

# Final Conference Call Minutes

---



## *Aquatic Settlement Work Group*

**To:** Aquatic SWG Parties **Date:** December 10, 2014  
**From:** Michael Schiewe, Chair (Anchor QEA, LLC)  
**Re:** Final Minutes of the November 12, 2014 Aquatic SWG Conference Call

---

The Aquatic Settlement Work Group (SWG) met by conference call on Wednesday, November 12, 2014, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Attendees are listed in Attachment A of these meeting minutes.

## **I. Summary of Action Items**

1. Aquatic SWG members will submit edits and comments on the draft Total Dissolved Gas (TDG) Reduction Alternatives Analysis to Douglas PUD by Tuesday, December 9, 2014; Douglas PUD will request approval of this document during the Aquatic SWG conference call on December 10, 2014 (Item VI-4).
2. Douglas PUD will incorporate revisions, as discussed, into the final draft 2015 Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Plan, and will provide the final plan including a list of revisions to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG by Friday, November 14, 2014 (Item VI-6). *(Note: Douglas PUD incorporated the revisions, as discussed, and the final 2015 Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Plan, including a list of revisions, was distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Geris on November 13, 2014.)*
3. Douglas PUD will provide a revised Wells White Sturgeon Stocking Program Statement of Agreement (SOA) that includes a revised stocking formula, as discussed, to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG by Friday, November 14, 2014 (Item VI-7). *(Note: Douglas PUD provided a revised SOA to Geris on November 13, 2014, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day.)*
4. Aquatic SWG members will review and provide comments on the revised stocking formula outlined in the revised Wells White Sturgeon Stocking Program SOA prior to the Aquatic SWG conference call on December 10, 2014 (Item VI-7).
5. Anchor QEA will distribute meeting information for the Aquatic SWG Chair position interviews and Aquatic SWG follow-up discussion to be conducted via conference call on Monday, December 8, 2014, from 8:30 a.m. to 11:45 a.m., and 1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m., respectively (Items VI-8). *(Note: Kristi Geris distributed a meeting invite for these*

- conference calls, as discussed, to the Aquatic SWG following the conference call on November 12, 2014.)*
6. The Yakama Nation (YN) will provide their questions for the Aquatic SWG Chair position interviews to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG (Item VI-8).  
*(Note: Bob Rose provided the YN's questions to Geris following the Aquatic SWG conference call on November 12, 2014, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day.)*
  7. Anchor QEA will distill into a shorter list the Aquatic SWG Chair interview questions submitted by Aquatic SWG members (13 total), ensuring that the list captures the four themes commonly expressed by each member (i.e., facilitation, dispute resolution, administrative support capabilities, and maintaining objectivity), and will provide the revised list of questions to the Aquatic SWG by Friday, November 14, 2014 (Item VI-8).  
*(Note: Kristi Geris distributed the shorter list of questions, as discussed, to the Aquatic SWG on November 14, 2014.)*

## **II. Summary of Decisions**

1. The Aquatic SWG members present approved Douglas PUD's proposed modifications to improve lamprey passage in the collection gallery at Wells Dam (Item VI-2).
2. The Aquatic SWG members present approved the 2015 Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Plan, contingent upon incorporation of revisions discussed (Item VI-6).

## **III. Agreements**

1. There were no agreements discussed during today's conference call.

## **IV. Review Items**

1. Kristi Geris sent an email to the Aquatic SWG on November 10, 2014, notifying them that the draft TDG Reduction Alternatives Analysis is available for a 30-day review period. Comments on the draft document are due to Douglas PUD by Tuesday, December 9, 2014 (Item VI-4).

## **V. Documents Finalized**

1. The final 2015 Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Plan that was approved by the Aquatic SWG on November 12, 2014, was distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Kristi Geris on November 13, 2014 (Item VI-6).

## **VI. Summary of Discussions**

1. **Welcome, Review Agenda, Meeting Minutes Approval, and Review of Action Items** (Mike Schiewe): Mike Schiewe welcomed the Aquatic SWG members (attendees are listed in Attachment A) and opened the meeting. Schiewe reviewed the agenda and

asked for additions or other changes to the agenda. Douglas PUD added a brief update on incidental encounters with bull trout at the Twisp Weir.

