

## Memorandum

---

To: Wells, Rocky Reach, and Rock Island HCP Hatchery Committees, and Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee Hatchery Subcommittee Date: June 15, 2022

From: Tracy Hillman, HCP Hatchery Committees Chairman and PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Facilitator

cc: Larissa Rohrbach and Kristi Geris, Anchor QEA, LLC

**Re: Final Minutes of the May 18, 2022, HCP Hatchery Committees and PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Meetings**

---

The Wells, Rocky Reach, and Rock Island Hydroelectric Projects Habitat Conservation Plan Hatchery Committees (HCP-HCs) and Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee's Hatchery Subcommittee (PRCC HSC) meetings were held in person at Douglas PUD Headquarters in East Wenatchee, Washington, on Wednesday, May 18, 2022, from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Attendees are listed in Attachment A to these meeting minutes.

### Action Item Summary

#### Joint HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC

##### *Long-term*

- Mike Tonseth will distribute the analysis showing feasibility of the Methow spring Chinook Salmon Outplanting plan based on historical run size data (Item I-A). (*Note: This item is ongoing; expected completion to be determined.*)
- Kirk Truscott will work with Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (CTCR) staff to develop a model that addresses the probability of encountering natural-origin Okanogan spring Chinook Salmon at Wells Dam (Item I-A). (*Note: This item is ongoing; expected completion date to be determined.*)
- Kirk Truscott will determine the number of scales that should be collected from spring Chinook Salmon at Wells Dam for elemental signature analysis to discern Okanogan spring Chinook Salmon from Methow spring Chinook Salmon (Item I-A). (*Note: This item is ongoing; completion depends on the outcome of the previous action item.*)
- Keely Murdoch and Mike Tonseth will obtain estimates of pre-spawn mortality from Andrew Murdoch to update the retrospective analysis for Wenatchee spring Chinook Salmon (Item I-A). (*Note: This item is ongoing; expected completion date to be determined.*)
- Mike Tonseth and Greg Mackey will solicit input from hatchery managers on effective methods to count surplus fish (Item I-A). (*Note: This item is ongoing; expected completion by early 2022 for incorporation into Broodstock Collection Protocols (BCPs).*)

### *Near-term (to be completed by next meeting)*

- Larissa Rohrbach will file and distribute *10-year Comprehensive Review* chapters and comments to the HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC for review as they are completed (Item I-A). (*Note: The final chapter addressing Objective 5 for spring and summer Chinook Salmon was distributed for review on May 5, 2022. Comments are due June 30, 2022.*)
- Todd Pearsons and Catherine Willard will revise Grant and Chelan PUD's draft Statements of Agreement on Sockeye Salmon Obligation for approval in an upcoming meeting (Item I-A). (*Note: This item is ongoing.*)
- The PUDs will note in the final implementation plan documents that production implemented by tribal partners (Yakama Nation [YN] and CTCR) to meet the PUDs No Net Impact (NNI) mitigation obligations will be identified separately in future sensitivity analyses and implementation plans in future recalculation efforts (Item II-A). (*Note: This item is ongoing.*)
- Members of the HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC will discuss potential hatchery management changes for rearing and release of Methow summer Chinook Salmon following completion of the 10-year Comprehensive Reports (Item II-A). (*Note: This item is ongoing.*)
- The Joint Fisheries Parties (JFP) will provide counterproposals for the respective PUD proposed implementation plans by May 27, 2022, the PUDs will review the counterproposals by June 3, 2022, and the HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC will convene by conference call on June 6, 2022, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m., for further discussion (Item II-A).
- Douglas PUD and Chelan PUD will search for their respective Settlement Agreements for a full discussion of NNI, as cited in the Biological Assessment and Management Plan (BAMP)<sup>1</sup>, and will post the agreements to the HCP-HCs extranet site for review (Item II-A).
- Douglas PUD will inquire about using Douglas PUD Headquarters in East Wenatchee, Washington, as the primary meeting place for the HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC monthly meetings (Item IV-A).

### **Rock Island/Rocky Reach HCP-HCs**

- None.

### **Wells HCP-HC**

- None.

### **PRCC HSC**

- None.

---

<sup>1</sup> Biological Assessment and Management Plan: Mid-Columbia River Hatchery Program, April 1998.

## Decision Summary

- None.

## Agreements

- None.

## Review Items

- Larissa Rohrbach distributed updated tabulated recalculation sensitivity analysis components with proposed recalculated production levels for HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC review on April 18, 2022.

