



Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee Meeting

In person at Douglas PUD and Webex
Tuesday, March 28, 2023
9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

PRCC Representatives and Alternatives

Curt Dotson, Tom Dresser (Alt), GPUD
Kirk Truscott, Casey Baldwin (Alt), CTCR
Tom Skiles, CTUIR
Scott Carlon, Justin Yeager (Alt), NMFS

Jim Craig, Bill Gale (Alt) USFWS
Chad Jackson, A. Murdoch (Alt) WDFW
Keely Murdoch, Brandon Rogers (Alt), YN

Meeting Attendees

Bryan Nordlund, Facilitator
Larissa Rohrbach, Anchor QEA
Tom Skiles, CTUIR
Tom Lorz, CTUIR
Curt Dotson, GPUD
Tom Dresser, GPUD
Rod O'Connor, GPUD

Tim Taylor, GPUD
Scott Carlon, NMFS
Jim Craig, USFWS
Chad Jackson, WDFW
Andrew Murdoch WDFW
Keely Murdoch, YN

Actions Items

- Request for K. Truscott to coordinate a presentation by CTCR on 2022 Northern Pike Removal Efforts.
- Tom Skiles will confirm that Brett Hull will serve as the Policy Representative for the CTUIR.
- Draft Policy Representative meeting presentations will be provided to subcommittees for discussion in their May meetings.
- T. Dresser will prepare a brief summary of potential insurance requirements for NNI Fund or Habitat Subcommittee Funded projects to inform potential contractors that may bid on those types of projects.

Review Items

- The PRCC Policy Representative meeting presentations were distributed to the PRCC and to the subcommittees on April 18, for discussion in the May meetings. Comments should be submitted no later than 30 days following the May meetings.

Decisions and Approvals

- The PRCC approved additional NNI funding (H601) of \$8,746 for Real Time Research (RTR) on Avian Predation on ESA-listed Juvenile Salmonids on the Middle Columbia River, 2023 to apply toward increased insurance premiums since approval of the original proposal.

I. Welcome, Announcements and Agenda Review

- B. Nordlund welcomed everyone to the meeting.
- Tom Skiles has accepted a new job as Water Master for the Klamath Basin. Tom Lorz will stand in as the representative to the PRCC for the CTUIR. The PRCC congratulated T. Skiles on his new position. Tom Lorz will take on Tom Skiles' role as a Spill Committee Representative.
- No changes to the agenda were requested.

II. Meeting Minutes Status

- The February 28 PRCC meeting minutes were distributed by Larissa Rohrbach by email on March 14, 2023, with comments due by March 27. The PRCC approved the February 28 minutes without new revisions.

III. Actions Items Review

- Request for K. Truscott to coordinate a presentation by CTCR on 2022 Northern Pike Removal Efforts.
 - K. Truscott said he has spoken to staff and is waiting for responses.
- C. Dotson will inquire with RTR whether comments on the draft 2022 Avian Predation Report should be shared in a meeting prior to the next PRCC meeting.
 - RTR presented their report and the PRCC provided feedback during a special meeting held on March 21. This topic will be discussed further in today's meeting.
- K. Truscott will identify a PRCC Policy Representative for the CTCR.
 - Joe Peone has responded to serve as Policy Representative for the CTCR.
- C. Dotson will distribute comments on the revised draft survival study plan with Grant PUD responses.

- Two sets of comments and responses were forwarded to the PRCC on March 27.

IV. PRCC Policy meeting planning – timing, format, discussion.

B. Nordlund has proposed to hold meetings of the Policy Representatives once per year to provide overview of PRCC activities, and additional meetings can be called for considering specific topics at any time during the year. The format for the annual meeting will be a 6-hour meeting including lunch. Potential dates include June 20, or the weeks of July 10, or July 17. B. Nordlund has been reaching out to individual representatives to confirm availability. T. Dresser will respond to B. Nordlund with Grant PUD's preferences.