The revised draft October 8, 2014 conference call minutes were reviewed. Kristi Geris said that all comments and revisions received from members of the Aquatic SWG were incorporated into the revised minutes, and that there were no outstanding edits or questions to address. Aquatic SWG members present approved the October 8, 2014 conference call minutes, as revised.

Action items from the last Aquatic SWG meeting on October 8, 2014, and follow-up discussions were as follows: *(Note: italicized item numbers below correspond to agenda items from the October 8, 2014 meeting.)*

- *Anchor QEA will distribute meeting information for a conference call on Wednesday, October 22, 2014, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. to further discuss Wells white sturgeon stocking plans and the Aquatic SWG Chair position candidates (Items VI-3 and VI-6).*

Kristi Geris distributed a meeting invite for this conference call, as discussed, to the Aquatic SWG following the conference call on October 8, 2014.

- *Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) will provide a response to the Colville Confederated Tribes' (CCT's) email requesting clarification of the technical basis for WDFW's position on the 2015-2017 white sturgeon stocking plans in the Wells Pool by Friday, October 17, 2014 (Item VI-3).*

WDFW provided a response to Kristi Geris on November 5, 2014, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day.

- *Douglas PUD will provide a revised Wells White Sturgeon Stocking Program SOA to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG (Item VI-3).*

Andrew Gingerich provided a revised SOA, as well as a Microsoft Excel file containing a formula to help calculate stocking values, to Geris following the meeting on October 8, 2014, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day.

- *Aquatic SWG members will review the résumés and curriculum vitae (CVs) of the five Aquatic SWG Chair candidates and will rank the candidates first to last (1 to 5) for filling the Chair position; Aquatic SWG members will provide their rankings to Kristi Geris (with a copy to Mike Schiewe) by Tuesday, October 21, 2014, and Geris will compile the results for discussion at the Aquatic SWG conference call scheduled for Wednesday, October 22, 2014 (Item VI-6).*

This action item was completed.

- *Jason McLellan will determine whether the CCT prefer anonymity regarding the Aquatic SWG Chair candidate selection process, and once determined, Kristi Geris will distribute an email to the Aquatic SWG clarifying how the rankings will be presented during the Aquatic SWG conference call on Wednesday, October 22, 2014 (Item VI-6).*

McLellan clarified that anonymity is not necessary for the CCT via email on October 9, 2014, and Geris distributed an email that same day, as discussed.

2. **DECISION: Approval of Lamprey Modifications in Collection Gallery at Wells Dam**  
(Chas Kyger): Chas Kyger said that a revised 3D figure depicting the lamprey side entrance modification, along with the final draft 2015 Lamprey Study Plan for approval, were distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Kristi Geris on November 10, 2014. Kyger said that Douglas PUD discussed the design with the HCP Coordinating Committees, and specifically with National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) engineering staff, regarding salmonid passage. Kyger said that the design is such that the orifices and entrances are small enough to exclude salmon, while allowing lamprey to pass through. He said that Tom Kahler (Douglas PUD HCP Coordinating Committees representative) also discussed with NMFS the appropriate attraction flow in order to avoid creating passage issues for salmon. He said that Douglas PUD would like to obtain approval of the design from both the Aquatic SWG and HCP Coordinating Committees in order to move forward with fabrication and plans to install the modification during the annual winter maintenance period at Wells Dam.

Patrick Verhey asked if any extended residence time is anticipated in the structure. Kyger said that the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) has installed similar entrances, along with passive integrated transponder (PIT)-tag detection to monitor for residency in the structures; however, analyses of those data are still underway. Kyger said that Douglas PUD will also have PIT-tag detectors installed in their proposed structure, along with radio telemetry antennas located outside the structure and throughout the collection gallery. He said that currently, there are no data available regarding extended residency; however, duration of residency will be monitored during the 2015 study.

Steve Lewis asked about possible turbulence through the structure, and if Douglas PUD has modeled flow through the area. Kyger said that Douglas PUD does not intend to perform any modeling. He said that the design is similar to the USACE installation at McNary Dam, which carries only about 1 cubic foot per second (cfs) of flow through the chamber. He said that Douglas PUD engineers indicated that with such a small volume of flow, turbulence will not likely be an issue. He added that USACE did not mention any issues with turbulence.