## Finalized Documents

- None.

## I. Welcome

### A. Agenda, Announcements

Tracy Hillman welcomed the HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC. In-person attendees announced themselves for attendees on the phone. Todd Pearsons introduced Tim Taylor, a new Grant PUD Senior Biologist, who will start listening in on HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC meetings.

Hillman reviewed the agenda and asked for any additions or changes to the agenda. The following additions were made to the agenda:

- Catherine Willard added an announcement about a Tumwater Dam Open House.
- Greg Mackey added spring Chinook Salmon brood collection at Wells Dam under Item II-B BCPs.

The HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC reviewed the revised draft April 20, 2022, conference call minutes. Outstanding comments were reviewed and addressed. HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC representatives present approved the April 20, 2022, conference call minutes, as revised.

Action items from the HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC meeting on April 20, 2022, were reviewed and discussed (*Note: Italicized text below corresponds to action items from the previous meeting*).

### Joint HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC

#### *Long-term*

- *Mike Tonseth will distribute the analysis showing feasibility of the Methow spring Chinook Salmon Outplanting plan based on historical run size data (Item I-A).*

This item is ongoing; expected completion to be determined.

- *Kirk Truscott will work with CTCR staff to develop a model that addresses the probability of encountering natural-origin Okanogan spring Chinook Salmon at Wells Dam (Item I-A).*

This item is ongoing; expected completion date to be determined.

- *Kirk Truscott will determine the number of scales that should be collected from spring Chinook Salmon at Wells Dam for elemental signature analysis to discern Okanogan spring Chinook Salmon from Methow spring Chinook Salmon (Item I-A).*

This item is ongoing; completion depends on the outcome of the previous action item.

- *Keely Murdoch and Mike Tonseth will obtain estimates of pre-spawn mortality from Andrew Murdoch to update the retrospective analysis for Wenatchee spring Chinook Salmon (Item I-A).*

This item is ongoing; expected completion date to be determined.

- *Mike Tonseth and Greg Mackey will solicit input from hatchery managers on effective methods to count surplus fish (Item I-A).*

This item is ongoing; expected completion by early 2022 for incorporation into BCPs.

#### *Near-term (to be completed by next meeting)*

- *Larissa Rohrbach will file and distribute 10-year Comprehensive Review chapters and comments to the HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC for review as they are completed (Item I-A).*

The final chapter addressing Objective 5 for spring and summer Chinook Salmon was distributed for review on May 5, 2022, with comments due by June 5, 2022. Kirk Truscott said, due to his current workload, he will not be able to submit comments by the May 5 deadline. Tracy Hillman suggested extending the deadline. Truscott said he can provide comments by June 30, 2022.

- *Todd Pearsons and Catherine Willard will revise Grant and Chelan PUD's draft Statements of Agreement (SOA) on Sockeye Salmon Obligation for approval in an upcoming meeting (Item I-A).*

This item is ongoing.

- *The PUDs will note in the final implementation plan documents that production implemented by tribal partners (YN and CTCR) to meet the PUDs NNI mitigation obligations will be identified separately in future sensitivity analyses and implementation plans in future recalculation efforts (Item II-A).*

The PUDs will complete this in the future. This item is ongoing.

- *Greg Mackey will determine whether the balance of the Wells summer Chinook Salmon NNI mitigation not reared at Chief Joseph Hatchery (CJH) may be reared independently from other summer Chinook Salmon production at Wells Fish Hatchery (FH) for release into the Methow River (Item II-A).*

Greg Mackey said there is plenty of capacity at Wells FH to rear additional fish; however, the facility does not have enough vessels for rearing several separate groups of fish. Douglas PUD

is proposing to reduce Methow steelhead numbers from 48,000 to 17,000, which will free up two circular tanks.

- *Members of the HCP-HCs will discuss potential hatchery management changes for rearing and release of Methow summer Chinook Salmon following completion of the 10-year Comprehensive Reports (Item II-A).*

This item is ongoing. Mike Tonseth noted that the PRCC HSC should also be included on this action item.

## II. Joint HCP-HC and PRCC HSC

### A. Hatchery Production Recalculation

#### *Draft Implementation Plan*

Tracy Hillman recalled, over 1 month ago, the PUDs distributed proposed implementation numbers and the JFP has been working to develop an implementation plan for PUD review (the most recent drafts were distributed by Larissa Rohrbach on April 18, 2022).

