

# Final Meeting Minutes

---



## *Aquatic Settlement Work Group*

**To:** Aquatic SWG Parties **Date:** November 13, 2013  
**From:** Michael Schiewe, Chair (Anchor QEA, LLC)  
**Re:** Final Minutes of the October 9, 2013 Aquatic SWG Meeting

---

The Aquatic Settlement Work Group (SWG) met in person at Douglas PUD headquarters in East Wenatchee, Washington, on Wednesday, October 9, 2013, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Attendees are listed in Attachment A of these meeting minutes.

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

1. Kristi Geris will contact Bob Rose and Steve Lewis to bring them up to speed on the details of the Aquatic SWG Extranet site (Item VI-2).
2. Aquatic SWG members will set up their login information to the Aquatic SWG Extranet site as soon as instructions are received via email from Douglas PUD Information Systems (IS) staff (Item VI-2).
3. Andrew Gingerich will develop a draft sturgeon stocking plan proposal, and draft Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan outline, and provide the drafts to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG no later than October 31, 2013 (Item IV-4).
4. Mike Schiewe will contact Bob Rose and Steve Lewis to bring them up to speed on the sturgeon discussions (Item VI-4).
5. Chas Kyger will provide the 2013 Adult Pacific Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Update that was discussed at the meeting on October 9, 2013, to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG (Item VI-7). *(Note: Kyger provided the update to Geris on October 11, 2013, and Geris distributed the update to the Aquatic SWG that same day.)*
6. Pat Irlle will provide Chris Coffin's email address to Kristi Geris to add to the Aquatic SWG distribution list (Item VI-8). *(Note: Irlle provided Coffin's email address to Geris on October 10, 2013, and Geris added Coffin to the Aquatic SWG distribution list on that same day.)*
7. Patrick Verhey will provide an official letter designating the current Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) AQUATIC SWG Policy Representation to Kristi Geris for the administrative record (Item VI-9). *(Note: Verhey provided Mike Schiewe*

*with an email notice on October 10, 2013, designating the current WDFW HCP Policy Representation.)*

## **II. Summary of Decisions**

1. There were no Statement of Agreements (SOAs) approved at today's meeting.

## **III. Agreements**

1. The Aquatic SWG members present approved the Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan (Item VI-3).
2. The Aquatic SWG members present approved the Water Quality Attainment Plan (WQAP) (Item VI-3).
3. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) approved the request to defer the Twisp Weir Bull Trout study until 2017, as distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Kristi Geris on October 22, 2013.

## **IV. Review Items**

1. Kristi Geris sent an email to the Aquatic SWG on October 30, 2013, notifying them that the Phase One White Sturgeon Management Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Study Plan is out for a 30-day review period, with comments due to Andrew Gingerich no later than Friday, November 29, 2013.

## **V. Reports Finalized**

1. The final Bull Trout Stranding, Entrapment and Take Study Plan was submitted to FERC on September 23, 2013, as distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Kristi Geris that same day.
2. The final Wells Hydroelectric Project Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan was submitted to FERC on October 15, 2013, as distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Kristi Geris on October 17, 2013.
3. The final Wells Hydroelectric Project Water Quality Attainment Plan (WQAP) was submitted to FERC on October 21, 2013, as distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Kristi Geris that same day.

## **VI. Summary of Discussions**

1. **Welcome, Agenda Review, and Meeting Minutes Review** (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. The following revisions were requested:
  - Pat Irle added a Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) staff update.

- Patrick Verhey added a WDFW Aquatic SWG Policy representative update.

The revised draft September 11, 2013 meeting minutes were reviewed. Kristi Geris said that all comments and revisions received from Aquatic SWG members were incorporated into the revised minutes, and that there were no outstanding edits or questions to discuss. The Aquatic SWG members present approved the September 11, 2013 meeting minutes, as revised.

