

# Final Conference Call Minutes

---



## *Aquatic Settlement Work Group*

**To:** Aquatic SWG Parties **Date:** August 13, 2015  
**From:** John Ferguson, Chairman (Anchor QEA, LLC)  
**Re:** Final Minutes of the July 8, 2015 Aquatic SWG Conference Call

---

The Aquatic Settlement Work Group (SWG) met by conference call on Wednesday, July 8, 2015, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Attendees are listed in Attachment A of these meeting minutes.

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

1. The Colville Confederated Tribes (CCT) will draft proposed guidelines for hatchery rearing of juvenile sturgeon, specifically as it relates to criteria for culling fish, and will provide the proposed guidelines to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG for further discussion during the Aquatic SWG conference call on August 12, 2015 (Item VI-1). (Note: Jason McLellan provided proposed criteria for culling fish to Geris on July 16, 2015, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day.)
2. Douglas PUD will prepare a draft letter to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) requesting permission to combine all Aquatic Settlement Agreement (ASA) Annual Reports and deadlines into one submittal, and provide the draft letter to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG. The Aquatic SWG will review and discuss the draft letter at a future meeting (Item VI-1).
3. The Yakama Nation (YN) will present a summary of recent YN lamprey translocation efforts during the Aquatic SWG conference call on August 12, 2015. Kristi Geris will coordinate with Bob Rose regarding the need for a WebEx (screen share; Item VI-1).
4. Andrew Gingerich and John Ferguson will coordinate with the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) Committees, as applicable, to ensure consistencies between the Aquatic SWG-approved Twisp Weir Operations Plan and percent hatchery-origin spawners (pHOS) goals and objectives outlined in the HCP Broodstock Collection Protocols (Item VI-2).
5. Steve Lewis will provide a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) white paper on lamprey translocation risk factors to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG for further discussion during the Aquatic SWG conference call on August 12, 2015

(Item VI-4). (Note: Lewis provided a paper titled, "Translocating Adult Pacific Lamprey within the Columbia River Basin: State of the Science," to Geris on July 31, 2015, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day.)

6. Discussion on potential lamprey translocation and tagging opportunities (including the YN's presentation on recent YN lamprey translocation efforts), review of discussions with Chelan PUD and Grant PUD, and discussion of the USFWS white paper on lamprey translocation risk factors, will continue during the Aquatic SWG conference call on August 12, 2015 (Item VI-4).
7. **The Aquatic SWG meeting on August 12, 2015, will be held by conference call, and a date for the next in-person meeting will be discussed at that time (Item VII-1).**

## II. Summary of Decisions

1. The Aquatic SWG members present approved the Twisp Weir Operations Plan, contingent that future operations of the weir are consistent with pHOS goals and objectives outlined in the HCP Broodstock Collection Protocols (Item VI-2).

## III. Agreements

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

## IV. Review Items

1. There are no items that are currently available for review.

## V. Documents Finalized

1. The Final Twisp Weir Operations Plan that was approved by the Aquatic SWG on July 8, 2015, was distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Kristi Geris on July 9, 2015 (Item VI-2).

## VI. Summary of Discussions

1. **Welcome, Review Agenda, Meeting Minutes Approval, and Review of Action Items** (John Ferguson): John Ferguson welcomed the Aquatic SWG members (attendees are listed in Attachment A) and opened the meeting. Ferguson reviewed the agenda and asked for additions or other changes to the agenda. The following revisions were requested:
  - Steve Lewis added a discussion on potential drought-related alternative operations to minimize impacts to aquatic species.
  - Jason McLellan added an update on larval collection for sturgeon supplementation.

The revised draft June 10, 2015, conference call minutes were reviewed. Kristi Geris said all comments and revisions received from members of the Aquatic SWG were

incorporated into the revised minutes, and there were no outstanding edits or questions to discuss. Aquatic SWG members present approved the June 10, 2015, conference call minutes, as revised.