B. Nordlund proposed that PRCC Policy Representative meeting presentations which have been prepared by Grant PUD should be reviewed by the subcommittees ahead of the meeting. K. Truscott supported the idea and said he will brief his Policy Representative, Joe Peone, ahead of the meeting. C. Jackson, J. Craig and S. Carlon agreed to that approach. K. Murdoch said she supports that idea but would go further, and asked for the opportunity for subcommittee members to be able to offer comments on those presentations if they feel something is missing, or should be presented differently. B. Nordlund said he asked Tracy Hillman, the facilitator of several subcommittees, to receive direct feedback on the presentations at the subcommittee meetings. Consensus on the content of the presentations could be vetted within the subcommittees. J. Craig asked that adequate lead-time be given to PRCC and subcommittee members to provide that feedback and for Grant PUD to make those revisions ahead of the Policy Representatives meeting.

B. Nordlund confirmed the list of Policy Representatives: Joe Peone for CTCR, Ritchie Graves for NMFS, Jim Craig and Bill Gale for USFWS, Brock Hoenes for WDFW, and David Blodgett III for Yakama Nation. Tom Skiles will reach out to Brett Hall as representative for the CTUIR.

Draft presentations for the Policy meeting will be provided to the PRCC and its Subcommittees for discussion in their May meetings.

V. Steelhead Fallback and Overshoots – ongoing coordination and discussion.

C. Jackson said no additional presentation of data is planned for today's meeting. Grant PUD is already implementing fall spill unlike upstream projects. WDFW recommends that going forward, recommendations would be brought through this committee when some conclusion is reached on what the science is telling us to support any decision to implement spill differently. If there are any questions, we are ready to receive those.

B. Nordlund asked about the status of WDFW's review of the science specific to Grant PUD's projects, given the presentations provided over the past two months.

A. Murdoch said there is currently an action item from the HCP Coordinating Committees to update the timeline for the data collected through 2022, and to update the data to account for harvest below and above Wells Dam. At the Priest Rapids projects (Priest Rapids Dam [PRD] and Wanapum Dam [WAN]), Grant PUD is already

implementing close to 75 days of spill; we are trying to evaluate whether that is the best can be done or if there are some adjustments that may improve fallback success. Most importantly, the goal is to do the best we can as a region to get fallbacks successfully down below PRD; not necessarily back to their natal stream which would be an overreach of the mid and upper Columbia agreements. It would help for all the dams to provide some spill. The large majority of overshoots that are ascending over PRD are passing back below PRD; in general, project specific conversion rates (at PRD and WAN) are fairly high. Its will never be 100% of the fish, and there is not a target or a survival standard. An adaptive management approach could be taken to test if adjustments to spill implementation can be made to achieve a maximum overshoot/fallback success within the current paradigm at Grant PUD's projects. S. Carlon asked if the fall spill obligation is included in Grant PUD's Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) license; C. Dotson confirmed it is a license condition, and said the associated Biological Opinion (BiOp) from NMFS includes dates for when spill would start and end. Because it's part of the BiOp and FERC license, there could be an amendment needed to make changes. T. Dresser said if there is consensus in this group it would need to be documented in a Statement of Agreement (SOA), and would require an amendment to the BiOP, then Grant PUD would have to communicate with FERC to determine if a license amendment would be needed. There is a specific table on page 78 of Grant PUD's license that lists changes that would require Grant PUD to file a license amendment. For example, Grant PUD has to seek approval from FERC to change the hatchery production numbers. B. Nordlund said the science would have to be solid to support a recommended change, however perhaps there could be room for changes in a single year to test assumptions.

B. Nordlund asked if there is anything the PRCC can do to continue the conversation. C. Jackson said at this time WDFW is not requesting anything from the PRCC. In the coming months after the dataset is updated WDFW will bring that information back to this committee. In the future, WDFW will seek consensus from the PRCC on recommendations. A. Murdoch said it may be that NMFS got it right in the BiOP, but we don't know until a change is made and evaluated. One way to adjust spill operations might to adjust spill dates.