Mike Tonseth said the JFP has convened three meetings and are now very close to having a draft implementation plan for review. There are still outstanding questions revolving around the inundation mitigation. The JFP believes that the Salmon and Steelhead Settlement Agreement (Settlement Agreement) and HCPs clearly indicate that NNI needs to include impacts to all fish and not just natural populations or federal programs. Even though inundation programs are fixed, this production is still impacted by downstream projects. Chelan PUD's proposal included full summer Chinook Salmon inundation unavoidable project mortality (UPM) and Grant PUD's proposal included partial summer Chinook Salmon inundation UPM. Inundation UPM does not apply to Douglas PUD because the Wells Project is located at the upstream end of the system. What still needs to be addressed is Chelan PUD's and Grant PUD's steelhead inundation UPM.

Kirk Truscott added that the JFP has been working hard on this. The Settlement Agreement and HCPs are intended to achieve NNI, but how can this be done without addressing the inundation component? He does not believe the JFP's position on summer Chinook Salmon is different than feedback that has been provided all along. Because most of the discussions have revolved around summer Chinook Salmon, not much time has been spent on how best to approach mitigation for impacts to steelhead inundation.

Bill Gale said for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the goal is to make the (hydro)projects invisible. If a program is not mitigating for losses, this is not making the project invisible. Another thing to note, the JFP is prioritizing in-place, in-kind mitigation. Eventually numbers will move around, but the goal is to make the in-place, in-kind mitigation stronger.

Keely Murdoch and Brett Farman had nothing further to add.

Hillman asked if the PUDs have questions at this time.

### *Grant PUD*

Todd Pearsons said including inundation for everything is the same as including the high end of the sensitivity range for all species (option 3), so then why conduct a sensitivity analysis if this is the end goal? During the last recalculation, there was no inundation mitigation in the Grant PUD implementation plan, so this is a significant deviation from the past. The last plan included the high range for spring Chinook Salmon, the middle range for summer Chinook Salmon, and the low range for steelhead. This was the agreement, which involved policy-level (i.e., signatory organizations, but not the policy committee) negotiations.

Murdoch said, as previously discussed, the end goal is to achieve NNI. The initial summer Chinook Salmon production directed by the Settlement Agreement for Grant PUD was 833,000 fish. At that time, capacity for 833,000 fish had not yet been constructed. Therefore, one-third of the production went to CJH and the other two-thirds were split between the Methow and Wenatchee subbasins. Grant PUD completed improvements requested at Carlton Acclimation Facility to support overwinter acclimation, but capacity was also reduced at Dryden Pond due to total maximum daily load issues. During recalculation 10 years ago, Chelan PUD and Grant PUD summer Chinook Salmon production was reduced to the extent it could fit into existing capacities. The JFP wanted to include inundation mitigation, but there was no point in pushing for this when there was nowhere to rear the fish. Grant PUD's production is now proposed to be less than it was before (given within-hatchery and project survival rates) and, as a result, there is enough capacity to include inundation mitigation.

Gale said, in terms of hatchery capacity, he recalls that most parties involved with the last recalculation thought that as hatchery production came online to supplement the natural population, mitigation obligations would increase. However, this was not the case. Regarding the sensitivity analysis, he recalled conducting the analysis recognizing there was disagreement preventing forward progress, and the sensitivity analysis was a way to get around these disagreements. Now that hatchery capacity is not a limiting factor, the JFP's position is that mitigation for inundation fish is the expectation, not an exception.

Pearsons said part of this seems to be a difference in perspectives by organization. Grant PUD's view is if survival improves in a project area, which is the case for Grant PUD, then in-hatchery mitigation should decrease, not increase. Pearsons said, the position he is hearing is that the built capacity is the ground floor, and mitigation can only go up and not down. Gale said this is not what he intended by his comments, and he clarified that if there is space, the JFP has the expectation that mortality on inundation fish be addressed. If there is no space, the path forward is a sensitivity analysis.

Pearsons asked, for Grant PUD, is there a scenario where mitigation would be less than full capacity at all facilities? Gale said if Grant PUD is making a project invisible by fully mitigating for all groups and this is less than capacity, then this would be such a scenario.

Pearsons said then, in years with good survival and low recalculation values, inundation for mitigation is included. He asked if, in another period that is at facility capacity, is inundation mitigation production not included?