Ferguson reviewed action items from the last Aquatic SWG conference call on June 10, 2015, and follow-up discussions were as follows (*note: italicized item numbers below correspond to agenda items from the June 10, 2015 meeting*):

- *Douglas PUD will contact the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) regarding Pat Irle's replacement as the Ecology Aquatic SWG Technical Representative (Item VI-1).*

This will be discussed during today's conference call.

- *The CCT, Douglas PUD, and John Ferguson will discuss developing guidelines for hatchery rearing of juvenile sturgeon. The path forward will be considered during an Aquatic SWG meeting in summer 2015 (Item VI-1).*

Ferguson recalled the plan to hold this discussion in-person when the Aquatic SWG convenes the next in-person meeting; however, he proposed beginning these discussions via telephone call or email if the Aquatic SWG elects to hold the next meeting via conference call. Jason McLellan recalled his main concern was regarding how to select fish to cull. He said last year, when fish were culled down to the target release group number, only the largest fish were selected for release and the rest (smallest) were culled. He acknowledged that historically, this has largely been the standard hatchery practice, coupled with the desire to release fish of similar size to the previous year's releases. He suggested, however, that this year there needs to be a discussion regarding an appropriate way to reach the release group numbers while minimizing selection. Steve Lewis asked if last year's culling was also tied to origin, and McLellan said it was not; that all fish were wild-caught larvae. Ferguson asked when a decision would be needed on culling criteria. McLellan said likely by October 2015, and Andrew Gingerich agreed. Gingerich suggested that McLellan provide a proposal via email. McLellan agreed, and said he will draft proposed guidelines for hatchery rearing of juvenile sturgeon, specifically as it relates to criteria for culling fish, and will provide the proposed guidelines to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG for further discussion during the Aquatic SWG conference call on August 12, 2015. (*Note: McLellan provided proposed criteria for culling fish to Geris on July 16, 2015, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day.*)

- *Douglas PUD will prepare a draft letter to FERC requesting permission to combine all ASA Annual Reports and deadlines into one submittal, and provide the draft letter to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG. The Aquatic SWG will review and discuss the draft letter at a future meeting (Item VI-1).*

Andrew Gingerich said a draft letter is complete and under agency review and will hopefully be distributed for Aquatic SWG review within the next 30 days. This action item will be carried forward. Steve Lewis asked if the proposed combined ASA Annual Report is separate from reporting requirements under the USFWS Bull Trout Biological Opinion (BiOp). Gingerich clarified that Douglas PUD will continue to provide USFWS with a separate Incidental Take Report on an annual basis, as required under their USFWS Bull Trout BiOp; however, Douglas PUD will not file a separate Bull Trout Management Plan Annual Report with FERC.

- *The USFWS and Douglas PUD will continue coordination with the Rocky Reach Fish Forum (RRFF) and Priest Rapids Fish Forum (PRFF) regarding potential lamprey translocation and tagging opportunities, as they arise (Item VI-1).*  
This will be discussed during today's conference call. Steve Lewis noted that dialogue among the forums is still ongoing. He said, in the RRFF and PRFF, there is typically a reoccurring agenda item for open discussion regarding this topic.
- *Andrew Gingerich, Bob Rose, and John Ferguson will coordinate on developing an agenda item regarding potential lamprey translocation and tagging opportunities to discuss during the Aquatic SWG conference call on July 8, 2015 (Item VI-1).*  
This will be discussed during today's conference call.
- *The YN will present a summary of recent YN lamprey translocation efforts during the Aquatic SWG conference call on July 8, 2015 (Item VI-1).*  
This action item will be carried forward. Kristi Geris will coordinate with Bob Rose regarding the need for a WebEx (screen share).
- *Kristi Geris will coordinate with RD Nelle (USFWS) regarding access to the Aquatic SWG Extranet Site (Item VI-2).*  
Geris helped Nelle access the Extranet Site following the meeting on June 10, 2015.
- *Chas Kyger will discuss the statistical design of the Aquatic SWG-approved 2015 Juvenile Lamprey Habitat Evaluation Study, specifically regarding sample site selection, during the Aquatic SWG conference call on July 8, 2015 (Item VI-2).*  
This will be discussed during today's conference call.
- *Andrew Gingerich will provide the Passive Integrated Transponder (PIT)-Tag Information System (PTAGIS) file for brood year (BY) 2014 Wells White Sturgeon releases to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG (Item VI-3).*  
Gingerich provided these data to Geris on June 19, 2015, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day.
- *The Aquatic SWG meeting on July 8, 2015, will be held by conference call, and a date for the next in-person meeting will be discussed at that time (Item VII-1).*  
Observed.

