

Final Conference Call Minutes



Aquatic Settlement Work Group

To: Aquatic SWG Parties

Date: November 12, 2015

From: John Ferguson, Chairman (Anchor QEA, LLC)

Re: Final Minutes of the October 14, 2015, Aquatic SWG Conference Call

The Aquatic Settlement Work Group (SWG) met by conference call on Wednesday, October 14, 2015, from 10:00 a.m. to 11:40 a.m. Attendees are listed in Attachment A of these meeting minutes.

I. Summary of Action Items

1. 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).
2. Bob Rose will provide the draft Yakama Nation (YN) Pacific Lamprey Supplementation and Monitoring Frameworks to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG (Item VI-1).
3. Aquatic SWG members will contact Douglas PUD no later than Friday, October 23, 2015, if there is interest in assisting with Douglas PUD's upcoming juvenile Pacific lamprey habitat survey (Item VI-1).
4. Bob Rose will discuss internally the Colville Confederated Tribes' (CCT's) proposed criteria for culling juvenile white sturgeon and report back to the Aquatic SWG during the next meeting on November 12, 2015 (Item VI-1).
5. Douglas PUD and the CCT will discuss white sturgeon fin ray sampling and deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) tissue sampling protocols to consider for incorporation into Wells Project white sturgeon monitoring and evaluation (M&E) planning (Item VI-2).
6. Discussion on potential lamprey translocation and tagging opportunities will continue during the Aquatic SWG conference call on November 12, 2015 (Item VI-3).
7. The CCT will keep the Aquatic SWG updated on the progress of internal discussions regarding potential lamprey translocation and tagging opportunities (Item VI-3).

8. Bob Rose will provide details on the recent YN lamprey translocation releases in the Methow Basin, including details regarding M&E planning, during the Aquatic SWG conference call on November 12, 2015 (Item VI-3).
9. Steve Lewis will coordinate with Tracy Hillman (BioAnalysts), Rocky Reach Fish Forum (RRFF) and Priest Rapids Fish Forum (PRFF) Chairperson, regarding possibly distributing RRFF and PRFF lamprey recommendations to the Aquatic SWG for consideration (Item VI-3). *(Note: Lewis provided the RRFF and PRFF lamprey recommendations to the Aquatic SWG on October 19, 2015.)*
10. Chas Kyger will provide a recap and overview on the progress of the ongoing Douglas PUD Lamprey Study during the Aquatic SWG conference call on November 12, 2015 (Item VI-3).
11. **The Aquatic SWG meeting on November 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. There were no decisions approved during today's conference call.

III. Agreements

1. Aquatic SWG members agreed to reschedule the Aquatic SWG meeting on November 11 to November 12, 2015, to accommodate the Veteran's Day holiday (Item VII-1).

IV. Review Items

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

V. Documents Finalized

1. The Bull Trout Stranding Survey Memorandum distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Kristi Geris on October 6, 2015, will be finalized and included in the Bull Trout Management Plan Annual Report, which Douglas PUD will submit to FERC in May 2016 (Item VI-1).

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 discussions on: 1) white sturgeon lessons learned from a recent RRFF and PRFF White Sturgeon Workshop; and 2) lamprey translocation next steps.

- Andrew Gingerich added updates on: 1) the Douglas PUD 2016 Lamprey Study; and 2) a Grant PUD 2015 Lamprey Study.

The revised draft September 9, 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 September 9, 2015, conference call minutes, as revised.

Ferguson reviewed action items from the last Aquatic SWG conference call on September 9, 2015, and follow-up discussions were as follows (*note: italicized item numbers below correspond to agenda items from the September 9, 2015 meeting*):

