

# 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 11/28/2018

Link for Web Meeting: <https://www.conferencecalling.com/meeting/14896798>

**Thursday, November 29, 2018, starting at 1 pm**

**Attending: Brandon Rogers-Yakama Fisheries, Blaine Parker-CRITFC, RD Nelle-USFWS, Rick M-PUD, On the phone- Erick VanDyke-ODFW, Julie Carter-CRITFC, Blane Bellerud-NMFS. Presenters-Geoff McMichael, Aaron Penvose, Ralph Lampman. Guests-Jen Kelly-PUD.**

## **1. August meeting minute's approval request – done via email.**

Last call for edits. Edits were received shortly after distribution so minutes will be considered final.

**To Do: add minutes to website.**

## **2. New Proposals, Extension Request or Final Report Presentations.**

- a. Geoff McMichael-Larval/age 0 Predator fish Recruitment Reduction

Geoff presented his proposal to address the high mortality rate (63%) between Hanford Reach and McNary Dam by reducing the non-native predator larval survival rate. He proposes to do this by lowering pool elevation above McNary Dam to move larval Walleye and bass from the slow moving quickly warming backwater areas to the colder fast water areas. His proposal consists of 3 phases, this funding request of 128K is for half of the cost for the first phase which consists of modeling and field sampling. He has secured the other half of the money needed from the Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee. Questions during the presentation included:

Blaine- abundance estimates for predators difficult to determine.

Erick-verified that URB are the focus, Geoff confirmed that URB from Hanford reach are the focus.

Brandon – do we know anything about predation on spring Chinook, Geoff- no, work has focused on fall Chinook.

Jen- could this be done in August? Geoff- more like April. RD asked about when Walleye spawn, Geoff clarified the temp requirements and the short duration of 2 – 3 weeks.

Rick- we use a reimbursement method, are you OK with that? Geoff-yes.

Jen – what do the CoE and BPA say about this? Geoff- no one in those ranks has said this cannot be done. CoE biggest concern was barge traffic impacts. NMFS biggest concern is potential impacts on efficiency of TSW's.

Geoff clarified that the deliverables for phase one would be a detailed report with recommendations.

Post presentation Discussion.

Blaine-encouraged that no “show-stoppers” have been identified. Excited about potential impact of predator year class survival from this type of work.

Rick expressed concern that this is research and not necessarily mitigation. With our small fund, he prefers to see money used for “shovel ready” projects that produce tangible results.

Blaine-not a new idea, been discussed for use with birds, there are lots of moving parts but the short WSE changes (drawdown) durations shouldn't be a problem.

Erick-idea has been around a while, could be useful but this is not implementation, not mitigation, so hesitant to support. There are other processes in play here also, and Fall Chinook are not listed and it may be better to focus on eggs rather than larvae.

RD- it may work but seems like it would be difficult to implement.

Blaine-moving larvae may be as effective as egg dewatering.

Erick-moving up ops to focus on eggs may minimize interference with operational priorities.

Blaine-technique amenable to annual variation, dry years, etc.

Erick-lots of unknowns.

Several members expressed interest in talking to coworkers before voting so no vote was taken.

**To Do-**

**Rick- create a doodle poll for a conference call to discuss and vote on this and the Icicle Creek boulder field.**

## b. Ralph Lampman-Juvenile Lamprey Tracking with Acoustic Tags

Ralph presented his proposal which is to track lamprey using acoustic tags developed by PNNL and first tested last year. This work utilizes an acoustic antennae array in place for a salmon tracking study greatly reducing the cost of collecting this data. The proposal asks for 59K, 30K of which is for purchasing the tags. They do plan a third year of tracking but do not plan to come to us for funding. They are also asking BPA for funds.

RD asked what they would do if BPA and MFCC approved funding. Ralph wasn't sure, not as simple as just tagging more fish, numerous issues exist, not the least of which is obtaining enough lamprey for an expanded tagging effort. RD asked if tagging 200 fish would answer the questions they want answered. Ralph could not say "yes". He talked about releasing more fish at the upriver or perhaps a higher location. RD commented that doing that may make the results less comparable.

Blaine asked Yakima techs were being trained to do tagging and Ralph clarified that they are doing that now.