B. Nordlund asked if it's known whether water temperature or other water conditions influence fallback. A. Murdoch said several years ago a study was done by Townsend and Skalski that evaluated categorical factors affecting fallback, however they did not create an individual-based model which would better answer this question. What we have inferred from our observations is that fallback is primarily driven by water temperature. We do not have information on what causes a fish to go all the way above Wells Dam rather than just above PRD, and what makes them turn back around, and there is variability across years. A lot of the information we have about fallbacks is based on PIT tagging rates in natal streams; we assume that PIT tagging rates have been declining over time with the sunseting of the Integrated Status and Effectiveness Project (ISEMP) or other monitoring programs. A. Murdoch said, a recommendation I've made over 15 years would be to maintain consistent tagging rates to inform these data, to better understand the magnitude of the overshoot problem, and make better management decisions. There hasn't really been any adaptive management done in the Federal hydrosystem either; there is a spill program in place but we haven't seen a formal plan on how the Federal projects will be managing that process. Until that

happens, the current data incorporate the actions that Grant PUD has been taking. To tease out a treatment effect of the Grant PUD projects it may be better to evaluate those specific actions sooner than later before additional changes are made at other projects.

S. Carlon asked if steelhead from the Deschutes and Klickitat Rivers overshoot. A. Murdoch answered that no, they don't overshoot, and those are cold water systems. Fish from other tributaries do especially if they are warm water rivers heavily impacted by irrigation withdrawal like the Yakima River.

C. Dotson said regarding operational changes; there are a lot of different participants to involve, and Grant PUD is having internal discussions on discussions to date.

K. Truscott said he appreciates the dialogue on the adaptive management construct, however a key question would be to understand what can be done without an amendment to the license. T. Dresser said that will be determined in discussions with FERC; typically the need for license amendment would occur if there is exposure risk with third parties based on alignment with what's drafted in the Priest Rapids Settlement Agreement and FERC documents. B. Nordlund noted that the direction from the PRCC, documented in SOAs, would be important to support those conversations as well.

VI. Survival study planning – ongoing coordination and discussion.

C. Dotson said Grant PUD is working on an updated version of their survival study plan, Version 3.0 which is still in draft form, but incorporates comments received in October 2022. In response to feedback, the following changes were made:

- The timespan of studies was expanded from 2025 through 2027 to allow for annual check-ins on results based on our requirements. The initial years address steelhead and yearling Chinook salmon. Sockeye salmon will be incorporated into the updated version of the study plan.
- The number of detection points between Rock Island Dam (RIS) and PRD were increased. Array locations were added at Crescent Bar, Sunland Estates, Beverly Bridge, Matawa, Vantage Bridge and the WAN forebay to segment the PRD project into components that can be analyzed separately.
- Appendices will be added to describe the surgical methods and husbandry, and statistical approach.

K. Truscott asked if there is a compiled document with comments and responses to written comments provided on the Word documents and to comments made in meetings. He said he does not want to make the process onerous, however it may be helpful in the future if questions arise about why the study was implemented in a certain way. C. Dotson said a summation of comments can be added to the back of the study plan that shows what the comment was, the response, and the action.

B. Nordlund asked if the next step would be to issue a formal draft for members to comment on. C. Dotson said yes, but this will be a living document for a time. Version

3.0 will include an ongoing spreadsheet of comments and responses, and issues can be continue to be discussed within PRCC.

K. Truscott, K. Murdoch, and C. Jackson thanked Grant PUD for their early engagement with the PRCC which made for easier discussions. C. Dotson said Grant PUD needed the lead time to prepare for the studies as well. Due to supply chain issues a longer lead time to order equipment like data loggers which will allow suppliers to obtain better prices; they are still needing 8-14 months lead-time to obtain the electronics, and prices are continually rising.

C. Dotson said when there is a final draft study plan, an SOA will be drafted to seek agreement to ensure there is understanding and consensus on expectations ahead of the study being implemented. The study would commence in April of 2025.

S. Carlon asked about concerns around flows controlled at Grand Coulee Dam and potential effects on survival study implementation. K. Truscott said this study would not be affected by issues that are occurring now, in water year 2023, however flow duration curves could be affected by dry water years. In the HCP-CC there are concerns about turbine repairs needed at Grant Coulee Dam which will cause them to release less water this spring, combined with low snow water equivalent this year such that flows from the upper Columbia River may be meagre in April and May, affecting the 2023 Rocky Reach Dam Confirmation Survival Study. If that was to happen during Grant PUD's study, the question is how would we deal with it. In theory, if there are low flow water years, or if there are changes in hydrosystem operations like turbine repairs, a study could not be conducted. T. Skiles asked if there are unfavorable pre-season flow forecasts whether the HCP Coordinating Committee will use those forecasts to decide whether they will implement those survival studies. K. Truscott said that is a decision that Chelan PUD will have to make; the risk is that the HCP-CC will later decide that the results are invalid due to having been conducted during a year that falls outside the normal operations. C. Dotson asked for Chelan PUD's study, is it Chelan PUD or the HCP-CC that decide if the study is valid or not? K. Truscott said he does not know, but there have been some cases in the past where studies were invalidated due to flow conditions. T. Dresser said in 1996 and 1997 there were some steelhead studies invalidated due to avian predation. During the 2014 drawdown of the Wanapum Pool there was not enough mixing of treatment fish and the control group, and the detection site was moved down to PRD. By chance, there were detection points just below Ringold Hatchery so the PRCC did invalidate the initial detection site but went ahead and accepted the downstream detection site to save the survival study.