- *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 the draft letter is still under internal review. This action item will be carried forward.
- *Bob Rose will provide the draft YN Pacific Lamprey Supplementation and Monitoring Frameworks to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG (Item VI 1).*
This action item will be carried forward.
- *Douglas PUD will provide a draft Bull Trout Stranding Survey Memorandum for review to Kristi Geris for distribution to the Aquatic SWG prior to the next Aquatic SWG meeting on October 14, 2015 (Item VI-2).*
Andrew Gingerich provided a draft memorandum for review to Geris on October 5, 2015, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG on October 6, 2015. Gingerich said only one comment has been received to date on the draft memorandum, which was from Steve Lewis regarding the frequency of surveys. Gingerich said he responded to Lewis' comment via email, and Lewis indicated the response satisfied his question. Gingerich said the draft memorandum will be finalized and included in the Bull Trout Management Plan Annual Report, which will be submitted to FERC in May 2016.
- *Steve Lewis will contact Jim McGee (Douglas PUD) regarding U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) consultation for the Douglas PUD Methow Groin Rehabilitation work (Item VI-2).*
Lewis contacted McGee and confirmed the required consultation was completed for this work, as distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Kristi Geris on September 17, 2015. Lewis asked when dredging in front of the Methow boat launch will begin, and Gingerich said he understands it may start as early as next week. Gingerich added that Scott Kreiter (Douglas PUD) is the lead on this project and would be the person to

contact with questions. Gingerich said a fish salvage action will be conducted once the silt curtain is in place, and fish will be returned to the main body of water.

- *Douglas PUD will provide Kristi Geris with the ramping rate schedule used for the drawdown of the Wells Reservoir to elevation 771 feet mean sea level that was undertaken earlier this month to conduct the Douglas PUD Methow Groin Rehabilitation work, and Geris will distribute the schedule to the Aquatic SWG (Item VI-2).*

Andrew Gingerich provided these ramping rates to Geris on September 24, 2015, which Geris distributed to the Aquatic SWG that same day.

- *Aquatic SWG members will contact Andrew Gingerich and Patrick Verhey if they are interested in attending a boat tour of the Wells Reservoir on September 16, 2015, while the reservoir is at the drawdown elevation (Item VI-2).*

This activity is complete.

- *Steve Lewis and Bob Rose will coordinate internally within their respective agencies, and also with Douglas PUD, regarding potentially assisting with Douglas PUD's upcoming juvenile Pacific lamprey habitat survey (Item VI-2).*

Lewis asked if USFWS was able to assist with the survey. Chas Kyger said Douglas PUD invited USFWS to join; however, he never received a response. He added that the survey was then conducted sooner than expected in order to complete the effort before the water level came back up. Andrew Gingerich also noted that Rose indicated YN interest in assisting via a phone call and Ralph Lampman (YN) via email; however, the next day Douglas PUD discovered that the reservoir level was coming back up, so the survey effort was conducted on too tight of a schedule to coordinate with folks. Patrick Verhey asked if any lamprey were observed during the low water surveys, and Kyger replied none were observed. Gingerich noted that there is still one more survey planned (for a total of four), and interested parties are welcome to join. Lewis asked where sampling will be focused during the fourth survey. Kyger said all 11 sites will be surveyed again, and each site is approximately 30 meters long. He said sites range from the mouth of the Methow River to the mouth of the Okanogan River, and throughout the Wells Pool in between. He said the survey will be conducted at the reservoir elevation that is typical for this time of year. Gingerich requested that Aquatic SWG members contact Douglas PUD no later than Friday, October 23, 2015, if there is interest in assisting with the upcoming juvenile Pacific lamprey habitat survey.

- *Bob Rose will discuss internally the CCT's proposed criteria for culling juvenile white sturgeon and report back to the Aquatic SWG during the next meeting on October 14, 2015 (Item VI-3).*

This action item will be carried forward.

- *Douglas PUD will coordinate with the YN, CCT, and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) to discuss the fate of surplus brood year (BY) 2015*

Wells Hatchery white sturgeon, based on an upcoming hand count of production, prior to the Aquatic SWG conference call on October 14, 2015 (Item VI-3).

This will be discussed during today's meeting.

- *Douglas PUD will provide an update on BY 2015 Wells Hatchery white sturgeon rearing, specifically regarding surplus fish, during the Aquatic SWG conference call on October 14, 2015 (Item VI-3).*

This will be discussed during today's meeting.

- *Discussion on potential lamprey translocation and tagging opportunities will continue during the Aquatic SWG conference call on October 14, 2015 (Item VI-4).*

This will be discussed during today's meeting, and will also be carried forward.