Lewis asked Kyger to clarify what Douglas PUD was requesting approval for, and Kyger said that the request is to approve the structure. Kyger added that an additional approval will be requested regarding attraction flow velocities. Mike Schiewe added that it is his understanding that NMFS engineer Aaron Beavers has been coordinating with Douglas PUD on this for the past several months. Andrew Gingerich also noted that this item has been under discussion and out for review for some time, and no

comments or requests for additional time for review have been received from members of the Aquatic SWG.

The Aquatic SWG members present approved Douglas PUD's proposed modifications to improve lamprey passage in the collection gallery at Wells Dam. Schiewe said that this same request for approval will be taken to the HCP Coordinating Committees next Tuesday, November 18, 2014.

3. **Wells Hatchery Sturgeon Update** (Andrew Gingerich): Andrew Gingerich said that, due to capacity issues, Wells Hatchery staff had to start culling fish. He said that the 120,000 direct gamete-origin fish on station were culled down to 30,000. He said that none of the 9,500 larval-origin fish have been culled, which leaves about 40,000 total sturgeon on station at Wells Hatchery. He said that Wells Hatchery staff will continue culling, as needed, which reiterates the need to reach resolution on sturgeon stocking in the Wells Pool so that Wells Hatchery staff can manage fish accordingly.

Gingerich said that the fish on station are doing well; however, over the last 2 weeks, about 200 direct gamete-origin fish have died in Tank 6. He said that the remaining fish in that tank have been treated, and overall health seems to be improving. Chad Jackson said that when the loss in direct gamete-origin fish started, WDFW (Wells Hatchery) staff contacted the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Fish Health Lab at the Dworshak National Fish Hatchery near Orofino, Idaho, and requested that the fish health screening samples obtained from Wells Hatchery be tested as soon as possible. Jackson said that the lab tested the samples, as requested, and also tested samples obtained from dead fish from Tank 6. He said that the preliminary results showed no signs of White Sturgeon Iridovirus (WSIV), and it was apparent that something else was causing the mortalities in Tank 6. Gingerich said that Tank 6 is still being monitored closely, and he noted that at least as of currently, no WSIV has been detected in either source fish. He added that contracting is also underway to help expedite obtaining fish health results.

4. **Draft TDG Reasonable and Feasible Analysis for Review** (Andrew Gingerich): Andrew Gingerich said that Kristi Geris sent an email to the Aquatic SWG on November 10, 2014, notifying them that the draft TDG Reduction Alternatives Analysis is available for 30-day review. Comments on the draft document are due to Douglas PUD by Tuesday, December 9, 2014. Douglas PUD will request approval of this document during the Aquatic SWG conference call on December 10, 2014.
5. **Incidental Encounters with Bull Trout at the Twisp Weir** (Andrew Gingerich): Andrew Gingerich said that while Douglas PUD operates the Twisp Weir to manage for HCP Plan Species, bull trout encounters at the weir are also monitored under the Aquatic Settlement Agreement Bull Trout Management Plan. Gingerich said that during

June and July, bull trout are typically encountered at the Twisp Weir during their spawning migration. He said that Douglas PUD has incidental take coverage under their 2012 Biological Opinion (BiOp), and this year the number of bull trout encountered exceeded the take limit for that facility. He said that Douglas PUD and USFWS have been working closely to determine how to address this.

Gingerich said that Douglas PUD wanted to notify the Aquatic SWG of this situation because bull trout are managed under the Aquatic Settlement Agreement. He said that some of the responses to this situation being discussed include, but are not limited to: 1) developing an annual operating plan that summarizes efforts designed to limit take; or 2) reinitiating consultation and working with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), and formally requesting that USFWS limits re-consultation thereby potentially increasing the take limit. He said that Douglas PUD and the USFWS are aware that counts at Twisp Weir and at Wells Dam increase and decrease as the population fluctuates naturally, and they need a take limit that is protective and realistic.