R. O'Connor noted that discussions within Grant PUD have focused on concern that flows are still locked up as snow.

VII. New GPUD requirement for insurance for funded projects – brief follow-up.

T. Dresser provided additional background information on insurance coverage increases regarding the NNI and habitat contracts that are put in place on behalf of the PRCC and PRCC-Habitat Subcommittee (SC). He said that questions from PRCC Habitat SC members and contractors have come up on why additional liability insurance coverages and coverage limits have increased. T. Dresser reported that the primarily reason is due to an increase in the number of insurance claims, settlements related to

those claims, and cost increases industry-wide. This is information coming from insurance underwriters that Grant PUD works with, as well as direct experience, and the experiences of other PUDs. In addition, there are different risk tolerances between the different PUDs, so others may tolerate more risk than Grant PUD.

T. Dresser explained that standard coverage for the Habitat SC and NNI Fund contracts has always included general liability, workman's compensation, and automobile insurance. In the past year, the other insurances that have been required included excess umbrella, watercraft, professional liability, and pollution liability. Depending on complexity and potential risk of life and limb several of these insurances may be carried by a contractor before they can carry out work for Grant PUD. The required coverage of the excess umbrella alone can range from \$1 to \$10 million. It's also been standard for Grant PUD to require contractors to also carry up from \$1 to \$5 million for watercraft, \$1 million for professional liability, and \$1 million for pollution. Some entities may be self-insured and can add the insurance products as needed, but others may not be able to do that due to their perceived risk by their specific insurer. T. Dresser said he and C. Dotson do have some ability to work internally to determine what adequate coverage is, we are the liaison between the contractors and risk and procurement staff within Grant PUD. For instance, Grant PUD staff has been able to "right-size" watercraft coverage based on the complexity of the project; where work is to be completed, conditions under which boat work will occur, type and size of watercraft, and number of people on the boat.

T. Dresser continued that the concern within the Habitat SC is that these increases in insurance requirements may result in some contractors or vendors being unable to secure the required coverage and/or they had not anticipated a need for additional coverages and therefore did not initially include these costs in proposed budgets, which required Grant PUD to go back to the subcommittee to request approval for changes. Grant PUD is sharing this information with the PRCC to explain that there may be an additional line item within a budget for various insurance coverages, or additional requests for funds in the future.

B. Nordlund asked if there were specific situations where those insurance requirements would be waved. T. Dresser said yes, the insurance needs are determined based on the type of project, complexity, potential for loss of life and limb, pollution, etc. A contractor working in, over, or around water within the boat restricted zone at WAN might have stacked umbrella coverage of \$20 million, whereas the meeting facilitator would not be required to have much of that coverage. C. Dotson said the risk and insurance staff at Grant PUD make the ultimate decision on what coverage to require.

K. Murdoch asked for clarification if this is just for NNI Fund and Habitat SC projects or for all contracts, such as smolt trap operations? T. Dresser said this is for all contracts that Grant PUD would issue.

K. Truscott asked if Grant PUD could provide a summary of expected types of insurance that may be required for subcontractors. T. Dresser said he could prepare a brief summary of typical insurance requirements but would caution that we do not have the final say within Grant PUD. B. Nordlund asked if there is something that should be provided to the contractors before they start bidding. T. Dresser said that has not

happened in the past, and Grant PUD representatives are trying to become more experienced in what the insurance requirements may be on new contracts to proactively inform representatives to the Committees and contractors.

