

McNary Fisheries Compensation Committee Meeting

Northern Wasco County PUD Meeting Room

2345 River Road, The Dalles, Oregon 97058

Call in Number: 1-971-256-0996 , passcode: 148967

Updated 15/16/2016

Tuesday, May 17, 2016, 10 – 2 pm

Attending: Rick M.-PUD, Gary F.-NOAA, Dan R.-WDFW, RD Nelle-USFWS, Korenna C.-PUD

On Phone: Erick V.-ODFW, Julie C.-CRITFC

Presenting: Margaret Neumann-MCFEG, by phone: Geoff McMichael-Mainstem Fish Research

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

- a. Yakima Basin Backyard Salmon Habitat Project, Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group, Margaret Neuman.

Margaret Neuman presented this proposal using a PP presentation. The proposal is to identify entities with property adjacent to the Yakama River that are interested in improving their riparian buffer. MCFEG does the rest, including planning, permitting, and planting, including supplying the trees and shrubs to be planted. The landowner agrees to water the new plants. MCFEG has been doing this work for several years now on a grant from Washington State DEQ. Washington State DEQ recently adopted a federal requirement that projects of this type provide a 75' buffer, larger than many of the small scale projects MCFEG works on. That is why MCFEG came to MFCC for funding. Margaret was asking for \$90, 218 but emphasized that the project is scalable.

Erick asked what size buffers previous projects had. Margaret said it varied from 40' to 75'. Erick asked if there were any structures involved, Margaret confirmed it was only shade creation.

Gary asked what would prevent a landowner from having a change of heart subsequent to project completion and just cutting it all down or property being sold and new owner wants an improved view.

Margaret said they do have a landowner agreement that is signed stipulating they will maintain and water the plantings for 10 years but admitted enforcement is questionable. She went on to say that most participants are river lovers and want the improvements, and do maintain them. She had one example of a project that was compromised due to a foreclosure and the bank wouldn't allow entry. Further, there is something called the "shore line protection act" that should prevent them from clearing a riparian/buffer zone.

Gary asked about the landowner contribution, Margaret said it varies by project but that the plants are purchased with grant funds.

Gary asked if the committee could be involved in site selection.

Margaret said she would prefer we not be involved but if that was important it may be possible.

Rick asked if she know the number of interested landowners ready to go and what % of contacted landowners are interested. Margaret said maybe 4 or 5 were interested when they ran out of money and the % of contacted that are interested would be way less than 3 of 10.

Gary asked if Margaret knew the success rate of her projects?

Margaret thought that the Walla Walla examples had high success rates to which Gary said he would like to know the details of success rate of similar projects, and added that we need to be reasonably assured that there would be some benefit to fish.

Rd asked how they find participants?

Margaret said they started with a mailer which was a total failure. They did some presentations and some door to door. RD asked about the in kind contributions, Margaret said it is mostly labor and the watering.

Dan commented that RDG's and recovery boards need to send a strong message to (DEQ) that the 75' buffer is going to kill small scale recovery efforts. Also he would like to see a stated minimum buffer and agreed to Gary that some % success data would be nice to know and if a project failed, why.

Dan also suggested that Margaret think about project location and effectiveness for salmon. Where is the most effective place to work? He suggested perhaps using Dan Isaac's stream temp model to identify higher up tribs that could perhaps benefit more than larger lower river stretches.

Post presentation discussion concluded that we would like Margaret to prepare a full proposal and include:

1. Similar project success data from Walla Walla and Yakama area.
2. More specifics on locations, a rationale for site selection.
3. a stated minimum buffer size.
4. the land owner agreement

ToDo: Rick will draft a response letter for Margaret and circulate for comment.

b. McNary Fish Predator Management, Yakama Nation, Geoff McMichael.

The second proposal was presented over the phone while we viewed a powerpoint by Geoff McMichael. Geoff described the problem with data showing a 37% juvenile salmon survival rate from the Hanford Reach to McNary Dam. He also presented data on predator abundance, specifically Walleye, Smallmouth bass and Northern Pikeminnow. He went on to describe the vulnerability of Walleye larvae to water temperature and flow and how survival could be reduced by manipulating reservoir elevation. He proposed a 3 phase approach, modeling, sampling and then testing. He closed with some comments about why he was approaching us and how he had received support from the people he had contacted within the CoE and BPA.

Discussion and Questions

Dan asked is the survival rate quoted was related to tagging project and fish size.