Geris said that a third revised draft of the Mid-Columbia Regional Sturgeon Workshop meeting minutes were distributed to the Aquatic SWG on October 8, 2013. The workshop was held at Douglas PUD headquarters in East Wenatchee, Washington, on Tuesday, September 10, 2013, from 9:00 am to 3:00 pm. Geris said that comments and revisions were received from all Aquatic SWG members that were present at the workshop except for the Yakama Nation (YN). The Aquatic SWG members present recommended that Geris follow up with Bob Rose before finalizing the revised draft minutes.

2. **Aquatic SWG Extranet Site Tutorial** (Andrew Gingerich and Julene McGregor): Andrew Gingerich summarized that, as discussed at the Aquatic SWG meeting on January 9, 2013, the Wells Dam 401 Water Quality Certification and FERC license requires Douglas PUD to provide Aquatic SWG materials to the public. He said that a new public website, [www.douglaspud.org](http://www.douglaspud.org), went live on October 4, 2013, and this site includes information about the Wells Project and the Aquatic SWG, including links to Ecology water quality data. He said that a secure Aquatic SWG Extranet site (not for public access), <https://extranet.dcpud.net/sites/nr/aswg/>, has also been under development; and that Douglas PUD IS staff and Kristi Geris have been uploading Aquatic SWG documents to the secure site. He said the extranet will allow the Aquatic SWG and Douglas PUD to track all relevant documents to ensure that final documents, as approved by the Aquatic SWG, will be made public on Douglas PUD's public webpage. Final documents from that site will be pulled and posted to the public site.

Douglas PUD IS staff member, Julene McGregor, distributed Aquatic SWG Extranet Site Document Library Instructions (Attachment B), which are also available in the "Help Documents" on the Extranet site. She gave the following instructions for accessing the Aquatic SWG Extranet site: 1) copy and paste the secure link into an Internet browser; 2) specify a login format (select "Forms Authentication" for non-Douglas PUD employees); and 3) enter your username and password. McGregor said that she will distribute a hyperlink to instructions on how to set up a username and password to access the site. She added that the hyperlink is time-sensitive and needs to be accessed within a few days, or it will become inactive. Aquatic SWG members agreed to setup their login information to the Aquatic SWG Extranet site as soon as instructions are received via

email from Douglas PUD IS staff. (Note: McGregor distributed instructions for username and password creation to Aquatic SWG members on October 11, 2013.)

McGregor reviewed the Aquatic SWG Extranet Site home page. She explained that this website is intended to replace the need for an ftp site and minimize the amount of attachments that are received via email. For example, instead of receiving draft meeting minutes for review via email attachment, Geris will instead send an email notifying Aquatic SWG members that the meeting minutes are posted to the Extranet site and are available for review. Aquatic SWG members will then download a copy of the meeting minutes to their personal computer, edit them, and then upload the edited document to the Extranet site via the “Document Drop.” Geris will be notified when new documents are uploaded to the Document Drop, and she will incorporate edits into a master revised draft. Gingerich suggested that Aquatic SWG members contact him, McGregor, or Geris during the first few times accessing the site to help walk through the steps. McGregor also clarified that users can only view their own edits—that is to say, a user cannot view another user’s edited document that has been uploaded to the Document Drop, and only Geris has access to all edited documents. She also clarified that the site is secure, so only those with logins have access to the Aquatic SWG Extranet Site. She said that a user’s edited documents will remain on the site so that users can access past edits if they choose. She discussed possibly adding an “Incorporated” checkbox to the document properties, which would help Geris track which edited documents have been incorporated into master drafts, and would also show users when their edits have been addressed.

McGregor noted the last page of Attachment B, which identifies characters that are not compatible with the Extranet site (i.e., cannot be used in file names). She briefly reviewed the different views available along the left panel of the home page that will sort the document library by, for example, Action Items, Agendas, Meeting Minutes, and so on. She also said that she can create a “Meeting Date” view that will sort documents by meeting date (i.e., all meeting materials for a particular date lumped together).

Gingerich said that file sharing and document reviews via the Aquatic SWG Extranet Site will begin from this point forward. Geris said that she will contact Bob Rose and Steve Lewis to bring them up to speed on the details of the Aquatic SWG Extranet site. McGregor said that she can be reached at (509) 881-2236, to answer any questions about the Extranet site.