K. Truscott asked, if a subcontractor has an adequate level of liability insurance, do they also have to include Grant PUD as being insured for risk on the project? He noted that under some contracts, the CTCR has had to list the utilities as also insured. T. Dresser said Grant PUD have not previously required the contractors to add Grant PUD to their policies. (After the meeting Dresser, noted he would confirm this with Grant PUD's procurement staff).

C. Dotson said, after Real Time Research's (RTR's) 2023 contract was approved based on last year's budget and insurance coverages, Grant PUD changed the insurance requirements. Required coverages were increased for watercraft coverage from \$2 million to \$5 million and umbrella coverage from \$1 million to \$5 million. C. Dotson asked if the PRCC would approve funding for the additional premium charges which were an additional \$8,746 this year. J. Craig said that is not a large sum for this size of project, but it's a cost that was not anticipated at the time and said he could approve. K. Truscott said because RTR was the only competitor, he can approve. All PRCC representatives approved the addition RTR's budget from the NNI Fund (H06) based on the assumption the additional budget is to be applied to insurance premiums.

VIII. Draft Real Time Research Report and Presentation

K. Murdoch reminded the PRCC that she had raised some concerns with Real Time Research's (RTR's) 2022 Draft Annual Report on Avian Predation in the Columbia River Basin, specifically with Appendix B, summarizing predation rates on steelhead smolts by hatchery-origin versus wild fish. Estimates that the wild component of the run ranged from 20% to 25% did not ring true. A sizeable component of the hatchery-origin fish from the upper Columbia Basin are not externally marked, or adipose-fin present (ad-present) and were not being scanned for coded wire tags (CWTs) during the past years of study.

Since the March 21 special meeting to hear RTR's presentation, K. Murdoch assembled the various data sets showing proportions of wild smolts from the upper Columbia River tributaries, and shared a spreadsheet with PRCC representatives on Monday, March 27 summarizing this information. K. Murdoch stated that based on existing datasets, the average wild smolt production is always under 10%; there are confidence intervals that are not shown, but year to year the average is under 10%. There is either a problem with the ad-present fish being called wild, or a problem of selecting for wild fish at RIS. In most years, the proportion of ad-present hatchery-origin fish from upstream programs is slightly higher than what RTR is calling wild fish, which indicates that RTR or the other contractors collecting the fish for the avian predation study are correctly identifying a lot of the samples.

K. Murdoch said she does want to share this information with Q. Payton so RTR is aware of it. The data sources are all listed on the first tab of the spreadsheet shared today. Murdoch said she was one of the parties, along with WDFW, that requested the comparison between hatchery and wild fish in the 2022 report, but now would recommend that RTR remove Appendix B from this report because of doubts in the

verity of the identification of fish as wild, or alternatively RTR could change the data labels in Appendix B to “ad-clipped” versus “ad-present,” but that may be misleading because they are making the correct call some of the time. Moving forward, K. Murdoch said all steelhead PIT tagged for the avian predation study should be scanned for CWT during collection at RIS. C. Dotson confirmed that CWT scanning is being done on smolts that are being PIT-tagged at RIS this year for the avian predation evaluation.

B. Nordlund asked if all steelhead smolts from the upper Columbia River tributaries have CWTs. K. Murdoch said yes, all ad-present hatchery steelhead have a CWT, and then a tag-retention rate of less 100% is determined by a Monitoring and Evaluation crew that evaluates for tag loss. There would be a very small amount of error because of that tag loss, but that can be corrected for. C. Jackson said the objective is always to tag 100% of smolts.

T. Dresser said he understands that based on the information that RTR looked at information one way that may not be accurate; but is not comfortable asking to exclude analyses that have already been performed at the request of the PRCC. K. Murdoch said that they requested the analysis using 2022 data and did not specifically request a retrospective analysis of data that already existed, however one of the problems appears that they were not able to correctly identify wild fish because they or their contractors were not actually scanning for CWTs.

K. Murdoch said at the last meeting RTR seemed excited to use hatchery program PIT tag data to evaluate whether there are different predation rates on different hatchery stocks. There are a wide variety of rearing and release groups emerging from the different hatcheries; if we had that information we may be able to adaptively manage those programs to reduce the impact of predation. As an NNI-funded project all parties will want these data to be made more useful to managers to focus their efforts.