Geoff said it came from many years of tagging with some fish as small as 60 mm and he acknowledged that larger fish have higher survival. Dan also brought up the potential for an ecosystem shift, decrease walleye results in an increase in SMB. Gary added a concern about shallow water increasing salmonid exposure to avian predation.

Geoff acknowledged that these were good points and countered that perhaps the manipulations could be done for limited duration and at night. He also mentioned that the model predicted the majority of the reservoir would be unaffected and that it could predict the % of dewatering based on flows and elevations.

Gary questioned how effectiveness would be evaluated to which Geoff responded that there would be sampling prior, during and after the manipulation which may reflect a change in abundance.

Gary then brought up compensatory actions by other species and asked are these fish that survive in the study area just going to be eaten later?

Dan and Gary had some additional points about larval survival and the Northern Pikeminnow Sport Reward program.

Dan asked if the CoE was really interested and how high up the food chain Geoff had gone with this idea.

Geoff said he had talked to Ann Setter, Doug Baus, and Scott Bettin. Dan said he needed to move up the food chain.

Gary cited an example at John Day where they wanted a 1.5' manipulation and all the NEPA roadblocks that request ran into. Gary wondered out loud if this idea could be combined with the John Day action to expedite it.

Dan complimented Geoff for thinking out of the box but thought there were some steps to take before coming to us and asking for money.

RD asked if lamprey stranding had been considered. Geoff said he had talked to Yakima lamprey experts Lampman and Uhler about this and they cited some survey work that did not find lamprey in the substrate in the subject area.

Geoff also pointed out that the manipulation would not dewater to substrate.

Gary asked how long the drawdown would have to last to be effective. Geoff said that is something that would be modeled and tested. The CoE would prefer less drawdown for shorter periods.

Post Presentation Discussion

Julie pointed out that the proposal was consistent with our mission and that she would leave the technical discussion to the biologists on the committee and that CRITFC supported the effort.

Dan said it was complicated and should be a regional proposal reviewed by ISRP.

Others agreed and thought it was innovative and potentially effective but that it was too large and complicated for our fund and that it needed more coordination and assurance that the CoE would agree to the manipulations.

The Committee agreed that our response should be to deny funding and suggest that he do more preliminary work and then submit to NWPC and BPA.

To Do: Rick will draft a denial letter and circulate for comment.

2. February meeting minutes approval request.

Minutes approved

3. Other new business, agenda additions, etc.

2015 Annual Report

Report Approved

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

- (1) Haven't gotten e-copy yet.
- 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)
 - 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) Final report received and approved, final reimbursement made.
 - xii) Adult Pacific Lamprey in the Snake- Receiver update (ED 12/31/14). Report provided
 - xiii) Evaluation of Restoration Actions to Increase Overwintering Survival of Juvenile Tucannon River spring Chinook and summer steelhead, (ED 12/31/15) Received final invoice of \$9,333.21 on 5/13/16.
 - xiv) Wallowa-Baker Restoration Project, ODFW, (ED 12/31/17)

Not much for updates, final invoice for Tucannon River project has been submitted and is under review, Wallowa-Baker project signed and in effect, Lamprey passage in the Snake report received.

Dan and others made some suggestions that this update section be simplified to remove completed projects with no likely updates, completed projects likely to have updates, and active projects.

ToDo: Rick will process invoice and revise update section for next meeting.

See updated Grant Summary Table for complete list of activity.

5. Change Forms

- a. Committee Protocols – waiting for rewrite of section on decision making by Julie Carter, CRITFC.
- b. CF-2016-3 Addition of a preliminary proposal application

Julie reiterated that she still intends to rewrite the decision making section of the protocols document. Rick brought up the preliminary proposal question but no discussion ensued.

ToDo: Julie will be rewriting the Decision Making sections.

Rick will try to prepare a new change form with a proposed preliminary proposal format.

6. **Website updates** Updated tables and added February minutes.

Rick mentioned that the website was not up to date due to reorganization at the PUD.

7. **Next Meeting Date** Mid August.

Next meeting date of August 16 at 10 AM was selected.

Korena also mentioned that since the McNary turbine will be OOS for most of 2016 that the 2016 contribution to the Trust Fund would likely be reduced or even eliminated depending on the contribution calculation formula.

To Do List:

Rick

1. Draft letter to Margaret
2. Draft letter to Geoff
3. Post February Minutes
4. Post 2015 AR
5. Modify update list on agenda
6. Develop preliminary proposal format
7. Update Website

Julie

1. Rewrite Decision Making section in protocols document.