Steve Lewis said that he spoke with FERC directly, and they indicated that they prefer not to reinitiate consultations unless absolutely necessary. Lewis said that discussions include considering limiting take based on a proportion of population. He added that about every 10 years there is a significant increase in bull trout numbers, which is a positive sign. Gingerich said that this year, more than 200 bull trout were observed at the Twisp Weir, when typically, only about 120 are observed. Gingerich said that Douglas PUD is discussing options internally and reviewing data to determine if there is a way to modify trapping to minimize fish encounters.

**6. DECISION: Approval of 2015 Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Plan**

(Chas Kyger): Chas Kyger said that the final draft 2015 Lamprey Study Plan for approval was distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Kristi Geris on November 10, 2014. Kyger said that Bob Rose provided comments on the final draft plan prior to the meeting on November 12, 2014. Rose said that, following discussions with Douglas PUD earlier this month, the YN have additional questions, as follows:

Sample Size

Rose asked if Douglas PUD knows how many fish will be released. Kyger said that a specific release number was not included in the plan because the source of fish and how many can be obtained for the study is still unclear. Rose suggested adding a minimum number to the plan. He said that at least 150 fish would be ideal, but with more, additional objectives can be addressed. Rose said that based on last year's study, he believed that with 150 radio-tagged fish, about 50 fish would pass via each ladder. He added that 50 fish would be the absolute minimum to be statistically valid. Kyger said that Douglas PUD is hopeful to obtain additional fish, and Rose suggested obtaining

additional fish from Priest Rapids Dam. Rose added that he understands the reluctance to identify release locations at this point; however, these types of details will eventually need to be included in the plan.

#### Acoustic Telemetry Methods

Rose said that from an entrance efficiency perspective, 50 acoustically-tagged fish entering each ladder is fundamental to the study; otherwise it will be unclear how many fish approached the Project and turned around, and how many were detected. Kyger explained that the purpose of the acoustically-tagged fish is for drawing conclusions about the radio-tagged fish. He added that due to ambient noise, unless the acoustically-tagged fish use the new structure, the first time those fish would be detected is at Pool 19, which means those fish would be undetected for a large section of the lower fishway. Rose said that he is not confident that the telemetry equipment will detect all fish approaching the dam. He added that “approaching the dam” could mean to the edge of the Project area, and he suggested identifying whether fish are approaching the dam at least within a couple hundred feet. He asked if the only acoustically-tagged fish will be those tagged for the study at McNary Dam, and Kyger said that Douglas PUD will also be acoustically tagging fish. Kyger said that of those details were not yet included in the plan, because Douglas PUD is still determining the best acoustic tag to use that will be similar in tag burden to the radio tags. Rose asked if it is more appropriate that the acoustically-tagged fish mimic the radio-tagged fish or the natural run at large. He said he believes that the acoustically-tagged fish should represent the run at large, and added that he thinks the acoustic tags are about half the size of radio tags. Kyger said that there is a wide range of sizes, which are largely based on battery life. He added that the goal is to make the acoustically-tagged and radio-tagged fish as comparable as possible. Andrew Gingerich noted that Douglas PUD is considering a tag with a longer tag life than, for example, a Juvenile Salmon Acoustic Telemetry System tag. Kyger added that these details will be added to the plan as they become available, and will definitely be included in the final report.

#### Preliminary Data

Rose suggested making preliminary data from the study available as soon as possible, and he suggested that this be completed as early as January or February 2016. Kyger said that Douglas PUD can request a preliminary update as soon as data collection ends. He noted that there was some overwintering last year; however, he agreed that reviewing preliminary data as soon as possible would be beneficial.

#### Mobile Tracking

Rose said that mobile tracking seems to be an important component, and suggested including criteria in the study plan. He suggested that mobile tracking can be a useful tool to help identify where fish are located and why they may not be approaching or entering the Project. Kyger said that a first step would be to determine where fish can

be detected in the fishway. He said once that is determined, efforts such as mobile tracking could be initiated to more closely evaluate any areas of poor detection. He noted that in the 2013 study there was no evidence of significant delays. He said that the total passage time was about 16 hours, including those fish that were released directly above the trap that tended to act sluggish at first before starting to move around. He added that conducting mobile tracking everywhere was not planned. Rose agreed that mobile tracking should be conducted with purpose; he just wanted to make sure it is conducted.

