

McNary Fisheries Compensation Committee Meeting

Northern Wasco County PUD Conference Room

2345 River Road, The Dalles, Oregon 97058

Call in Number: 1-971-256-0996 , passcode: 245144

Updated: 5/19/2015

Thursday, June 4, 2015, 2 – 4 pm

Attending: Rick M-PUD, Gary F.-NOAA, Erick V.-Oregon. On phone: Julie C.-CRITFC, Bob R.-Yakama, Dan R.-WA, RD Nelle-USFWS, Presenters on phone- Mitchell Long-KCT, Paul Tappel, John Crandall-Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation.

1. New Proposals, Extension Request or Final Report Presentations.

a. Fish Screen- Kittitas Conservation Trust – Mitchell Long.

Mitchell opened with a discussion of the proposed install site, species present, stream size, and a brief description of the screen. He pointed out that there currently are not any anadromous fish in the stream but there have been steelhead in there in the past. He talked about the cost which he estimated at 340K, of which they would ask for 30 - 50% of from MFCC, so between \$102K and \$170K. Mitch said the county was assessing flood control and passage in the system and that there is significant habitat above this diversion. When asked about differences from the farmers screen, he referred to Paul.

Paul said there are significant differences but failed to list any. He said that once he understood the hydraulics he understood how to make a better screen. He said he took elements from several other types of screens, including the farmers screen. He claimed his screen would have more uniform velocities, be better for small volumes and be modular. There are no moving parts, no electrical needs, no motors; it is a very simple design that uses water velocity to keep it clean.

Dan asked if it was NOAA approved and how long it would last. Paul said it wasn't NOAA approved but that it would have only small variations from the criteria that are similar to variations in the farmers screen that were approved by NOAA. Gary said it would need to meet NOAA criteria for anadromous fish to be approved, even though there aren't any in the system now. Paul said he had worked with Jeff Brown at NOAA, Gary said he would talk to Jeff. Paul said the materials were designed to last hundreds of years.

John Crandall asked if it would pass lamprey and Mitch said he was confident that it would.

Paul then stated that he thought the ratio of sweep to approach velocities was more important than the values themselves.

Gary asked about turbulence in the plunge pool to which Paul said it would be gentler than most.

Erick asked if this was a "proof of concept" project? Paul didn't really answer this but it was confirmed that this would be the first "Washington Screen" built and as such, was a "proof of concept" effort.

Paul emphasized that the principal advantage was its simplicity, adding that there are elements of several other screen types in the design. Gary asked about it being self cleaning to which Paul said he had a high degree of confidence that it would be.

Gary asked if it had been modeled and Paul said no, it hadn't, but he was confident that the hydraulics would work and you can't model fish behavior or debris management. There were some comments about why if it is so simple hadn't it been invented 50 years ago? We verified that there are not currently any anadromous fish in the system. Gary asked about time line, Mitch said if approved he would like to install this fall but that could be pushed back. Paul pointed out the list of characteristics in one of his papers and added that fish screens can be complicated but this one isn't. The cost estimate, Paul said, was high but only about 80K was for screen components, the rest was for infrastructure at the site. That is about where we left the discussion, Paul and Mitch were thanked for their presentation and signed off.

To Do: All- Send your vote to Rick on if you would like to see a full proposal or not.

Gary – talk to Jeff Brown about the screen.

Rick – Fill out Vote Record Form with member responses, communicate results to Mitch and Paul.

Send record of conversation with Dan from FCA regarding Paul and the Washington Screen.

b. Lamprey Habitat Restoration Guide, Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation, John Crandall.

John was on the phone but his presentation was on the screen for those in attendance to view. He projected the guide page by page on the screen and talked about the development of each section. He went through the entire guide this way explaining why it was organized the way it is and where the photos and graphics came from, and other aspects of the process. He mentioned that the guides we had were not the final version and that the final printed booklets would be sharper and glossier. Content won't change but it will look more polished. Those in attendance were impressed

with the draft copy John had provided and complimented him on a job well done. Bob Rose was also recognized and thanked for coming up with the concept of the guide. Rick reminded John that he had 60 days after the grant end date of May 31, 2015 to submit final invoices. Erick asked if the electronic copy would be on our website, Rick said it could be.

To Do: Rick to get electronic copy and submit to PUD IT dept. for posting.