- 3. DECISION: Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan and Water Quality Attainment Plan** (Andrew Gingerich): Andrew Gingerich said that the SPCC Plan and WQAP are both requirements under the Wells Dam 401 Water Quality Certification and new FERC operating license for Wells Dam, and that Douglas PUD has worked closely with Ecology in developing both documents. He said that both documents are due to

FERC by October 31, 2013, and that he hoped to obtain approval of both documents to complete consultation records by the end of the month.

Mike Schiewe said that some of these types of documents also require HCP Coordinating Committees' consultation under the new FERC license. He said that the Coordinating Committees believe that development and review of these types of documents are more appropriately the prerogative of the Aquatic SWG, and so they are discussing options to streamline the Coordinating Committees' review and approval process, as opposed to reviewing and approving such documents independently.

Pat Irlle noted the differences between the Douglas PUD Water Quality Management Plan and the WQAP, and said that the expected level of Coordinating Committees' involvement may also be different. Gingerich said that Douglas PUD carefully reviewed the license and 401 Certification languages, and HCP review and consultation is necessary for both plans. *(Note: this process was completed at the same time the Aquatic SWG had a 30 day review of the documents.)* Chas Kyger added that similar requirements are outlined for lamprey documents.

The Aquatic SWG members present approved the SPCC Plan and the WQAP.

4. **Sturgeon Discussion** (All): The Aquatic SWG agreed that Jason McLellan should postpone his presentation, "Naturally Produced Larvae: A New Approach to White Sturgeon Conservation Aquaculture," until all Aquatic SWG members are present. McLellan's presentation was distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Kristi Geris on September 9, 2013, and was presented at the Mid-Columbia Regional Sturgeon Workshop on September 10, 2013. Andrew Gingerich said that he had hoped to have everyone participate in today's discussion; however, he also recognized the need to make progress knowing that everyone cannot always be present. Mike Schiewe asked if there are critical dates in the near term to which the Aquatic SWG needs to be sensitive. Gingerich said that there is currently adequate rearing capacity at Wells, but Douglas PUD will want to start culling in the next few months; and therefore, will need to know how many fish should be retained for planting. He added that, for M&E purposes, Douglas PUD will also want to know how many fish need to be tagged, and release dates need to be discussed. In addition, tags need to be ordered and fish marked. Gingerich proposed that Douglas PUD develop a SOA that supports both larval and direct gamete programs and that recommends using a combination of sources this coming release year. He said that, with the fish that are on station, there is a good chance to meet the goal of 5,000 fish into the Wells Project in the first stocking year. He said that he is encouraged by the recent information about high genetic diversity in larval fish, and that Roosevelt fish also seem to be appropriate to use based on historic gene flow and the absence of distinct population segments for White Sturgeon in the mainstem Columbia. He said that there are not enough fish for larval source only, but the factorial

crosses and brood seem acceptable. He said that the 2,500 larvae are doing quite well; and added that 2,500 larvae and 2,500 direct gamete fish may be a good starting point. He noted that the YN and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) would also need to approve the SOA; and that Douglas PUD is also waiting on fish health results.

Chad Jackson agreed with Gingerich's proposal. He said WDFW's main concern is that there are enough fish to fulfill the M&E component (i.e., large enough sample size for a valid study). Gingerich added that the plan is to front-load the stocking years to ensure a large enough sample size and support an already low estimate population size. Jackson noted that Grant PUD's contractors determined that their M&E objectives could be met with stocking lower numbers; to which Jackson added that if Douglas PUD determined the same, WDFW would also be supportive.

Gingerich said that the current sturgeon SOA that was approved early this year supports both programs for 4 years. He said that, based on M&E from those first 4 years, informed decisions can be made for subsequent stocking in the next 5 to 10 years, under the Wells White Sturgeon Management Plan (MP).