Brett Farman noted that this discussion is talking about two different things. Pearsons's point that Grant PUD had a certain mitigation number last time, which is now increasing, is a different issue than considering what NNI means. Using a baseline that was strictly agreed to last time does not account for the total picture now. In the past, it sounds like there were some concessions given capacity limitations. Now, there is capacity and the goal of NNI is to make the projects invisible, regardless of what was done in the past. Better or poorer survival does come into recalculation; however, this number is not forever unchanged. As more information becomes available, these numbers go up and down. Recalculation should be looking at the full project effect, which, in his view, clearly includes inundation.

Tonseth agreed with Farman that two separate topics are being discussed. Additionally, Tonseth believes that Grant PUD's production obligation is in fact going down. Grant PUD's summer Chinook Salmon mitigation was reduced from 833,000 fish to 659,000 fish in the last recalculation. This mitigation would have likely been higher, but there was no infrastructure capacity to rear these fish. He recalls the parties pushing for overwinter acclimation for Methow and Wenatchee summers. Ultimately, Grant PUD was only able to create overwinter acclimation capacity at the Carlton Acclimation Facility. So, the parties worked within the available capacity. Grant PUD summer Chinook Salmon mitigation went down from 833,000 fish to 659,000 fish. What is currently proposed is approximately 583,000 fish. Even if Grant PUD provides the full inundation UPM, this still comes in lower than 659,000 fish. This value is lower due to increased survival and improved in-hatchery survival and smolt-to-adult returns.

Murdoch said, regarding the expectation that production will go up or down, she spent a lot of time reviewing the BAMP because it describes NNI, initial production, and how production was calculated for all three PUDs. In the BAMP, there was an expectation that when mitigation was implemented, the runs would improve, resulting in larger runs; therefore, NNI mitigation would increase because projects would be intercepting and killing more fish. The BAMP also includes a section about building more hatchery capacity as runs increase. The BAMP is not a legally binding document, but it is the basis for, and is consistent with, the HCPs and Settlement Agreement that state if survival standards are reached by implementing hatchery programs, and NNI is achieved, the expectation is this will contribute to recovery. While not a recovery plan, the parties fully expected to be at recovery by now and have larger runs because the survival standards have been achieved. The number

plugged in the BAMP for mortality rate was 7%<sup>2</sup> (i.e., things are only going well if they are better than 7%); however, there is still the capacity issue. Therefore, she thinks the expectation that production will go down may be shortsighted.

Pearsons clarified that he agrees recalculation can go up or down. The basis for his questions is because he thought Gale was saying numbers are based on the facility as constructed and can only go up from there. Pearsons understands the JFP's position to have mitigation for inundation fish; however, he cannot deviate from what was agreed to in the last implementation plan, which was agreed to by all parties and did not include inundation. He does not have the authority to deviate from the compromise position of the sensitivity analysis (high, medium, and low), as done in the past. He understands this was strictly a negotiated number, based on a sensitivity analysis, due to differences of opinions. However, if this is a sticking point with the JFP, the discussion will need to go to the Policy Committee.

Murdoch said the sensitivity analysis was not agreed to in the Settlement Agreement. It was what had to be done to get around the issue at that time. She defers to the BAMP, which describes exactly how the initial mitigation was calculated and provides datasets. Compensation levels were determined using run counts at Priest Rapids Dam over a baseline time period from 1974 to 1983. For the JFP, this is not a negotiation. Grant PUD has never mitigated for 833,000 fish. In her opinion, Grant PUD did not achieve NNI in the first 10 years, or in the second 10 years, and she would like to finally get to it in this recalculation.

Pearsons reiterated that he understands what Murdoch is saying, but he does not have the authority to deviate from what was done in the past. This is a difference of opinions, which was the basis for conducting the sensitivity analysis last time and this time.

Murdoch said the Settlement Agreement indicates that, "Grant PUD shall, in consultation with the PRCC HSC, develop the facilities necessary to produce 833,000 (plus an additional 10% capacity allowance to provide flexibility) yearling summer Chinook smolts as called for in the BAMP."<sup>3</sup> Grant PUD has never done this, even including inundation fish, Grant PUD is still not meeting this. If the JFP knew conducting a sensitivity analysis would become a policy issue, this likely would have been reconsidered.

Gale said first, he understands Pearsons' position. However, his understanding of the Settlement Agreement is that it tasks the PRCC HSC with recalculation and these issues are integral to recalculation, so it is bothersome that Pearsons is not given the authority to make these decisions as

---

<sup>2</sup> The BAMP has two objectives: 1) To help recover natural populations throughout the Mid-Columbia River Region so that they can be self-sustaining and harvestable, while maintaining their genetic and ecologic integrity; and 2) to compensate for a 7% mortality rate at each of the five PUD-owned Mid-Columbia River mainstem dams (Wells, Rocky Reach, Rock Island, Wanapum, and Priest Rapids) in a manner that is consistent with the first objective.