**2. DECISION: Twisp Weir Operations Plan** (Andrew Gingerich): John Ferguson said Kristi Geris sent an email to the Aquatic SWG on May 26, 2015, notifying them the draft Twisp Weir Operations Plan is available for a 30-day review period, with edits and comments due to Andrew Gingerich by Friday, June 26, 2015. Ferguson recalled the plan is not a FERC requirement; rather, Douglas PUD agreed to develop this document after discussion with USFWS related to high numbers of bull trout encounters at the Twisp Weir in 2014. Gingerich welcomed any last-minute questions on the plan, and said, otherwise, Douglas PUD is requesting approval of this document. He recalled that this year, spring Chinook salmon broodstock collection for Douglas PUD's HCP obligation was accomplished via trapping at Wells Dam; so, trapping at the Twisp Weir was not needed, which resulted in zero incidental take this year. He said in the future, however, this document will be used to minimize incidental take at the Twisp Weir.

Steve Lewis recalled the large numbers of bull trout that passed the Twisp Weir in 2014 and asked how this plan will minimize the incidental take of bull trout during similar high-run years in the future. Gingerich said a key change in weir operations will be to not trap during nighttime hours, which Douglas PUD believes, based on PIT-tag data from the Twisp River, will largely reduce encounters. He recalled that PIT-tag data indicate a nocturnal behavior in bull trout in the Twisp River. He also noted that as bull trout counts at the Twisp Weir and Wells Dam increase and decrease as the population fluctuates naturally, the incidental take limit may be exceeded; however, this is why the Twisp Weir Operations Plan is a living document, which can be revised as necessary.

Lewis asked if it is possible to cue or link potential bull trout passage numbers at the Twisp Weir based on passage at Wells Dam. Gingerich said, unfortunately, bull trout passage numbers at Wells Dam are not necessarily reliable indicators of how many bull trout will pass the weir or on what days. He said, however, that monitoring spring Chinook salmon tagged at Wells Dam and their behavior when entering the Twisp River shows that spring Chinook salmon are more evenly distributed during the daytime, which suggests that Douglas PUD can still meet their HCP obligations and not operating the weir during the nighttime.

Judy Neibauer (USFWS) asked if Douglas PUD has observed fish migrating or behaving differently with this year's high-temperature and low-flow scenarios; for instance, have bull trout been observed at Wells Dam earlier than in past years? Gingerich said he has not yet analyzed these data statistically; however, qualitatively, it seems more fish than usual were passing the dam in May 2015, which is slightly early compared to past years. He added that Douglas PUD plans to thoroughly analyze these data during annual reporting. Neibauer noted her interest in evaluating these data when considering

timing at the weir, especially with regard to climate change and consideration of water flow and temperature.