Pat Irle said that she would like to hear more discussion on whether there is a need for 5,000 fish to achieve M&E objectives. She said that recent studies seem to indicate that larval source fish are "better" than brood source fish with regards to greater survival and allelic diversity. She added that passive integrated transponder (PIT)-tagging the fish will provide the data needed for several different analyses. McLellan added that, from a technical perspective, 5,000 fish do not necessarily need to be stocked for an M&E program. He said that objectives can be met by adjusting release strategies, such as size, location, and time. He said that there are data that indicate that stocking can be reduced by 60% while still meeting M&E objectives. McLellan noted that there is no compelling scientific or statistical justification behind the number 5,000, and he added that he is not implying that 5,000 is a bad number. Rather, there is no compelling reason that the Aquatic SWG needs to stick to that number. He said that current research indicates that long-term risk is lower and genetic diversity is significantly higher with larval wild-origin fish. He added that there is no genetic benefit to using fish from direct gamete takes. He said that a strong argument can be made that there is no benefit to including the direct gamete takes in a release strategy.

Gingerich acknowledged that the technical information should be considered. He said the challenge is that Douglas PUD's FERC license indicates stocking up to 5,000 and stocking another number will require an explanation to FERC. He said that, additionally, the Aquatic SWG signed a SOA which stated that both larval collection and direct gamete programs are suitable. Gingerich said that if this is no longer the case, the SOA needs to be revisited. McLellan said that he is not suggesting that direct gamete take fish are not suitable; rather, he is saying that based on the most recent data, larval

collection appears to be better. He noted that the SOA was signed knowing that both programs were pilot, and not knowing what fish could be obtained. He said that the direct gamete program has not met collection goals, and that the recent data indicate that larvae are the better alternative, from a genetic perspective. Bret Nine noted that when agreement was reached on the SOA, the matrix was two three-by-three (3x3) mating matrices; this matrix was not ultimately met. McLellan added that having the same 3x3 genetic crosses spread across the entire basin by all three PUDs is a concern.

Schiewe asked whether if there is a loss of recruitment within the next 5 years of the stocking program under the White Sturgeon MP, it would be hard to rebuild. McLellan said that there would not be an issue with 1 or 2 years; however, more than that may cause issues. He added that a couple of bad years are not unlike the natural situation where recruit failure occurs in a natural population in some years.

Schiewe suggested carrying this discussion forward to the Aquatic SWG meeting on November 13, 2013. Gingerich agreed, and asked what needs to happen between now and then. Schiewe suggested that Douglas PUD develop a draft proposal; and Irlle suggested that Douglas PUD also develop a draft M&E Plan. Gingerich agreed to develop a draft sturgeon stocking plan proposal and a draft M&E Plan outline, and to provide the drafts to Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG no later than October 31, 2013. He asked if Aquatic SWG members present would approve using the 2,500 larval fish on station, and spreading the additional fish over 11 or 12 half-sibling families; which would be close to a 50/50 split between the larval and direct gamete programs. McLellan said that he would be interested in hearing a technical argument for using direct gamete origin fish. He added that even if agreement is reached on a 50/50 split with 250 per half-sibling cross, most larvae present represent more than 100 individual spawners, so there will still be a very small number of crosses swapping with highly inbred individuals. Gingerich noted the several uncertainties inherent in a M&E program, such as survival and recapture; and he explained that those are some of the reasons behind starting with a 50/50 split. Schiewe asked if a goal of the M&E program is to compare the two programs, and Gingerich replied that it is not. He added that the White Sturgeon MP intended for M&E to address what subsequent stocking would look like based on what is happening today and focus on things like survival and retention within the Wells Project. McLellan added that he did not see value in comparing the two programs. He said that the ultimate goal is to achieve population abundance, and M&E is meant to evaluate the aquaculture program in order to reach that end goal.