<sup>3</sup> Priest Rapids Salmon and Steelhead Settlement Agreement, Section 10.4.



the PRCC HSC representative for Grant PUD. Gale said, in the past and now, he has always come to this forum as a PRCC HSC representative for USFWS with the authority to discuss issues, change positions, and move forward. It seems Grant PUD's position, and now the JFP's position, cannot change, and he finds this troublesome. Secondly, he would like to talk about this issue from Chelan PUD's and Douglas PUD's perspectives because this is still a combined conversation.

Tonseth said, regarding the other PUDs, this current topic only affects Chelan PUD inundation and not Douglas PUD. Regarding Grant PUD's position and the JFP's position, part of the conversation the JFP has had includes this outstanding uncertainty because the HCPs and Settlement Agreement are largely ambiguous to what is in and out. This leaves everyone in a void of trying to interpret what the intent was when the BAMP was created. He asked, if any member of the JFP has the expectation that full inundation UPM is included in NNI, will policy committees need to be involved for Grant PUD to consider this?

Pearsons said Grant PUD has not yet seen a counterproposal to see what these numbers are. His understanding was that the recalculated numbers are largely based on the sensitivity analysis, and then negotiated within a range of the sensitivity analysis, as done in the past. It seems now, this is not the case, for reasons Murdoch has outlined. Regarding Tonseth's question, Pearsons asked if he means mitigation for inundation for all species. Tonseth said, UPM for inundation of summer Chinook Salmon and steelhead is part of the sensitivity analysis but not included as part of Grant PUD's implementation plan. Pearsons said if Tonseth is asking about a counterproposal for no change to spring Chinook Salmon, a change in summer Chinook Salmon for another 50,000 fish on top of Grant PUD's proposal, and another 60,000 steelhead onto what Grant PUD is doing now, this is something he cannot address today. He knows this is a sticking point within Grant PUD, and he suspects this would need to go to policy. If the JFP can provide a counterproposal highlighting these differences, he can take this back to Grant PUD for consideration and further discussion. Tonseth asked if Pearsons needs a formal counterproposal from the JFP before making the official call to take this discussion to policy. Pearsons said a formal counterproposal will be helpful, so Grant PUD knows exactly what the JFP is targeting.

Truscott said he appreciates Pearsons' position. He understands how it could be perceived that Grant PUD mitigation is increasing. Pearsons clarified, again, he did not mean to say Grant PUD mitigation is increasing; rather, he was responding to Gale's comments. Pearsons reiterated that he understands recalculated numbers can go up and down. Truscott agreed with this interpretation because recalculation depends on returns. During the last recalculation, inundation was not included for reasons conveyed. The Settlement Agreement and HCPs are overtly clear about using full use of existing facilities, and the JFP is trying to stay within these sideboards. The realization now is there is space available without constructing new facilities and this achieves NNI. All parties agree NNI is the objective. All parties can say there is ambiguity about what is in and what is out, but what is not ambiguous is achieving NNI.

Pearsons said regarding steelhead, Grant PUD's Biological Opinion (BiOp) stipulates no more than 100,000 fish and this counterproposal is suggesting 170,000 fish. Truscott clarified Grant PUD would be mitigating for 170,000 steelhead or a number allocated through species swaps, understanding constraints. For example, substitutions with summer Chinook Salmon. There would still be available space without building new facilities. This would be another option to achieve NNI.

Pearsons said this is additional information he did not have before. He thought the JFP was stating a position to include inundation for steelhead, requiring building new facilities, which is against Grant PUD's BiOp, and is therefore, a non-starter for Grant PUD. Truscott said the JFP wanted to lay out overall inundation to get a read, knowing there would be issues. The JFP knows Grant PUD is waiting for an implementation plan, and the JFP has been working on this. There are a lot of different options to develop, what one PUD does might impact another PUD, and there are BiOp limitations. The JFP is trying to put out the best proposal. Murdoch agreed the JFP has modeled so many options and there are a lot of moving parts. Truscott said he is encouraged to hear that if the JFP provides an implementation plan, Grant PUD is willing to discuss how to move forward versus just saying no.