Kirk Truscott (CCT Aquatic SWG Technical Support, and HCP Hatchery and Coordinating Committees Representative) noted that the draft Twisp Weir Operations Plan includes a section tailored to broodstock collection of spring Chinook salmon at the Twisp Weir from June 1 to about mid-August, and the 2015 HCP Broodstock Collection Protocols indicate spring Chinook pHOS management intended for the Twisp Weir from May 1 to August 22, which is not included in the Twisp Weir Operations Plan. Gingerich said Greg Mackey (Douglas PUD HCP Hatchery Committees Representative) would know more about HCP obligations at the Twisp Weir; however, Gingerich explained that the weir is operated for both steelhead and spring Chinook salmon activities. He said steelhead pass the weir earlier in the year (early spring), and realistically, bull trout are not typically encountered during steelhead protocols. He said the intent of the Twisp Weir Operations Plan is to address when spring Chinook salmon trapping is ongoing because this activity overlies bull trout spawning migration from around June 1 to about mid-August. He said June 5 to 6 is about the earliest bull trout arrive at the weir, and then numbers increase from about June 15 through July. He said PIT-tag detection histories then show that fish leave the Twisp River in the fall around September to November, but the weir is not operating by that time. He said this is why the Twisp Weir Operations Plan only focuses on June and July. Truscott asked, if all spring Chinook salmon broodstock are collected at Wells Dam, will the Twisp Weir still be operated to manage for spring Chinook salmon pHOS? Gingerich said he thinks Douglas PUD's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Permits do not mandate operation of the Twisp Weir for pHOS management; however, he said this is really a question for Mackey. Gingerich also noted with regard to take, that he believes if managing for pHOS at the weir is a permit requirement, then it would be a Douglas PUD action; however, if it is a State action, any take would be assigned to Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and their permits. Truscott said he just wants to be sure there is consistency between the Twisp Weir Operations Plan and the HCP Broodstock Collection Protocols. Gingerich said he knows the weir is not operating this year, which means at least this year, WDFW is not performing pHOS management at the Twisp Weir. Chas Kyger said he was recently by the Twisp Weir and confirmed the trap was not operating.

Truscott recognized again that the Twisp Weir Operations Plan is a living document, and he expects there to be a continued desire to manage for pHOS in the Methow Basin, including in the Twisp River. He advised making sure approving the Twisp Weir Operations Plan will be consistent with pHOS management outlined in the HCP Broodstock Collection Protocols. Ferguson suggested approving the Twisp Weir Operations Plan contingent that future operations of the weir are consistent with pHOS goals and objectives outlined in the HCP Broodstock Collection Protocols. Lewis asked if

the HCP Committees will receive the approved Twisp Weir Operations Plan. Gingerich and Ferguson said they were not sure that the HCP Committees were aware of this plan. Lewis suggested coordinating with both Mackey and Tom Kahler (Douglas PUD HCP Coordinating Committees Representative) on this. Gingerich and Ferguson agreed to coordinate with the HCP Committees, as applicable, to ensure consistencies between the Aquatic SWG-approved Twisp Weir Operations Plan and pHOS goals and objectives outlined in the HCP Broodstock Collection Protocols.

Lewis asked if Douglas PUD received any feedback from WDFW regarding PIT-tagging and associated impacts to juvenile bull trout at the Twisp Weir. Gingerich said Douglas PUD and WDFW exchanged emails about not PIT-tagging fish at the weir. He said, essentially, Douglas PUD informed WDFW that so long as operating actions are funded by Douglas PUD, the protocol is to not tag and clip bull trout, unless otherwise approved by USFWS. He said Douglas PUD indicated they are trying to minimize impacts to bull trout under Douglas PUD action, and he did not feel there was any pushback. Neibauer said, based on recent discussions with WDFW, it seems they may have interpreted this as being a shutdown on future bull trout monitoring in the Twisp River. She said further discussion is needed on this and suggested instead of PIT-tagging, installing additional PIT-tag arrays. She said it seems there are already a lot of PIT-tagged fish in the Twisp River, and there just needs to be further discussion about possible data gaps. Ferguson noted that most tagged fish are adults, which would be one data gap. Neibauer agreed, noting that more data are needed on juvenile bull trout. Lewis suggested holding a separate meeting to further discuss this, and Gingerich agreed.

The Aquatic SWG members present approved the Twisp Weir Operations Plan, contingent that future operations of the weir are consistent with pHOS goals and objectives outlined in the HCP Broodstock Collection Protocols. The Final Twisp Weir Operations Plan was distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Geris on July 9, 2015.