2. **White Sturgeon**

Wells White Sturgeon M&E Update (Andrew Gingerich): Andrew Gingerich said the 2015 Wells white sturgeon M&E sampling was completed last week. He said, in summary, there were 443 captures total, including 242 captures during the summer session (i.e., July to August 2015), and 201 captures during the fall session (i.e., September to October 2015). He said there were 33 recaptures during the fall session that were also captured during the summer session. He said only about 6% of the fish captured, or 30 of 443 captures, were BY 2014 fish (i.e., fish in the water since June 2015, or 1-year-old fish), which he said is not surprising. He added that most fish encountered were BY 2013 fish, released in 2014. He speculated that the gear was selective for BY 2013 fish, and that low BY 2014 catch rates was not necessarily indicative of survival; however, he said this will not be definitively determined until next year.

Jason McLellan asked how many wild fish were captured. Gingerich replied that three wild fish were captured during the summer session and four wild fish were captured during the fall session. He said all seven wild fish were outfitted with a 10-year acoustic-tag, passive integrated transponder (PIT) tag, and scute mark. He said no wild fish were recaptured, and that these tagged fish are being detected on receivers throughout the Wells Reservoir. He said he plans to develop a graph depicting the size distribution of the wild fish captured. He said, in summary, all seven wild fish captured were between 60 to 90 centimeters in length, and all were in great condition externally and with respect to condition factor.

McLellan asked if DNA samples were collected from the wild fish captured, and Gingerich replied they were not. Gingerich added that DNA sampling was not included in the current M&E plan; however, this is not to say DNA sampling could not be performed during future M&E efforts. He said fish are already being scute-marked, so collecting a DNA sample will not be difficult. He recalled also discussing pectoral fin ray age dating on fish during a past Aquatic SWG meeting; however, he said this was not completed either, and is also not included in the M&E plan.

McLellan said collecting fin tissue is a standard protocol throughout the basin for newly handled wild fish, and suggested adding this procedure to the Wells white sturgeon M&E planning.

Gingerich said one reason fin ray samples were not obtained on wild fish was because he has no

experience doing it and needs to be trained. John Ferguson asked if Gingerich needed training on how to take the sample or analyze the sample, and Gingerich said physically taking the sample. McLellan clarified that the standard protocol is for tissue collection for DNA—not fin ray sections for aging. He said tissue collection for DNA is just a small piece of fin tissue cut from the posterior end of the pectoral fin, stored in ethanol. He added that he can discuss with Douglas PUD fin ray sampling, as well. Gingerich said he was not expecting to encounter this size, or this many, wild-origin fish given the previous studies that demonstrated very few sturgeon remaining in the project area. He apologized for not being completely prepared for encountering wild recruits. McLellan said it would be beneficial to add collecting fin tissue for DNA for every wild fish captured because those data are lacking for the Mid-Columbia pools. Ferguson suggested using the same laboratory to conduct the DNA analyses so everything is done in a consistent manner. McLellan said most DNA analyses for the Mid-Columbia pools have been done at the Genomics Laboratory at the University of California, Davis (U.C. Davis). Ferguson asked if a contract is in place, and McLellan said there is not, but that the basin and U.C. Davis have collaborated on previous contracts. Douglas PUD and the CCT will discuss white sturgeon fin ray sampling and DNA tissue sampling protocols to consider for incorporation into Wells Project white sturgeon M&E planning.

Gingerich said to date, there have been 108 acoustically tagged sturgeon. He said this includes: 1) 49 fish, which were tagged in-hatchery prior to release this year (BY 2014 fish); 2) seven wild-origin fish tagged with 10-year acoustic tags and PIT tags, which can be identified in the future so that fin ray and DNA sampling could occur if recaptured; and 3) 52 fish at 2.5 years of age, predominately from BY 2013, including 31 Marion Drain direct gamete-origin fish and 21 Lake Roosevelt larval-origin fish. Gingerich said Douglas PUD will continue to track these fish on 18 acoustic receivers installed throughout the Wells Reservoir. He said a new acoustic receiver was recently installed in the Chief Joseph Dam tailrace, with help from the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (USACE). He recalled that Douglas PUD had been trying to install a receiver in this location; however, because the land is owned by USACE, installing the receiver required additional coordination. He said the receiver was just installed about 1 week ago.