Pearsons assured everyone he is not backing out of representing Grant PUD on this issue; the way in which he needs to work through these issues is frustrating and he does not want to waste the HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC's time if there is nothing he can do. Currently, he has nothing specific to respond to except that Grant PUD needs to mitigate for inundation. Facilities are a big deal. Seeing what the JFP is considering for steelhead will be important. Deanne Pavlik-Kunkel agreed she and Pearsons have no authority to change policy-level decisions.

Truscott said in retrospect, it does not seem that the 10-year interval for recalculation was well thought out. If one recalculation requires building more capacity, considering how much time it takes to invest in capital, by the time this is completed, it will be halfway through the next 10-year period. Then, what if in the next 10-year period, it is determined that this capacity is no longer needed. This can be difficult to reconcile. In this instance, it seems Grant PUD dodged a bullet in the 2013 recalculation process by being able to achieve a negotiated NNI without needing to build another facility.

Gale apologized and said he misunderstood what Pearsons said before. He did not realize Pearsons was saying he needed to take the JFP's counterproposal back to Grant PUD for consideration. Rather, he thought Pearsons was stating he was unable to vote on this within the PRCC HSC. Pearsons thanked Gale and clarified, if there are two opposing positions and he has no authority, he would rather move this discussion to policy earlier than waste another 2 months within the HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC and not make any headway. That said, if the JFP can provide a counterproposal, this provides specificity to take back to Grant PUD.

Hillman said he also heard what Gale heard, but now it sounds like Grant PUD needs the JFP's counterproposal, and after review, this discussion may need to go to policy.

Murdoch said all scenarios that the JFP are modeling fit into existing facilities. However, technically, this should not make or break meeting NNI, based on the signed agreements. She does agree steelhead NNI is complicated due to the Settlement Agreement language capped by the BiOp language regarding 100,000 fish. She asked, what is Grant PUD's policy position? Is it that Grant PUD will not mitigate for inundation or that Grant PUD wants to negotiate? Pearsons said his understanding of the policy position is that Grant PUD would use the same generalized approach used during the last recalculation. Pearsons said Murdoch has emphasized doing things the same as done in the past, so Grant PUD is proposing to mitigate at a high level for spring Chinook Salmon, medium level for summer Chinook Salmon, and below the low for steelhead. Within the negotiation space, if the desire is to go high for summer Chinook Salmon, then can Grant PUD mitigate at the middle for spring Chinook Salmon? This would be the flexibility. If Grant PUD mitigates at the high end on something, then Grant PUD would want to swap out with medium or low on something else. The sensitivity analysis has a range, and Grant PUD's goal is to essentially hit the middle of the sensitivity analysis for all taxa combined to reflect uncertainty.. Pearsons understands that he has the authority to negotiate changing from high to medium or low.

Murdoch agreed the preference is to be consistent with the same generalized approach. However, she did not feel this meant agreeing to an outcome. For example, just because the outcome was low, medium, and high last time, does not mean this needs to be the same outcome this time. She always thought the goal was to get to NNI the best way possible. Doing a sensitivity analysis provided a way to look at where production numbers are and where to put fish (i.e., craft an implementation plan).

Pearsons said this is the negotiation. Murdoch said she has received clear direction the YN does not negotiate treaty resources. To her, this has been a 20-year progression to get Grant PUD to NNI.

Tonseth suggested keeping in mind that things like the sensitivity analysis, the datasets, and the smolt-to-adult return conversations were from the first recalculation effort this group ever went through. From his perspective, when members advocated doing what was done in the past, this meant as a starting point and did not mean things would not change this time from what was done the first time. It did not make sense to start over from ground zero; therefore, the approach was to take what was done last time as a starting point for this recalculation.

Greg Mackey recalled his surprise during the last recalculation that there is no true definition of NNI. He suggested having policy representatives legally define NNI for next time, which should have been done last time, otherwise he thinks this will be an ongoing problem. To him, it is not the burden of the technical committees to define legal terms.

Truscott agreed with Murdoch and Tonseth that agreeing to the same approach is different than expecting the same outcome. Pearsons said he does not disagree that the parties agreed to a methodology.

Hillman summarized that the JFP's bottom line is NNI. A question for the policy committees is, "What is NNI?," which seems to be the basis for a lot of misunderstanding. What programs are under NNI, what programs are subject to NNI, do these programs include inundation, and what about production in blocked areas? The signed documents say that any fish coming downstream need to be mitigated for. However, this has not been the case because inundation has not been fully addressed. Hillman said the next steps are for the JFP to provide implementation plan counterproposals and for technical representatives to discuss these with their policy representatives. He believes there is still an opportunity for resolution within the HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC.