**3. Ecology Aquatic SWG Technical Representative Update (Andrew Gingerich):**

Andrew Gingerich said Charlie McKinney (Ecology) responded to an email from Douglas PUD, which requested an update on a replacement for Pat Irle (former Ecology Aquatic SWG Technical Representative). McKinney indicated that Ecology is still working on replacing Irle's vacant position; however, finding a qualified candidate is taking longer than expected. McKinney said in the interim, he and Chris Coffin (Ecology) will stay as up to date with Aquatic SWG actions as possible. John Ferguson asked if McKinney provided any sort of timeline, and Gingerich said he did not. Gingerich said McKinney did indicate that he was receptive of hearing from others in the industry if they knew of qualified candidates. Steve Lewis asked if there was anyone at Ecology who is familiar with Douglas PUD's Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 401 Water Quality Certification, and Gingerich said he presumes so. Gingerich said, regardless, Douglas

PUD plans to continue moving forward with the requirements and conditions contained within that Certification. He added that McKinney also did not provide details on Ecology's regularity of attendance at future Aquatic SWG meetings.

#### **4. Pacific Lamprey**

2015 Juvenile Lamprey Habitat Evaluation Study – Statistical Design (Chas Kyger):

Chas Kyger said there were two key parts to the statistical design of this study: 1) how to select sampling sites; and 2) how to analyze presence and absence data from electro-sampling.

##### *Select Sampling Sites*

Kyger said first, an approach called Generalized Random Tessellation Stratified (GRTS) was used, which creates spatially balanced sampling sites within an identified wide range of potential sampling sites. He explained that, based on aerial photography and bathymetric data for the Wells Reservoir, a specific study area was determined, which excludes areas of the reservoir that cannot be sampled or where habitat is not suitable for juvenile lamprey. He said the study area was then ground-truthed by boat surveys, and additional areas of potential lamprey habitat observed during the boat surveys were added to the study area. He said 20 sites within the final study area were selected for site surveys where the habitat was classified as Type 1, 2, or 3. He said those survey data were then entered into GRTS to select sample points. He said the sample points were stratified into Type 1 and Type 2 habitats (Type 3 is defined as unsuitable for juveniles).

##### *Analyze Presence and Absence Data*

Kyger said multiple sampling visits will be conducted at the selected sample points, and occupancy modeling will be used to calculate the occupancy rate and detection probabilities (the same principal behind a mark recapture model). He noted that it is implausible to perfectly capture and detect fish at every sampling occasion, which is why five site visits are planned for each sample point. He said those data will be used to calculate detection probabilities, which will provide confidence that lamprey will be observed if present and with the sampling methods being used to estimate detection probabilities. He said this approach may provide a naïve estimate; however, it will also correct for imperfect detections that might be present. He said if adequate lamprey are detected, other variables can also be incorporated into the modeling (e.g., water level and amount of shocking effort).

Steve Lewis asked where the sampling efforts are mainly focused. Kyger said GRTS spreads the sample points throughout the reservoir; however, the most suitable habitat is located just downstream, across, and at the mouth of the Okanogan River. He said there is also suitable habitat in isolated areas around the City of Pateros. He said Douglas PUD also added "cherry-picked" sites of interest, such as one near the Pateros



boat launch. He recalled, in the past, there were concerns about lamprey presence in areas proposed for dredging for repairing the boat launch, so this site was added to try to inform lamprey presence in that area.

Kirk Truscott asked how far up the Okanogan River sample sites are located. Kyger said the farthest sites are located about 1.5 to 2 miles upstream from the mouth. He said, initially, additional survey sites were identified farther upstream; however, based on visiting the sites, these sites were deemed unsuitable or were in areas that could not be accessed with electrofishing.

Review of ASA Lamprey Requirements (Andrew Gingerich): John Ferguson recalled that this discussion was originally intended to follow the YN's presentation of YN lamprey translocation activities, goals, and near-term and long-range plans. He also recalled Douglas PUD's willingness to consider participating in regional efforts, so long as activities are consistent with lamprey requirements outlined in Douglas PUD's ASA and other applicable permitting and licensing documents.