#### Presentation of Data

Rose said that lamprey movement is often times characterized by averages; however, averages do not necessarily represent the finicky behavior of lamprey. He suggested that key information might be lost through the interpretation of averages, and suggested reporting empirical data (e.g., in the form of histograms). Kyger agreed, and recalled that the median and histograms for passage times were reported in last year's study, which will also be done for future studies.

Mike Schiewe asked if any of these issues need to be addressed in the plan prior to approval. Steve Lewis said that he would like these revisions included in the plan, particularly those regarding mobile tracking. He said that he would also like mobile tracking to be conducted in the tributaries—not just at the mouths of the tributaries. Gingerich recalled that, based on the 2013 study results, tributary tag detection efficiency above Wells Dam was essentially 100%. He said that Douglas PUD is interested in knowing if lamprey enter the tributaries; however, mobile tracking upstream in the tributaries is not pertinent information to this study, which focuses on Project effects. Kyger noted that acoustic arrays will be installed throughout the Wells Reservoir and that they will provide additional information which was not available for the 2013 study. Lewis asked why Douglas PUD was reluctant to monitor lamprey behavior in the tributaries. Gingerich explained that mobile tracking in the tributaries is outside of the scope of the management plan. He added, however, that Douglas PUD would be willing to coordinate and share tag codes with USFWS if they are interested in tributary tracking. Kyger suggested including a statement indicating that Douglas PUD is willing to do so. Gingerich also suggested copying USFWS (specifically RD Nelle) on future lamprey study reports.

Rose said that he is confident that the clarifications discussed will be addressed, as appropriate. Kyger said that Douglas PUD will incorporate revisions, as discussed, into the final draft 2015 Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Plan, and will provide the final plan including a list of revisions to Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG by Friday, November 14, 2014. The Aquatic SWG members present approved the 2015 Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Plan, contingent upon incorporation of the revisions discussed. *(Note: Douglas PUD incorporated the revisions, as discussed, and*



*the final 2015 Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Plan [Attachment B] was distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Geris on November 13, 2014.)*

7. **DECISION: Approval of Sturgeon SOA that uses Estimated Number of Parents to Determine Stocking Rates** (Andrew Gingerich): Andrew Gingerich said that a revised draft SOA for a Wells White Surgeon Stocking Program Brood Year (BY) 2015 was distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Kristi Geris on October 8, 2014. He said that the proposed SOA recommends a genetically based split through parental representation, targets 5,000 fish, and also moves genes from the lower river upstream. He said that in the interest of the administrative record, Douglas PUD would like a vote on the SOA to formally establish that it was brought to the Aquatic SWG for approval. Jason McLellan suggested first discussing the WDFW response to the CCT email requesting clarification of the technical basis for the WDFW position on the 2015-2017 white sturgeon stocking plans in the Wells Pool (Attachment C). The response was distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Geris on November 5, 2014. The Aquatic SWG agreed this would be helpful prior to voting on Douglas PUD's proposed SOA.

McLellan recalled that the CCT's first question was to provide evidence (i.e., number of alleles and citation[s]) supporting the statement that "...the John Day Pool [sturgeon population] which has higher observed genetic diversity than all pools above McNary Dam." McLellan said that WDFW responded with a graph indicating that there are more alleles; however, after further research, it became evident that the graph is not accurate, as follows: 1) the graph includes alleles from two different sources, which do not specify whether the loci are the same; 2) the Schreier et al. presentation (2011) indicated that 14 loci were evaluated, while the Matala report (2013) evaluated 13 loci, thus those data are not comparable; 3) the Mid-Columbia collection in the Schreier et al. presentation (2011) is comprised of a composite of three reservoirs, but the graph in the WDFW response lists each individual reservoir as having the composite number of alleles, which is misleading; 4) the Schreier et al. presentation (2011) was a preliminary report of results, which indicates substantially different numbers than those that were reported in the final study (Schreier PhD dissertation [2012]; Drauch Schreier et al. results [2013]), which indicates that diversity between groups is much closer than the WDFW graph suggests; 5) the work of Drauch Schreier et al. (2013) combined the Zone 6 pool collections with the lower-Columbia estuary collection (i.e., approximately half of that composite collection was from the lower-Columbia River estuary)—so arguably, the observed extra diversity could have come from the collection below Bonneville Dam; and 6) the Matala report (2013) indicated that the John Day Pool had the lowest allelic diversity of any Zone 6 pool, which is in contrast to the WDFW graph. McLellan said that, in summary, it is not clear to the CCT that there is any greater genetic diversity in the John Day Pool population when compared to the upper Columbia population. He added that YN broodstock—not the broodstock from Abernathy—have substantially lower diversity than the Zone 6 pools or estuary populations as stated in the Matala