Truscott said if this discussion is elevated to the policy level, he suggests splitting up these discussions per PUD. Pearsons agreed and recalled last time having separate SOAs.

Murdoch said, regarding the definition of NNI, in the first paragraph of the BAMP, there is a footnote that says, "a full discussion of NNI is provided in the settlement agreements." She asked if Douglas PUD or Chelan PUD has their original agreements. She said the BAMP is a 1998 document, so the agreements referenced will be older than 1998. Kahler said he reviewed Douglas PUD's 1990 Settlement Agreement and did not find a definition of NNI. He and Catherine Willard said they will search for their respective Settlement Agreements for a full discussion of NNI, as cited in the BAMP, and will post the agreements to the HCP Hatchery Committees extranet site for review. Pearsons agreed not knowing the definition of NNI is a large part of the struggle. The authors must have had an idea of what NNI means, but subsequent readers have had different interpretations.

Hillman asked when the counterproposals will be available for review and how long do the PUDs need to review them? The JFP will provide counterproposals for the respective PUD proposed implementation plans by May 27, 2022, the PUDs will review the counterproposals by June 3, 2022, and the HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC will convene by conference call on June 6, 2022, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m., for further discussion.

### *Chelan PUD*

Catherine Willard projected Chelan PUD's implementation plan proposal (dated April 14, 2022). The UPM for inundation for steelhead is 21,970 fish. She recalled wanting to discuss this number internally to better understand why Chelan PUD did not agree to this last time because the HCPs clearly state the PUD will work towards NNI; however, the HCP does not directly state which programs should be mitigated for. It turns out, one of the reasons Chelan PUD did not agree to this number last time due to capacity issues. To note, Chelan PUD is also going through relicensing and the timelines between Rock Island's new license and the HCP are not the same. Chelan PUD is considering requesting extension of the HCPs and wants to show that the PUD is committed to meeting NNI. Internal discussions to date support mitigating for Douglas PUD's steelhead inundation, which she believes will fit at Chiwawa Hatchery; however, she still needs to confirm the proposed production will not exceed capacity.

Tonseth said he believes the last recalculated value of 247,300 steelhead for overwintering at Chiwawa Hatchery included utilization of the high enzyme linked immunosorbent assay pond when it was not needed for spring Chinook Salmon. Willard agreed but wants to confirm.

Willard recalled Gale mentioning during the last meeting that the JFP was considering reallocating Methow spring Chinook Salmon Rock Island mitigation to the Methow Hatchery that Chelan PUD allocated to the Chiwawa Hatchery the same as what was done during the last recalculation and what Chelan PUD proposed this time. She asked if he could speak to how many fish and what this looks like for the Chiwawa Acclimation Facility and Nason Creek Acclimation Facility as fish are reallocated to the Methow Hatchery. Gale said he believes the idea was to redirect mitigation for Methow Subbasin mortalities to the Methow River rather than to the Wenatchee River. He believes this will not be too onerous, with no massive changes. Tonseth was hesitant to provide specifics until all three implementation plans are available; however, regarding spring Chinook Salmon, the general approach starts with in-kind and in-place for all three of PUDs' mitigation. Douglas PUD is the most straightforward. In the past, for Chelan PUD, all spring Chinook impacts for Rocky Reach Dam went to the Methow Subbasin, and impacts for Rock Island Dam went to the Wenatchee Subbasin. Willard asked if this includes Winthrop UPM, and Tonseth said yes.

### *Douglas PUD*

Mackey said Douglas PUD's steelhead and summer Chinook Salmon NNI are both small programs. There were no huge shifts in numbers. There should be no problems growing the fish. Summer Chinook Salmon NNI in the Methow could be a challenge, but if there is some flexibility something can be worked out. Douglas PUD will want steelhead NNI (17,000 Conservation Program fish) in the Twisp. The Hatchery Genetic Management Plan states that the NNI is the Twisp Conservation Program. Douglas PUD would like to get back to the original intentions of the Hatchery Genetic Management Plan. Methow FH is designed for three populations, so there is a lot of flexibility for spring Chinook Salmon. Wells FH is designed for production, but not for several small programs in separate rearing regimes.

## **B. Broodstock Collection Protocols**

### *Summer Chinook Salmon and Steelhead*

Tracy Hillman asked if there is a need for an interim BCP for summer Chinook Salmon. Mike Tonseth said he is hesitant to put work into interim protocols for summer Chinook Salmon and steelhead. He wants to wait until June 6, 2022, to make this decision.