Andrew Gingerich said the Pacific Lamprey Management Plan (PLMP) is Douglas PUD's governing lamprey document, which includes USFWS Section 18 Fishway Prescriptions. He said the PLMP begins with background information, status, and an overview of monitoring and studies for Pacific lamprey in the Wells Reservoir. He said Section 4 then outlines 14 high-level requirements (Protection, Mitigation, and Enhancements [PMEs]), which are further separated into adults, juveniles, and annual reporting. He said PMEs for adult lamprey include requirements such as upstream fishway operations criteria, salvage activities during ladder maintenance dewatering, upstream fishway counts, upstream passage improvements, fishway modifications to improve upstream passage, and an adult lamprey upstream passage evaluation. He said, with regard to juvenile lamprey, the PLMP acknowledges it is currently not feasible to conduct a survival study given the available tagging technologies; however, if applicable technologies do become available during the license period, juvenile lamprey passage and survival will be addressed. He said, lastly, PMEs for reporting include participating on regional lamprey workgroups and general reporting.

Gingerich said he believes Douglas PUD is effectively pursuing the PMEs outlined in the PLMP via the ongoing passage and enumeration studies and associated actions planned for the Wells Project and Reservoir. Ferguson noted that nothing seemed to be specifically spelled out in the PLMP with regard to translocation, perhaps with the exception of participating in regional forums. He asked if Douglas PUD was still willing to support translocation activities, if able. Gingerich said that is correct, and he noted that Douglas PUD has participated in translocation in the past in the form of gathering study fish to meet license requirements and study goals. He said if the Aquatic SWG agrees it would be wise to move fish, Douglas PUD could accommodate that. He added,

as he has suggested in the past, that the Aquatic SWG first needs to discuss any risks and unknowns to minimize the chances of being frustrated in the future by the decision to translocate fish. He said he knows some folks are supportive and some have concerns with translocation, which first warrants a thorough discussion. He questioned, for example, if there are biological concerns with translocation activities, and whether technical leads are supportive of translocation actions.

Kirk Truscott said, regarding translocation actions proposed for 2015, the CCT have environmental concerns, particularly in the Okanogan River. He said yesterday, the water temperature in the Okanogan River was 81 degrees Fahrenheit, and he suggested considering the real-time risks and benefits with translocation. He said generally, the CCT are on board with translocation above Wells Dam; however, he agreed with Gingerich that risks, benefits, and monitoring first need to be discussed.

#### Open Discussion (All):

##### *Review of Discussions with Chelan and Grant PUDs*

John Ferguson said this discussion was supposed to be led by the YN, so in addition to today's discussion, it will also be carried forward to the next Aquatic SWG meeting on August 12, 2015.

Chas Kyger said initial discussions are underway among Douglas PUD, Chelan PUD, and Grant PUD. He said further discussions and planning are needed to determine the best way to coordinate moving forward.

Kirk Truscott said, for 2015, based on the early salmon migration, he suspects lamprey are migrating early as well. He also noted he is not sure what opportunities will be available this year. John Ferguson said he is not aware of a formal proposal to translocate this year, and, at this point, this is just a discussion topic. Truscott suggested developing a well-thought out plan before proceeding with translocation activities.

##### *USFWS Perspectives*

Steve Lewis agreed that 2015 may not be an ideal year to kick off translocation activities. He said, however, in general, he thinks a translocation program would give Douglas PUD credit toward passage efforts. He added that because Wells Dam is located farthest upstream (compared to Chelan PUD and Grant PUD projects), he suggested that translocation needs to be on Douglas PUD's agenda. He said a more in-depth discussion is needed next month when the YN are able to participate.

##### *Potential Opportunities to Consider*

Steve Lewis suggested next month that the Aquatic SWG begin compiling a draft plan for translocating Pacific lamprey starting in 2016, as well as more clearly defining a

translocation program, determining what is feasible (e.g., opportunities at Priest Rapids Dam), and developing a plan and protocols for a drought, moderate, and high-flow year.