2. February 2015 meeting minutes approval request.

Minutes were approved and will be added to the web site. **To Do: Rick to send file to IT dept.**

3. Other new business, agenda additions, etc.

4. Grant Updates, work progress and financial activity.

i) Swauk Creek Restoration- Yakama Nation-Henry Fraser (ED-2/10/12)

ii) Lamprey Test Tank Construction-WDFW-Pat Shille (ED-12/4/12)

iii) Yakama River Adult Lamprey Tracking-Yakama Nation, Bob Rose, (ED-6/30/13)

iv) PIT Tagging Spring Chinook Parr-Year 1- WDFW-Dan Rawding, (ED-9/30/13)

v) Facilities Inventory and RME preparation, CRITFC, Brian McIlraith, (ED-3/31/14)

vi) Lamprey Screen Type Testing-USGS, Matt Mesa & Theresa Liedtke, (ED-12/31/13)

(1) See email update.

vii) Lamprey Habitat Restoration Guide, Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation, John Crandall, (ED 5/31/15)

(1) John presenting final product/report.

viii) Cle Elum River Restoration-Phase 2, Kittitas Conservation Trust, Mitchell Long (ED 12/31/14)

ix) PIT Tagging Spring Chinook Parr-Year 2, WDFW, Todd Miller (12/31/2015)

(1) no financial activity

x) Yakama River Adult Lamprey Tracking-Tags only, Yakama Nation, Bob Rose (ED 3/31/15)

xi) Yakama River Beaver Project, Mid C.Fisheries Enhancement Group-Mel Babik & WDFW-William Meyer, (ED 12/31/15)

(1) No financial activity, see written update.

xii) Adult Pacific Lamprey in the Snake- Receiver update (ED 12/31/14).

xiii) Evaluation of Restoration Actions to Increase Overwintering Survival of Juvenile Tucannon River spring Chinook and summer steelhead. (ED 12/31/15)

(1) No financial activity. Dan Rawding said that tagged fish are migrating now so they will start analysis in September or October and have a report to us by the end of the year. There was some talk of coming back to the committee for one more year of funding.

See updated Grant Summary Table for complete list of activity.

To Do: Rick has some updates to make.

5. Change Forms

a. Committee Protocols – See Protocols document with edits.

Rick presented a change form that consisted of numerous changes regarding responsibilities of the Secretary and the Committee Coordinator. Other changes were made to reduce redundancy, such as the paragraph on the Grant Award Document, but Julie felt the inclusion of that information in two locations was appropriate because one was definition based the other procedural based. Rick agreed to retract that change.

Bob initiated a discussion regarding the language on Decision Making. Basically Bob was advocating for requiring all members to vote on procedural changes, keeping the vote open until all votes were in but essentially closing the vote if a majority of members were present when voting on a grant, and four or more voted the same way. Gary thought it should be just the opposite but emphasized all votes referenced the entire committee not just those present for the vote. Erick asked if written (email) votes submitted before a meeting/vote were ok? Comments supported that. Dan asked about a definition of “present”. On the phone is considered present.

After much discussion Julie offered to rewrite this section of the protocols and try to capture the points mentioned and clarify the decision making process. All agreed that would be great.

One other change that Rick pointed out was an increase in the committee coordinators compensation rate for Direct Purchase Grants only from one half of a percent of the grant amount to one percent.

Update: 8/6/15 at the August meeting, Gary commented that he thought there was agreement on of the suggested changes with two exceptions; 1. The language regarding the GAD in two locations was OK, so Rick deleted that suggested change. 2. The section on Decision Making (2.2) was to be rewritten by Julie and then reviewed. All other changes could be implemented. Erick commented that he agreed with Gary’s recollection and he also wondered why

the protocols needed to emphasize personal attendance to meetings. Rick reviewed the section and noted that it just says personal attendance is “preferred”.

To Do: Julie to rewrite Decision Making section.

Rick to revise changes based on discussion and redistribute for member review and comment. Rick will send out his revised protocols and Julie can send out the Decision Making section. Once members respond with comments, Rick will make changes, add Julies section and distribute a final draft for approval. Please try to respond in a timely manner so this task doesn't linger. Thanks.

6. Website updates Added some tables, added minutes, updated contacts list.

Rick will check math in tables.

7. Next Meeting Date Mid August Rick to send out a doodle poll.

Summary of decisions and To Do List from June 4, 2015 Meeting.

To Do List:

All- Send your vote to Rick on if you would like to see a full proposal or not on the Washington Screen.

Gary – talk to Jeff Brown about the screen and share findings.

Julie - Rewrite Decision Making section capturing and incorporating discussion points from meeting.

- Rick –
1. Fill out Vote Record Form with member responses; communicate results to Mitch and Paul.
 2. Send record of conversation with Dan from FCA regarding Paul and the Washington Screen.
 3. Send February meeting minutes to PUD IT dept. for posting on web.
 4. Updates tables with new info and make formula corrections, send updates to PUD IT dept.
 5. Revise changes to protocols based on discussion and redistribute for member review and comment. Rick will send out his revised protocols and Julie can send out the Decision Making section. Once members respond with comments, Rick will make changes, add Julie's section and distribute a final draft for approval. Please try to respond in a timely manner so this task doesn't linger. Thanks.
 6. Send out a doodle poll for next meeting date.
 7. Get electronic copy of Lamprey Habitat Restoration Guide and get it posted on MFCC website.
 8. Type up meeting minutes.