Post presentation Discussion:

Rick commented that he wasn't clear on if work was successful this year but added that testing the tag was successful. Blaine – was excited about this work because it represents the first tagging of juvenile lamprey and since we funded it once it makes sense to see it through.

RD- the work is valuable in proving a concept, acoustic tracking of juvenile lamprey. Smart to utilize existing antennae array, may have started late last year so may be some valuable in starting earlier next year.

Blaine – commented that there may not be enough fish to tag thousands.

Erick – had reservations the first year because it was handled through the contributed funds program at USGS.

Also concerned about the quality of the presentation which may be indicative of work quality or product.

Blaine- countered that a messy presentation may not be reflective of the data quality.

Brandon- commented on the contributed funds program, say it's not a problem until it's a problem.

A vote was taken and there were enough "YES" votes (Blaine, RD, Brandon, and Rick) to approve funding for a second year.

To Do:

Rick- Fill out a vote record form.

Rick- Inform applicant.

Rick- prepare grant paperwork, circulate for signature, and document the grant.

(Blaine - I have a separate contract with the PUD to administer the grants once they are approved. I do this under the business name of Viking Enterprises and I get 0.05% of the grant amount for my services. This fee covers all paperwork and documentation needed for the life of the grant. The fee is paid out of the trust fund, not the PUD fisheries budget.)

## c. Aaron Penvose- Icicle Creek Fish Passage.

Aaron with Trout Unlimited presented this proposal which consists of modifying a section of Icicle Creek known as the boulder field to enable fish to pass this barrier. The idea is to widen the channel and decrease the slope and establish a series of pools for fish to ascend through this area in. Aaron went through some of the history of the effort which started back in 2012 and has accumulated many partners and interest since. Several designs were considered before deciding on the current plan. Providing passage through this area will open up access to 23 miles of mainstem habitat and dozens of miles of tributary habitat. Target species are steelhead and bull trout.

Questions during presentation:

Blaine- lots of energy in this area, are you concerned about potential destabilization resulting from disturbance. Aaron said this is a very old and stable formation not greatly affected by flow, so while it is a concern, they are not overly concerned by this.

Blaine- what about numbers of fish in the area now. Aaron said they have documented one steelhead above the area so far. Blaine asked if any radio tagging studies had been done and Aaron said yes but only for Bull Trout. Blaine also wondered about impacts to upstream fish if you introduce new fish upstream. Aaron said this was a concern, especially for the tribes.

Aaron also told us that most of the water in Icicle Creek is diverted at the irrigation dam upstream but that issue has been identified as a problem and there are meetings taking place to address this issue and there is funding to do so.

Aaron was the first presenter so discussion after the presentation was postponed until after the other presentations so we ran out of time for detailed post presentation discussion.

ToDo: Rick – schedule a conference call to discuss on and vote.

### 3. Other new business, agenda additions, etc.

- a. Introduction of new member, Blaine Parker with CRITFC.

#### **If time allows:**

- b. Website comments or suggestions.
- c. Grant Evaluation Table - review format, consider utility and decide to pursue or not.
- d. Logo selection- review current designs, decide on one or decide to redesign.

Items b, c, and d were not discussed so they will be discussed at the next meeting.

- e. Umtanum and NF Manastash wood replenishment extension request.

We did discuss this and voted on it. All present voted in favor of granting the request after some discussion about whether or not this was a continuation of last year's grant or a new grant. It was decided to treat this as a new grant.

#### **To Do:**

**Rick- Draft authorization letter, distribute and file.**

### 4. Grant Updates, work progress and financial activity.

#### Active-Open Grants

- a. Upper Yakima River Restoration Project-KCT- See update from Mitch.
- b. Screen Angle Testing- see update from Theresa
- c. Juvenile Lamprey Tracking – see update from Theresa
- d. Yakima Wood Fiesta – North Fork Manastash & Lower Umtanum Creeks – see update.
- e. Wallowa-Baker Habitat Restoration Project – See update from Colleen.

**Updates were distributed but not discussed.**

#### Closed but Update Worthy

- f. Swauk Creek Restoration-Yakama Nation
- g. Lamprey Habitat Restoration Guide – Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation
- h. Cle Elum River Restoration- KCT
- i. Yakama Beaver Project- MCFEG

### 5. Change Forms

### 6. Website updates

Working on web site updates, getting some training to be able to update as needed.

### 7. Next Meeting Date: Mid-February