Andrew Gingerich noted the importance of starting the discussion about risks. He questioned if fish being translocated from one location to another will be a detriment to another location where fish otherwise would have spawned. He noted that lamprey are quite a bit different than anadromous salmonids and suggested thinking about them differently as well; being panmictic in nature means lamprey may not want to travel above Wells Dam if suitable habitat is available below it. Lewis agreed, noting that translocation actions may be slightly experimental in nature.

John Ferguson suggested discussing where translocation rules and guidelines originate. He questioned, for instance, regarding the YN translocation efforts, how those decisions were made, who approved them, and if there was a genetic management plan. Lewis agreed, and noted that USFWS has a white paper on lamprey translocation risk factors, which he said he will provide to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG for further discussion during the Aquatic SWG conference call on August 12, 2015. *(Note: Lewis provided a paper titled, "Translocating Adult Pacific Lamprey within the Columbia River Basin: State of the Science," to Geris on July 31, 2015, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day.)*

Ferguson said discussion on potential lamprey translocation and tagging opportunities, including the YN's presentation on recent YN lamprey translocation efforts, review of discussions with Chelan PUD and Grant PUD, and discussion of the USFWS white paper on lamprey translocation risk factors, will continue during the Aquatic SWG conference call on August 12, 2015.

- 5. Potential Drought-Related Alternative Operations to Minimize Impacts to Aquatic Species** (Steve Lewis): Steve Lewis said hydroprojects typically follow some level of protocols for high, medium, and low flow years with regard to minimizing impacts to bull trout and other aquatic species. He asked, considering this year's low-flow scenario, if these protocols need to be adjusted at Wells Dam. Andrew Gingerich said Wells Dam is not operating differently than usual at this time with respect to drought conditions. He said Douglas PUD's FERC License No. 2149, CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification, and NMFS permitting contain some connection to low-flow and high-temperature years. He said, for example, in the fish ladder, trapping at Wells Dam must cease when the water temperature reaches a certain threshold. He said, however, in terms of the bypass, no changes are required under low-flow scenarios.

Lewis asked if there has been any significant change in ladder temperatures. Gingerich said this year, everything is slightly warmer, but in terms of flow (i.e., amount of water through the ladders to facilitate fish migrating upstream), conditions remain unchanged.

He added that fish passage at the dam is closely monitored each day. He said in early fall, if cease and desist of trapping activities is needed due to warm water, Douglas PUD will do so.

- 6. Larval Collection for Sturgeon Supplementation** (Jason McLellan): Jason McLellan said as part of the supplementation effort for the Wells Pool, this year, the CCT conducted larval collection in the Roosevelt Reach, which occurred earlier than usual due to warmer water temperatures and lower flows. He said the crew fished from June 25 to July 1, 2015, capturing and delivering more than 20,000 larvae to Wells Hatchery. He recalled the release goal of 5,000 fish, and said survival is currently at 50%, which should result in more than enough wild larval-origin juvenile sturgeon being available to meet the release goal, so long as everything goes well in the hatchery. Andrew Gingerich said this was a successful effort, and complemented Matt Howell (CCT) and his crew for the long, hours of work that were required to successfully collect these larvae.

## VII. Next Meetings

- 1. Upcoming meetings** (John Ferguson): The Aquatic SWG meeting on August 12, 2015, will be held by conference call, and a date for the next in-person meeting will be discussed at that time.

Upcoming meetings are as follows: *August 12, 2015 (conference call); September 9, 2015 (TBD); and October 14, 2015 (TBD).*

## List of Attachments

Attachment A – List of Attendees

## Attachment A List of Attendees

---

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Organization</b>
John Ferguson	Aquatic SWG Chairman	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
Steve Lewis	Aquatic SWG Technical Representative	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Judy Neibauer	Technical Support	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jason McLellan	Aquatic SWG Technical Representative	Colville Confederated Tribes
Kirk Truscott	Technical Support	Colville Confederated Tribes