Gingerich said 107 of the 108 acoustically tagged sturgeon are swimming around the Wells Reservoir, and one acoustically tagged sturgeon has been detected in the Wells Dam tailrace. McLellan asked if Douglas PUD operates receivers downstream of Wells Dam separate from Chelan PUD, and Gingerich replied that Douglas PUD operates two receivers in the Wells Dam tailrace. Gingerich said Chelan PUD also has a number of receivers installed in the Wells Dam tailrace, and that the PUDs have already started a data sharing process. He noted that Blue Leaf Environmental, Inc., handles data collection for Chelan PUD.

McLellan asked if Chelan PUD sampling efforts have captured any sturgeon with PIT tags indicating they were released in the Wells Project, and Gingerich said not that he is aware of.

Gingerich added that Douglas PUD has captured a Chelan PUD fish, and Chelan PUD was notified. He said a Chelan PUD hatchery fish was captured in the Chief Joseph Dam tailrace near Bridgeport, Washington, which had a left scute mark and PIT tag consistent with Chelan PUD tag code, and the PIT Tag Information System confirmed the fish was released at Chelan Falls in 2013. Gingerich said the interesting part was that the fish was not detected within the Wells fish ladder on the PIT tag arrays. He recalled that detection probability for salmonids throughout the Wells fish ladder is 99%. He hypothesized two potential explanations for this: 1) an angler caught the fish downstream of Wells Dam, then released it upstream of the dam; or 2) the fish possibly swam into the draft tube while the scroll case was drained for maintenance, where there was still approximately 1 foot of water, which is enough for a fish to survive (and has occurred at least once in the past). Subsequent to the completion of maintenance, when the unit was watered up, the fish could have locked itself through the unit. McLellan noted that fish swimming into draft tubes while operations are ceased is a common problem in the lower Federal Columbia River Hydro-System, and there is lots of literature available describing procedures to prevent this from happening. Gingerich said the fish captured in the Chief Joseph Dam tailrace was in great shape, and the fish encountered within the scroll case in the past was also in impeccable condition and later released at the boat launch/Wells Hatchery Outfall downstream of Wells Dam.

Gingerich said he plans to compile a summary report on the 2015 Wells white sturgeon M&E sampling effort after all data are verified. He said a timeline for the draft summary is not yet known; however, a final summary will be due with the annual white sturgeon reporting in May 2016, so the draft summary will be distributed sometime before then.

BY 2015 Wells Hatchery Rearing and Fish Health Update (Andrew Gingerich): Andrew Gingerich said yesterday, 2,800 Marion Drain direct gamete-origin fish were transferred from Wells Hatchery back to Marion Drain. He said mortalities in the hatchery for all fish have leveled off, and numbers are over program. He guessed that most, if not all, Marion Drain fish will be surplus. He said direct gamete-origin fish were hand-counted and reduced from three to two tanks, which freed up one tank to conduct a hand-count on larval-origin fish this week or next. He said hatchery staff guessed there are about 5,000 to 7,000 direct gamete-origin fish, and about 10,400 larval-origin fish, on station. He said he believes these numbers will decrease, noting that fish which cannibalize each other are hard to count as mortalities. He said even if there is a large decrease in fish, there is still a high chance of having surplus fish. He said these fish need a home or will have to be culled. He added, chances are, all direct gamete-origin fish will be moved off station, or returned to the YN. He said this will leave about 10,000 larval-origin fish to meet program, with 5,000 fish released in 2016.

RRFF and PRFF White Sturgeon Workshop: Lessons Learned (Steve Lewis): Steve Lewis said the RRFF and PRFF recently held a White Sturgeon Workshop, where area white sturgeon experts

shared presentations and discussed harvest, genetics, and next steps for white sturgeon in the Mid-Columbia Basin. Lewis asked what the major differences are in strategies for the Wells Project versus the other fish forums. He also asked about thoughts on the genetics aspects. He noted that discussions at the recent workshop seemed to suggest the need to weigh both harvest and genetics, and not just one aspect of sturgeon management or the other.