### *Spring Chinook Salmon at Wells Dam*

Greg Mackey said Douglas PUD is now collecting spring Chinook Salmon broodstock at Wells Dam. Twenty-two fish have already been sent to the lab for genetic testing and another 79 fish have been collected as of Monday, May 16, 2022. With recalculation underway, he would appreciate any

suggestions on how many fish to collect in order to avoid collecting wild fish that are not needed. Once collected, fish are put on formalin for sorting. Often times, fish have net scars that grow fungus quickly after taken off formalin. Therefore, these fish are held and released later. Douglas PUD prefers to reduce this number of unneeded fish. Typically, collection includes enough natural origin spring Chinook broodstock necessary to produce 225,000 smolts.

Tonseth said the JFP's current proposal does not change collection protocols for wild spring Chinook Salmon; although, this is not to say final numbers will not change.

Mackey said another thing to note, when developing the genetic chapter for the 10-year report, Douglas PUD asked Todd Seamons (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Genetics Program) to run genetic stock analyses with single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). Formerly, microsatellites were used but these are being phased out and SNPs is the contemporary monitoring of choice. Turns out, results from SNPs are comparable to microsatellites. There was a recommendation to add more Twisp River samples, which Douglas PUD is planning to do this summer. However, looking at probabilities of assignment using either methodology, there are a fair number of fish not assigned, which means twice the number of fish need to be trapped to obtain enough with acceptable assignment probabilities, and this still includes some error. Douglas PUD contemplated shifting to SNPs this year but decided to stick with microsatellites because there are too many questions. Each option has pros and cons. Douglas PUD will eventually shift to SNPs, once there are better baseline data.

### III. Rock Island / Rocky Reach

#### A. Tumwater Dam Question and Answer Session

Catherine Willard said Chelan PUD is hosting a Tumwater Dam fishway question and answer session tomorrow, May 19, 2022, from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m., at the Fire Hall in Leavenworth, Washington. Chelan PUD is starting a maintenance project next fall, and Chelan PUD's Board of Commissioners want to get a pulse on what the community thinks about Tumwater Dam. This will be an open house with information on the fishway and trapping for the hatchery programs. The YN will be present regarding Coho Salmon trapping at the dam. Grant PUD will also be present.

### IV. Administrative Items

#### A. Coronavirus Disease 2019 and Monitoring and Evaluation Activities

Committee members provided their monthly updates on the effects of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) restrictions on monitoring and evaluation activities. Community risk levels for COVID-19 are low and work restrictions are lifting broadly.

- Bill Gale said USFWS is returning to normal operations but is tracking the latest Centers for Disease Control and Prevention transmissions. If the county reaches high-risk levels, USFWS

will reimplement wearing masks and other precautions. USFWS staff are still required to wear masks when sharing vehicles.

- Greg Mackey said at Douglas PUD, meetings with external people is now allowed.
- Brett Farman said National Marine Fisheries Service is still in limbo between back to normal and some modified normal.
- Tracy Hillman said now that the HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC are meeting in person, it would be nice to use Douglas PUD as the primary meeting place. Tom Kahler said he will inquire about using Douglas PUD Headquarters as the primary meeting place for the HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC monthly meetings (note that the ability to use the space was confirmed after the meeting, and the Douglas PUD Headquarters have been reserved for the next three meetings).

## **B. Next Meetings**

The next HCP-HCs and PRCC HSC meetings will be held on Wednesday, June 15, 2022; Wednesday, July 20, 2022; and Wednesday, August 17, 2022.

The next meeting on June 15 will be held in person at Douglas PUD Headquarters.

## **V. List of Attachments**

Attachment A List of Attendees

**Attachment A  
List of Attendees**

Name	Organization
Kristi Geris	Anchor QEA, LLC
Tracy Hillman	BioAnalysts, Inc.
Catherine Willard*	Chelan PUD
Kirk Truscott*‡	Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
Tom Kahler*	Douglas PUD
Greg Mackey*	Douglas PUD
Rod O'Connor	Grant PUD
Deanne Pavlik-Kunkel	Grant PUD
Todd Pearsons‡	Grant PUD
Tim Taylor°	Grant PUD
Brett Farman*‡°	National Marine Fisheries Service
Katy Shelby°	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mike Tonseth*‡°	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Keely Murdoch*‡	Yakama Nation
Bill Gale*‡°	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Notes:

\* Denotes HCP-HCs member or alternate

‡ Denotes PRCC HSC member or alternate

° Joined by phone