report (2013) that was cited by WDFW. He said that even if there is greater diversity in the John Day population than the upper Columbia population, it is not being captured in the direct gamete program.

McLellan said that WDFW suggested that a 50/50 split is sufficient to represent all of the available Lake Roosevelt (FDR) genome, which is not the objective. McLellan reiterated that the objective is to maximize genetic diversity in the collection, by maximizing the number of contributing parents. He said that with a 50/50 split, WDFW is in essence suggesting that 18 direct gamete parents possess something advantageous to program success. McLellan said that there is no evidence that this is the case.

Gingerich said that regarding the CCT's first point, Douglas PUD also recognized that the 184 alleles reported for the McNary, Priest Rapids, and Wanapum pools were a composite; however, since Douglas PUD did not collect fish from those locations, it did not seem relevant to the 2015 stocking discussion. Gingerich also agreed with McLellan that even if there is increased diversity in the lower river, there is no evidence that the diversity is captured in the brood collection.

Aquatic SWG members voted on Douglas PUD's revised draft SOA for a Wells White Surgeon Stocking Program BY 2015, as follows: the YN and WDFW did not support the SOA at this time, USFWS and the CCT abstained, and Douglas PUD supported the SOA.

Chad Jackson that WDFW would be willing to consider a revised stocking number between WDFW's original proposal (distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Geris via email on October 6, 2014) and Douglas PUD's most recent proposed SOA. McLellan asked how WDFW would determine and justify a revised number, and Jackson said that an exact number was not yet identified in WDFW's revised SOA.

Gingerich suggested that the Aquatic SWG consider using an equation similar to that introduced by Douglas PUD to apply a coefficient to the direct gamete program that would favor, or acknowledge, increased diversity in the lower river. He said that the numbers do change; however, not by much from Douglas PUD's proposal, because the equation still captures the number of adults sired from the larval program. He said that, for example, using the formula depicted in Douglas PUD's most recent revised SOA, the denominator equals the number of assumed adults that sired larvae estimated using Jay et al. (2014) plus the number of adults that sired direct gamete fish (i.e.,  $N^L + N^{DG}$ ). He said that if it is accepted that there is some proxy for diversity in the lower river, the  $N^{DG}$  value can be multiplied by a number greater than one (favorability number). Bob Rose asked if the number of parents associated to FDR fish (i.e.,  $N^L$ ) will be the same for each year. Gingerich said that for this year,  $N^L = 97$  adults is based on recently published literature (Jay et al. 2014). He explained that the publication was a peer reviewed, and the research was conducted in locations close and immediately

upstream to where white sturgeon larvae were collected in 2014 for the Douglas PUD white sturgeon program. Gingerich suggested using 97 adults until another estimate proves to be more accurate, and he added that 97 adults was a conservative estimate. McLellan agreed that the estimate is very conservative, noting that the two spawning locations evaluated in the Jay et al. (2014) study, as well as the Northport spawning location, are located just upstream of the FDR larval collection site. The Waneta (evaluated in the Jay et al. [2014] study) and Northport sites are the two main spawning sites in the upper Columbia. Gingerich indicated that Douglas PUD would be willing to fund a pedigree or parent analysis, as long as the Aquatic SWG approved the formula shown in the SOA before the analysis was complete. In doing so, he said, if the genetic analysis showed more or less parents contributed to the larvae, the NL value would be revised accordingly (i.e. either up or down).