Andrew Gingerich said although the recent workshop was a RRFF and PRFF gathering, Douglas PUD did participate in the workshop. He noted that aside from Douglas PUD, most Aquatic SWG members also participate on the other forums. He said it is important to point out that Chelan PUD and Grant PUD are at a different stage in their white sturgeon programs compared to Douglas PUD. He said all three PUDs have a similar up-front stop-gap stocking plan, like that of the one that Douglas PUD has; entailing 20,000 fish in the first 4 years, but then the language in the Douglas PUD governing documents versus the Chelan PUD and Grant PUD documents have different specificities. He explained that Douglas PUD is required to stock up to another 15,000 fish in Years 5 to 10 of the Wells White Sturgeon Program, and it is up to the Aquatic SWG to decide how to do this. He said, hopefully, Douglas PUD can learn from Chelan PUD and Grant PUD efforts to help achieve this goal. He said additionally, methods for stocking the Wells Reservoir and source of fish are different than what has occurred in Chelan PUD and Grant PUD reservoirs.

Patrick Verhey asked what year of front-loading is the Wells White Sturgeon Program in now. Gingerich replied that the third year of releases are currently on station at Wells Hatchery. He recalled that Year 1 and Year 2 fish were released in 2014 and 2015, respectively. He said things are looking good to release another 5,000 fish in June 2016 (on station now). He said after 2016, there will be 1 more year of a 5,000-fish release toward the 20,000-fish release group; after that, releases will be a part of the 15,000-fish release group through Year 10. He recalled that the most recent Statement of Agreement (SOA) prioritized larval-origin and lower-river fish in an effort to maximize genetic diversity. He said this SOA was approved through Phase I of the Wells White Sturgeon Program; and based on the SOA, the 5,000 fish planned for release in 2016 will be larval-origin fish because there are enough on station to do so.

Gingerich said what is learned and how that modifies stocking will be a challenge, particularly after the 2017 release group. John Ferguson asked for examples of what may be challenging. Gingerich explained that even though Douglas PUD has some specificity in how many fish to release, the governing documents do not indicate how many to stock, from what source, and when to stock. He said those details are what people will want to have conversations about. He added that some white sturgeon M&E data indicate fish are surviving quite well, which begs the question of carrying capacity and whether it is realistic for these reservoirs to support many more thousands of fish. He said, in addition, specific to genetics, is it reasonable to have brothers and sisters on the same spawning grounds? He asked what the path forward is when

there are no discrete guidelines of how to stock. He said that is where the challenge is. Jason McLellan added that the fact that wild juvenile sturgeon are being captured in the Wells Pool adds a layer of complexity. He said at some level there is recruitment, and that needs to be taken into consideration. He said other than the Wanapum Pool, most other pools do not have evidence of having to deal with this.

Lewis said he just wanted to make sure the Aquatic SWG also considers the types of issues discussed during the RRF and PRFF White Sturgeon Workshop. Ferguson asked how Douglas PUD plans to stay in touch with these regional discussions. Gingerich said Douglas PUD is willing to attend these types of focused workshops in the future, as stipulated in the ASA White Sturgeon Management Plan; however, Douglas PUD does not attend the regular RRF and PRFF meetings. Ferguson suggested that Aquatic SWG members who also participate in these other forums keep Douglas PUD updated, as needed. Gingerich said in the case of this recent RRF and PRFF workshop, WDFW mentioned the workshop and suggested Douglas PUD participate.

McLellan noted that Lewis had initially alluded to a harvest and genetic perspective, and McLellan said these perspectives are not mutually exclusive. He said both components can be present in a program. Lewis agreed.

Gingerich said it is worth noting that he agrees with what Steve Parker (YN) and Keith Truscott (Chelan PUD) commented on during the workshop, being that these programs have been fairly successful, despite the differences in opinion and challenges along the way. Gingerich said he thinks the forums have done fairly well together.

3. **Potential Lamprey Translocation and Tagging Opportunities**

CCT Perspectives (Jason McLellan): Jason McLellan said he briefly discussed potential lamprey translocation and tagging opportunities with Kirk Truscott, and the CCT are still determining their position on this. The CCT will keep the Aquatic SWG updated on the progress of internal discussions regarding potential lamprey translocation and tagging opportunities.