Gingerich said that Douglas PUD is not necessarily opposed to reducing releases, but release numbers need to be balanced toward meeting M&E objectives. McLellan said that the Colville Confederated Tribes (CCT) would like to see as many larval-origin fish go in the water as possible. He added that these discussions can be held on an annual basis in order to re-evaluate what is on hand, as needed. He also said that based on



discussions with Larry Hildebrand, fish size at release may be the biggest factor in rebuilding. McLellan explained a model that indicates that only about 200 larval-origin individuals are needed to achieve 90% allelic diversity; and Gingerich noted that those numbers are also dependent on predation and other factors, which may be specific to the Wells Reservoir. Therefore, a strong M&E program will be needed to determine fish survival in Wells. Gingerich continued by saying that McClellan's model description is very beneficial; however, these data do not exist for Wells. McLellan acknowledged that obtaining specific survival estimates is difficult with sturgeon; and Gingerich said that getting 5,000 fish in the water can help answer some of those questions in the short term. McLellan agreed with this, so long as releases are structured to address those questions and enough effort is implemented to obtain adequate statistical power.

Aquatic SWG members present agreed to continue these discussions, and Schiewe said that he will contact Rose and Lewis to bring them up to speed on the issues discussed today.

5. **Conflict of Interest (COI) Policy** (Andrew Gingerich): Andrew Gingerich said that a draft COI Policy was distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Kristi Geris on August 27, 2013. He said that the draft policy, which is modeled after the Hatchery Committees' policy, is fairly liberal, in that those in conflict can participate in conversations but cannot vote. He said that the onus is on the member who is in conflict to explain the COI with the Aquatic SWG. He added that the draft policy is fairly standard with other forums and that he hoped to discuss and comment on the policy today and then vote on it next month. Mike Schiewe said there is interest in having this conversation with all members present; however, he said he thinks it is important to start discussing issues, if there are any. Schiewe reiterated that this is a very liberal approach that does not take people out of the discussion; it just takes them out of the decision.

Bret Nine asked if language in the bi-laws state that the Aquatic SWG makes the final decisions. Gingerich said that the Aquatic Settlement Agreement (ASA) states that the Aquatic SWG is responsible for carrying out the MPs, with support from the entire membership. He recalled a question from Patrick Verhey that was distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Geris on August 27, 2013. Verhey had asked if the Aquatic SWG is responsible for awarding Request for Proposal (RFP) contracts, and the answer is no—Douglas PUD is responsible.

Gingerich said that the perception is that people's technical opinions could be swayed by the agency that completes the work. Verhey said that WDFW does not agree with the COI Policy; and that WDFW feels that the current ASA is between government entities, not individuals. He further said that government representatives are representing the state, not individuals. He said if there is concern that there is individual interest, it should be brought to the policy level. Jason McLellan agreed with



Verhey, and added, for example, that the stocking decisions have no effect on individuals. Gingerich disagreed, and said he believes that stocking decisions have the potential to affect funding in future years. Pat Irle added that there seems to be perceived conflict whenever money is involved.

McLellan suggested that Douglas PUD develop an independent proposal review panel. He said that the Aquatic SWG can discuss the technical merits, as needed, and then the decision-making is completed by the outside review panel. Verhey added that WDFW is involved with a lot of entities. He also added that this policy does not treat all as equals—it gives Douglas PUD an exemption, which, Verhey noted, may not be appropriate. Gingerich asked how this policy is different from the HCP Tributary Committees' policy, where both Washington State and the Tribes have agreed to participate. Verhey said that the decision was not vetted at the policy level at WDFW, who are not supportive of entering into a COI Policy. McLellan said that he is not certain whether the CCT are supportive or not, nor is he certain how the issue was addressed in the Tributary Committees, but the issue was raised with their policy staff as well.

Verhey asked what past experiences have happened and what the dispute resolution process was in those cases. Gingerich said that he was not satisfied with how the sturgeon RFP process went; and he added that, from his perspective, there were COIs whereby the technical strategy decision could not be uncoupled from the agency hired to do the work. McLellan agreed that there was COI in the sturgeon RFP process. He said that, however, it was more of a problem with the process than with anything else. He said that he felt like the two proposers were pitted against each other and that they had to fight for their proposals. McLellan recommended stepping away from that kind of set-up. Chad Jackson agreed, and said that even if this policy was in place, everyone works together and knows each other, so everyone could have perceived conflict.