The Aquatic SWG agreed to have Douglas PUD provide a revised Wells White Sturgeon Stocking Program SOA that includes a revised stocking formula, as discussed, to Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG by Friday, November 14, 2014. Aquatic SWG members will review and provide comments on the revised stocking formula outlined in the revised Wells White Sturgeon Stocking Program SOA prior to the Aquatic SWG conference call on December 10, 2014. *(Note: Douglas PUD provided a revised SOA to Geris on November 13, 2014, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day.)*

8. **Aquatic SWG Chair Position – Interview Dates and Questions** (Mike Schiewe and Andrew Gingerich): Mike Schiewe said that based on dates submitted by the Aquatic SWG via the Doodle Poll, Monday, December 8, 2014, had the highest participation for conducting interviews. Kristi Geris recalled that, as agreed during the Aquatic SWG conference call on October 22, 2014, there will be three interviews, 45 minutes each, with 30-minute breaks in between, and all will be scheduled on the same morning (3.25 hours total). She said that additionally, in the afternoon of the same day as the interviews, there will be an Aquatic SWG conference call for members to discuss the interviews and a path forward (1 hour total). She said that with this schedule, and based on results from the Doodle Poll, the first interview would start at 8:30 am, and the follow up Aquatic SWG conference call would start at 1:00 pm. Aquatic SWG members present confirmed this date and schedule. Schiewe said that Anchor QEA will distribute meeting information for the Aquatic SWG Chair position interviews and Aquatic SWG follow-up discussion to be conducted via conference call on Monday, December 8, 2014, from 8:30 a.m. to 11:45 a.m., and 1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m., respectively. *(Note: Geris distributed a meeting invite for these conference calls, as discussed, to the Aquatic SWG following the conference call on November 12, 2014.)*

Schiewe said that a compiled list of Aquatic SWG Chair position interview questions (Attachment D) was distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Geris prior to the conference call

on November 12, 2014. Schiewe noted that several questions were redundant, and suggested revising the questions to remove that redundancy.

Bob Rose briefly discussed interview questions that the YN was submitting, and said that he will provide them to Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG. *(Note: Rose provided the YN's Aquatic SWG Chair position interview questions [Attachment E] to Geris following the Aquatic SWG conference call on November 12, 2014, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day.)*

Gingerich noted that all of the questions seem to fall under four overarching themes, including: facilitation, dispute resolution, administrative support capabilities, and maintaining objectivity. He suggested that Anchor QEA distill the questions into a shorter list that captures these four themes. Schiewe and Geris agreed to develop a shorter list of questions using the Aquatic SWG Chair interview questions submitted by Aquatic SWG members (13 total), ensuring that the list captures the four themes commonly expressed by each member, by Friday, November 14, 2014. *(Note: Kristi Geris distributed the shorter list of questions, as discussed, to the Aquatic SWG on November 14, 2014.)*

## **VII. Next Meetings**

1. **Upcoming meetings** (Mike Schiewe): Upcoming meetings are as follows:  
*December 8, 2014 (conference call); December 10, 2014 (conference call); January 14, 2015 (TBD); February 11, 2015 (TBD).*

## **List of Attachments**

Attachment A – List of Attendees

Attachment B – Final 2015 Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Plan

Attachment C – WDFW's Clarification of the Technical Basis for WDFW's Position on the 2015-2017 White Sturgeon Stocking Plans in the Wells Pool

Attachment D – Compiled List of Aquatic SWG Chair Position Interview Questions

Attachment E – YN's Aquatic SWG Chair Position Interview Questions

## Attachment A List of Attendees

---

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Mike Schiewe	Aquatic SWG Chair	Anchor QEA, LLC
Kristi Geris	Administration/Technical Support	Anchor QEA, LLC
Andrew Gingerich	Aquatic SWG Technical Representative	Douglas PUD
Chas Kyger	Technical Support	Douglas PUD
Patrick Verhey	Aquatic SWG Technical Representative	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Chad Jackson	Technical Support	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Jason McLellan	Aquatic SWG Technical Representative	Colville Confederated Tribes
Bob Rose	Aquatic SWG Technical Representative	Yakama Nation
Donella Miller	Technical Support	Yakama Nation
Steve Lewis	Aquatic SWG Technical Representative	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service