USFWS Perspectives (Steve Lewis): Steve Lewis said the USFWS has a lamprey initiative. He said this includes conducting an investigation in an experimental manner into a translocation program. He recalled sharing a paper titled, "Translocating Adult Pacific Lamprey within the Columbia River Basin: State of the Science," which was distributed to the Aquatic SWG by Kristi Geris on July 31, 2015. Lewis said the paper noted both risks and benefits to a translocation program.

Lamprey Translocation Next Steps (Steve Lewis): Steve Lewis suggested developing a proposal specific to the Wells Project in order to obtain a better sense of goals and objectives for this project, which, Lewis added, may or may not be something similar to what the YN is proposing.

John Ferguson said, from the perspective of Chairman of this forum, the group is still only in the discussion phase. He said the topic has been raised, a couple of frameworks have been discussed, and there is the ASA Pacific Lamprey Management Plan to consider. He said the Aquatic SWG has expressed that they believe translocation may be feasible based on other efforts, and everyone seems willing to further discuss this. He said, as for next steps, Douglas PUD has requested that the Aquatic SWG focus on risk and genetics issues and confirm everyone is on the same page. He said this includes discussing the logistics of trap and haul and associated issues. He also recalled the use of hatcheries had been mentioned, all of which are on the table for discussion. He said, so far, this topic has been carried forward to keep the discussion moving, and eventually it will become apparent what the group wants to do and what will work. He said he believes the topic is still vague and may not be ready to go to the Commissioners. He suggested convening a subgroup (e.g., himself, Bob Rose, and Andrew Gingerich) to develop an outline for discussion. Ferguson suggested the subgroup would identify key topics for discussion, then organize those topics to present to the Aquatic SWG and facilitate discussion until there is more clarity. He said at that point, it may be clearer how Douglas PUD can be a part of the broader effort.

Jason McLellan noted that the YN have already completed lamprey translocation in the Methow Basin, and he asked how that affects the Aquatic SWG. Lewis said he was unaware of this. Chas Kyger agreed with McLellan, recalling that the YN recently released hundreds of translocated lamprey in the Methow Basin, including in the mainstem Methow River and at the mouth of the Chewuch River. He said he only received vague details of these releases after the fact. Ferguson asked about the source, and McLellan said he understood the fish were captured at Priest Rapids Dam; however, McLellan said that needs confirmation. He added that he heard this secondhand from Kirk Truscott. He said he understands there were three releases; however, to his knowledge, the CCT were not notified, and there was no discussion of this within this forum. He said he is interested in hearing Aquatic SWG members' perspectives on how the recent YN releases fit within this group.

Gingerich said from Douglas PUD's perspective, the PUD has a responsibility to implement the ASA Pacific Lamprey Management Plan collaboratively with regional agencies and tribes. He said if other management actions take place outside the Wells Project area, including upstream in the Methow and Chewuch rivers, realistically Douglas PUD has no say in those actions. He said he would like to think the intent is to be collaborative; however, it is really not the purview of Douglas PUD because the action did not take place within the project boundary.

Ferguson asked if there is typically a permitting process, or coordination with USFWS, for these translocation efforts, and Lewis said there typically is. Ferguson said perhaps this was somewhat bad form to release without coordination. Patrick Verhey noted that there was some

level of coordination via the Chelan PUD Pacific Lamprey Workgroup, which, Verhey noted, Truscott attended. Verhey recalled Rose indicating directly that the YN would like to work with the CCT, and Truscott indicating that he will take the request back to the CCT policy folks. Verhey said, therefore, this was brought up for discussion, so it is not a surprise to him that it occurred. He added that he is not aware of dates, permitting, or amounts; however, he does not believe it is fair to characterize the release as a surprise.

Verhey said he believes the Aquatic SWG would be interested in the age and year of fish released, along with other fish data and M&E details. He questioned where these fish will want to spawn and rear, and noted that there will be similar questions as discussed in the Chelan PUD and Grant PUD forums with regard to data gaps and No-Net-Impact types of projects. He recalled concerns that no pheromone signals are coming from upstream of Wells Dam, and suggested the potential is there to establish pheromone signals for these fish.