Gingerich said that if Douglas PUD develops an independent proposal review panel, and the decision-making is taken out of this forum—which is not the intention of this group or the ASA language—there is the potential for certain members to become disgruntled with Douglas PUD's technical selections and decisions. Verhey said that he believes the rules to govern this policy are problematic (i.e., members either voluntarily recuse themselves from decision, or another entity can suggest the other is in conflict). Schiewe said that he is unaware of a scientific panel that does not have a COI Policy in place. He added that it is not to constrain the process; rather, it is to strengthen the process. He suggested that an alternative might be to make all Douglas PUD decisions in consultation with the Aquatic SWG.

Verhey suggested that, for now, discussions continue about a possible COI Policy; and he added that he would much prefer to work this out within the forum. Irle suggested that the Aquatic SWG only comment on technical aspects of RFPs and other documents,

and that Douglas PUD address anything related to funding. Gingerich noted that, in some instances, those two things cannot be separated. Verhey added that reasonable cost-effectiveness is an integral part of many technical discussions. He said whether it be in dollars and cents, or in magnitudes, what is reasonable also needs to be considered.

McLellan asked Gingerich if he envisioned the Aquatic SWG as being fully integrated in the review process; to which Gingerich replied that he does in terms of evaluating the technical components, but not in terms of hiring contractors. Irle suggested that if the Aquatic SWG agrees that two proposals are technically equivalent, then at that point, Douglas PUD should make the final decision. Schiewe noted that, if anyone chooses, they can always elevate the issue of the COI Policy to the policy level. He said another alternative would be to not put yourself in conflict by not submitting on a proposal. Verhey said that WDFW wants to be at the table to represent Washington State; and Schiewe said that nothing in this policy prevents anyone from participating in the discussions. Schiewe further said that Douglas PUD may need to amend their license if the decision-making is taken outside of the Aquatic SWG; and Irle noted that the ASA would definitely need to be rewritten. Schiewe noted that the list of examples of those who may be in conflict, as noted in the COI Policy, are not meant to be exhaustive—there are different degrees.

McLellan said that the Upper Columbia Technical Recovery Group (UCTRG) implements a COI Policy where: 1) for each agenda item, members in conflict identify themselves so that when that agenda item is discussed, those in conflict leave the room; and 2) an explicit, written out, standardized protocol is developed for scoring RFPs. Irle noted that she has not seen many satisfactory scoring protocols; and McLellan said that he could recommend one. Gingerich said that the draft Aquatic SWG COI Policy is figuratively “leaving the room,” and what McLellan just described is very similar to the policy being proposed.

Gingerich said that he will notify his manager that there was negative feedback on the draft COI Policy, and discuss a path forward.

6. **Aquatic Nuisance Species Update** (Chas Kyger): Chas Kyger said that Douglas PUD conducted aquatic nuisance species (ANS) monitoring for zebra and quagga mussels in July, August, and September of this year. He said that results from veliger samples have not yet been received, but the samples for artificial substrates were negative. He said that crayfish monitoring was conducted in the same locations as in 2012; and at the mouth of the Okanogan, 15 nonnative northern crayfish were found during 4 hours of sampling. Sampling included hand nets and flipping rocks. Crayfish monitoring was also conducted at Washburn Island, where one nonnative northern crayfish was found; it was also conducted at the mouth of the canals near the Bridgeport farms, where

another nonnative northern crayfish was found. Kyger added that Douglas PUD is also maintaining a database of incidental captures. Andrew Gingerich said that these results will be included in an annual report. Patrick Verhey asked if Douglas PUD tried trapping, and Kyger replied that, because trapping was so ineffective in 2012, they chose not to trap in 2013. Verhey noted that a recent graduate study found that trapping can be an effective method. Kyger said he reviewed that study and found that Douglas PUD was using different traps and was also setting the traps at different depths. He said that because there were other effective methods to conduct sampling, Douglas PUD chose to implement those rather than trapping.

