internal guidelines for how much can be spent on research, preserving the bulk of the fund for “on the ground” work.

Gary liked that idea and added that the CRFM was operated that way, with some money always going for research. He concluded that “earmarking” a percentage may be a good way to go.

Dan added that it would put us all on equal footing. He also reminded us that there are other anadromous species that can benefit and we should keep them in mind.

Julie asked if B run steelhead may be one of those groups and Gary said probably not at all, they travel to high in the water column and the intake is very deep. Lamprey and subyearling chinook would be the most impacted species.

Dave tried to inject the idea that Bull trout could be impacted also which got a good laugh.

Dan said there is a big problem with kelts getting downstream and steelhead overshooting streams.

Gary said that CRFM was addressing those issues.

Julie then made the point that as she reads the SA the mitigation is not general but very specific to species impacted by operation of the PUD turbine at McNary Dam.

Rick argued that the 1st criterion says “anadromous stocks” which opens up mitigation work for any anadromous species.

Gary asked what the PUD wants to do to which Rick responded it isn’t up to the PUD, it is up to the Committee but the PUD prefers mitigation over research, things like habitat work are most preferred.

Gary then picked up Bob’s earlier idea of allocating a certain percentage to research but Bob countered he didn’t really want to designate a specific amount but rather he wanted to establish a general consensus on the concept.

Julie and Dave agreed they didn’t want to be constrained by a percentage or set amount.

Brian then concluded that we were back to square 1, and that it would be up to the applicant to convince us that their research would lead to mitigation. Rick agreed and so did Erick who had recently joined the conversation.

Then there was a back and forth about what species to target, Brian wondered if our criteria needed to evolve based on better info now than when the SA was written. Rick argued that any work for any anadromous species would be fine but Julie made the point that you can’t look at just one statement in the SA, you need to consider the whole document and other parts specify species impacted by the operation of the PUD turbine. There were also some questions about what consequences would there be if we deviated from the criteria. Julie thought it would likely be a FERC issue but Gary offered that it would have to be a major deviation but that we should be careful. There was some question about being consistent with the Counsels’ F&W program Dan commented that anything we fund would likely be consistent. At this point the discussion was wrapping up and Julie offered to write a paragraph summarizing the discussion and attempt to clarify the acceptable range of project types we are most interested in funding. Perhaps part or all of it to be used on the web site or application.

Erick commented that the current batch of applications were research oriented and wondered what could be done to get the word out to other types of entities that would be more likely to bring “on the ground” type projects.

Rick mentioned a recent conversation with a regional director with OWEB that offered to help get the word about our fund to groups doing fisheries mitigation work.

4. Indirect Costs – see attached change form CF-2014-3

Rick submitted CF-2014-3 which would disallow inclusion of indirect funds in grant applications.

Erick, Julie and Dan were opposed to this change as written and the group agreed to look more closely at this cost and make sure that it is itemized in the budgets, with the implication that if it is excessive we could perhaps require a cap.

5. Grant financial activity since last meeting. Rick went through this sections but not much to report.

i. WDFW PIT Tagging Spring Chinook Parr-Year 1

- Invoices received, final report received,

ii. CRITFC Facilities Inventory and RME preparation

- received a final invoice – need clarification and discussion before processing.

Rick explained the confusion with this final invoice, saying it appeared HDR was charging CRITFC for services after the end date of the grant. Brian agreed that it was confusing but that the services were performed in the first two days of March. Brian is going to submit a written explanation for inclusion in the file.

iii. USGS Lamprey Screen Type Testing

-no financial activity

iv. Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation Habitat Restoration Guide

-no financial activity

v. Cle Elum River Restoration-Phase 2

-no financial activity

- vi. **WDFW PIT Tagging Spring Chinook Parr-Year 2**
- no financial activity
- vii. **Yakama River Adult Lamprey Tracking-Tags only**
- no financial activity
- viii. **Yakama River Beaver Relocation Project**
-no financial activity
- ix. **Adult Pacific Lamprey in the Snake- Receiver update**
-invoice from Lotek received before agreement in place, payment pending return of GAD.

Rick explained the hold up and confusion here and the resolution, which was to include some language the USFWS wanted in the GAD that simply stated no money was going to them. Rick also told of how the invoice for the work arrived before the GAD was in place, and that he was sitting on the invoice until the signed GAD was returned.

See updated Grant Summary Table for complete list of activity.

6. Committee Protocols – Grant end date extension language, review and vote.

We talked about this a bit and decided to accept it as is and detail the consequences of non-completion by the new end date in the letter approving the end date extension.

7. Website updates

- a. Several corrections – updated member contact info, protocols (added extension request sections), added change form for extension language, updated grant summary table.
- b. “Submitted Proposals for Funding” review draft format

Rick went through these and asked for comments and suggestions. There were a couple of suggestions, 1) be consistent with project titles on both spreadsheets, 2) on the vote record, add a project type classification and a date of decision, 3) add a one line description of each project on the All Applications Table Table, 4) and the date of discussion on the All Applications Table. Rick will do what he can to implement these suggestions.

8. Project Updates- progress updates from Grant sponsor or project manager.

- a. USGS, Matt Mesa – Lamprey Test Tank Screen type testing –

Rick mentioned that he had gotten an email from Matt saying the final report should be done soon and that he was retiring at the end of the month, Theresa L. would be taking over his work. Future of the test tank is unclear. There was some discussion about who implements screen criteria for lamprey and wouldn't salmon criteria provide protection, how do we get the best protection info for lamprey to the people installing screened diversions. It seemed there were more questions than answers.

- b. CRITFC- Brian/Julie - Facilities Inventory and RME for Lamprey- Brian to present the final report and go through contents with committee.

Brian went through a PP presentation in handout form and talked about the 95% draft report resulting from this grant. The conclusion was a recommendation that Brian incorporates outstanding comments, change the title from 95% draft to Final Report and resubmit. At that point the report will satisfy the last report requirements and the remaining funds can be released.

Rick then mentioned the other updates that had been distributed.

- c. WDFW – Todd Miller, Tagging Spring Chinook Parr-Year 1- see Final report
- d. WDFW – Todd Miller, Tagging Spring Chinook Parr-Year 2- see updates
- e. KCT- Mitchell Long, Cle Elum Restoration, Phase 2, see update
- f. Yakama – Bob Rose, Adult Lamprey Tracking,
- g. MSRF – John C- signed GAD Amendment extending end date added.
- h. WDFW- Hank- Swauk Creek
- i. MCRFEG & WDFW - Yakama River Beaver Relocation- relocating occurring

9. Next Meeting Date

Rick will set up a Doodle pool for the next meeting sometime during the middle of November