The Aquatic SWG agreed that next steps should include Rose providing details on the recent YN lamprey translocation releases in the Methow Basin, including details regarding M&E planning, during the Aquatic SWG conference call on November 12, 2015.

Gingerich agreed with Verhey; however, expressed disappointment, as the YN releases changes the outline discussed for how to approach lamprey translocation. Gingerich said perhaps a discussion on biology and risks is no longer needed since translocating is already happening. He said he thought the Aquatic SWG agreed to first discuss these things. Verhey agreed with Gingerich, and said hopefully having a discussion with Rose will ensure that everyone is better informed in the future. Lewis agreed with Gingerich, as well, and noted that even though the recent YN translocation occurred outside the Wells Project, he feels it still has implications to the Wells Project. Lewis said he would like to keep lamprey translocation as an agenda item for further discussion. He added that the RRF and PRFF developed lamprey recommendations and suggested forwarding those to the Aquatic SWG to help guide discussions as they progress. He said he will coordinate with Tracy Hillman, RRF and PRFF Chairperson, regarding possibly distributing RRF and PRFF lamprey recommendations to the Aquatic SWG for consideration. *(Note: Lewis provided the RRF and PRFF lamprey recommendations to the Aquatic SWG on October 19, 2015.)*

Ferguson said discussion on potential lamprey translocation and tagging opportunities will continue during the Aquatic SWG conference call on November 12, 2015.

Douglas PUD 2016 Lamprey Study (Andrew Gingerich): Andrew Gingerich said with November quickly approaching, Douglas PUD has begun discussions about dewatering the Wells Dam fishways for the annual winter maintenance. He said maintenance will include installation of the Aquatic SWG-approved lamprey entrance boxes, as well as installation of additional PIT-tag

detectors throughout the Wells Dam fishways. He said he wanted to remind the Aquatic SWG that installation of the boxes and additional PIT-tag detection is still planned, with the intention to conduct a follow-up lamprey radio-telemetry study in 2016. Chas Kyger recalled that the 2015 Lamprey Study was delayed due to complications with constructing the lamprey entrance boxes. He added that he will provide a recap and overview on the progress of the ongoing Douglas PUD Lamprey Study during the Aquatic SWG conference call on November 12, 2015.

Grant PUD 2015 Lamprey Study (Andrew Gingerich): Andrew Gingerich said, this year, Grant PUD acoustically tagged and released a series of fish captured at Priest Rapids Dam, and now Douglas PUD has the opportunity to track these fish. Gingerich said the fish are double-tagged with an acoustic tag and a full duplex (FDX) PIT-tag. He said fish will be tracked using Vemco VR2W acoustic receivers, which are designed to track lamprey and sturgeon carrying acoustic tags. He said, to his knowledge, he is not aware of other lamprey studies implementing acoustic tags detections, nor this double-tag methodology with PIT-tags. He said Douglas PUD's most recent acoustic download was a while ago, and at that time, no fish had been detected in the Wells tailrace or above Wells Dam. He said he believes this study was shared during a PRFF meeting, and wanted to let the Aquatic SWG know Douglas PUD is also tracking these fish.

VII. Next Meetings

1. **Upcoming meetings** (John Ferguson): Andrew Gingerich noted that the next Aquatic SWG meeting lands on Veteran's Day, which is an observed holiday off for Douglas PUD. Patrick Verhey suggested rescheduling the meeting to the following day. Aquatic SWG members agreed to reschedule the Aquatic SWG meeting on November 11 to November 12, 2015, to accommodate the Veteran's Day holiday.

The Aquatic SWG meeting on November 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: December 9, 2015 (TBD); January 13, 2016 (TBD); and February 10, 2016 (TBD).

List of Attachments

Attachment A – List of Attendees

Attachment A List of Attendees

Name	Role	Organization
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
Patrick Verhey	Aquatic SWG Technical Representative	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Jason McLellan	Aquatic SWG Technical Representative	Colville Confederated Tribes