7. **2013 Adult Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Update** (Chas Kyger): Chas Kyger said that he will provide a 2013 Adult Pacific Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Update (Attachment C) to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG. *(Note: Kyger provided the update to Geris on October 11, 2013, and Geris distributed the update to the Aquatic SWG that same day.)*

Kyger said that this update includes antenna locations and the number of tagged lamprey detected at each station. He said that after reviewing these data, it was discovered that ambient noise was causing low detection, and so this was filtered out to try to improve the detection history. He said that LGL Limited Environmental Research Associates will have improved data in the final report. Kyger said that there have been no PIT-tag detections since the last update; and he added that the last detections were just before the Aquatic SWG meeting on September 11, 2013. He said that there are about 40 days of battery life left in the acoustic tags.

Pat Irle asked how many total lampreys have passed Wells Dam, and Kyger replied that 14 lampreys have been detected in the Methow, and 5 have passed Wells Dam, but have not yet been detected in the tributaries—so, a total of 19. Andrew Gingerich added that about 30 lamprey have not been detected at all. He said that the last detection location indicates that many of these fish have entered the project and then turned around. Kyger added that multiple fish have come up the ladders, moved back down, and then gone to the other ladder. He said that he anticipates that the final report will evaluate these data more carefully.

Patrick Verhey asked if lamprey could be bypassing the count station, and Kyger replied that there is no way to tell yet. Verhey asked where the release locations were, and Gingerich replied that Douglas PUD only received the original quota, so the release locations were as planned—in the tailrace and in the ladders. Kyger said that Douglas PUD anticipates the final report to be ready by spring 2014.

8. **Ecology Staff Update** (Pat Irle): Pat Irle recalled that John Merz occupied a position directly above her, and that Charlie McKinney occupied the position above Merz. Irle

said that Merz has now been replaced by Chris Coffin, who has requested to be included on the Aquatic SWG distribution list. Irle said that she will provide Coffin's email address to Kristi Geris to add to the Aquatic SWG distribution list. *(Note: Irle provided Coffin's email address to Geris on October 10, 2013, and Geris added Coffin to the Aquatic SWG distribution list on that same day.)*

9. **WDFW Aquatic SWG Policy Representative Update** (Patrick Verhey): Patrick Verhey said that Jim Brown replaced Dennis Beich as the Aquatic SWG Policy Representative. Verhey said that he will provide an official letter designating the current WDFW Aquatic SWG Policy Representation to Kristi Geris for the administrative record. *(Note: Verhey provided Mike Schiewe with an email notice on October 10, 2013, designating the current WDFW Aquatic SWG Policy Representation.)*

## VII. Next Meetings

1. **Upcoming meetings** (Mike Schiewe): Upcoming meetings are as follows: *November 13, 2013 (conference call); December 11, 2013 (conference call); January 8, 2014 (conference call).*

## VIII. Wells Dam Site Visit (afternoon)

1. **Sturgeon Facility and Fishways** (Interested Parties): Andrew Gingerich and Chas Kyger led a tour of the Wells Dam sturgeon facility and west fishway. The tour included the new sturgeon facility that houses 12 circular tanks, the west Wells Dam fishway, the count station and interpretive center, and the collection gallery. Only Anchor QEA, Ecology, and Douglas PUD participated in this tour.

## List of Attachments

Attachment A – List of Attendees

Attachment B – Aquatic SWG Extranet Site Document Library Instructions

Attachment C – 2013 Adult Pacific Lamprey Passage and Enumeration Study Update

## Attachment A List of Attendees

---

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Mike Schiewe	SWG Chair	Anchor QEA, LLC
Kristi Geris	Administration/Technical Support	Anchor QEA, LLC
Andrew Gingerich	SWG Technical Representative	Douglas PUD
Chas Kyger	Technical Support	Douglas PUD
Julene McGregor	Information Systems	Douglas PUD
Patrick Verhey	SWG Technical Representative	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Chad Jackson†	Technical Support	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Pat Irle	SWG Technical Representative	Washington State Department of Ecology
Jason McLellan	SWG Technical Representative	Colville Confederated Tribes
Bret Nine	SWG Technical Representative	Colville Confederated Tribes
Bob Donnor	Photographer	Badger Mountain Video

Notes:

† Joined by phone