J. Craig suggested properly caveating and footnoting Appendix B to keep the existing data in the report, but ensuring study fish are scanned for CWTs in this year’s study.

B. Nordlund asked if there is a chance RTR are missing some hatchery programs in their sample, due to staggered hatchery release dates. C. Dotson asked if it is possible that the RIS collection facility is biased slightly toward wild fish.

A. Murdoch said Chelan PUD has never been able to quantify passage efficiency at the RIS juvenile bypass, and its unknown if collections at RIS represents the complete run of a given DPS or ESU or what factors influence collection efficiency at RIS, which differs in design from the other bypasses. Conceptually, by the time fish arrive at RIS, Wenatchee steelhead should be overrepresented to some degree because they are closest in proximity, they enter the river on the same bank as the bypass, and they have no other hydroprojects to pass through upstream of RIS. It would be expected that the Entiat and Methow steelhead would be slightly underrepresented in the collection, and even more for the Okanogan steelhead which have a long distance to travel and 2 projects to pass through upstream of RIS. A. Murdoch shared data (shown in slides shared during the meeting) about the proportion of various populations represented in RIS bypass monitoring. The hatchery and wild Wenatchee steelhead populations appear greatly underrepresented and Okanogan steelhead appear greatly overrepresented, which is not logical.

C. Dotson asked if there should be a correction factor applied based on PIT tags that are observed at RIS. A. Murdoch said annual adjustments would have to be made for each year independently. There is a very low recapture rate overall at RIS, less than 1%. Expanding the catch by a 1% sample rate results in a run size that is 4 to 5 times higher than what we've ever measured in monitoring. What we've heard from RTR in the past is they want to tag at RIS because it includes the Wenatchee River component of the DPS compared to tagging at Rocky Reach Dam, but we are not sure if the RIS capture is representative. There are two needs to better inform avian predation rates, scanning for CWTs at collection for PIT tagging, and understanding if the samples at the RIS bypass are representative of the run. It may be time to truly evaluate whether juvenile collection at RIS is representative of given populations.

C. Dotson said the data assembled by RTR are the best available for now and A. Murdoch agreed. C. Dotson suggested, because the report is nearly final, adding a note to Appendix B that the fish are presumed wild, but with an asterisk about the potential misidentification of ad-present fish. K. Murdoch said she would be more comfortable if the labeling was changed to ad-present or ad-absent, or to withhold Appendix B until we are sure they really represent hatchery versus wild fish. C. Dotson will coordinate with RTR to suggest revisions to the Appendix B. C. Dotson said based on comments from Quinn Payton (RTR), they are interested in more data if it can be provided.

T. Lorz asked if the CWT tagging rates have always been so high for upper Columbia River steelhead. K. Murdoch said, in the upper Columbia River tributaries, all hatchery program tags fish with either CWTs or are ad-clipped; for those fish that are ad present, they are always tagged with CWTs.

B. Nordlund thanked everyone for the discussion.

IX. Fish Passage Operations Report

Fish ladder inspections

No updates at this time.

Fish spill updates

No updates until fish-spill is reinitiated in spring 2023.

Fish counts for 2022

No updates until fish counts are reinitiated in April 2023.

Updates

X. Review of Outstanding NNI Funded Projects

- **Lower Wenatchee Instream Flow Enhancement Project Phase II.** No update.
- **Northern Pike Removal (2022-2024).** Kirk Truscott will coordinate a presentation for a future meeting.

- **WDFW PIT tag detection barge.** C. Jackson and A. Murdoch will provide a presentation in mid-summer, following the 2023 yearling outmigration, focused on detection results and overwinter survival.
- **2022 RTR Avian Predation study.** Discussed in today’s meeting.
- **2023 RTR Avian Predation study.** Will kick off this month.

XI. Sub-Committee Updates.

B. Nordlund has forwarded the latest subcommittee distributions he has received to date via email to PRCC members and alternates.

- Priest Rapids Fish Forum – next meeting is May 3.
- Habitat Subcommittee – next meeting is April 13.
- Fall Chinook Work Group – next meeting is May 2.
- Hatchery Subcommittee – next meeting is April 19.

XII. SOAs discussed in 2023

SOA number	Key words	Last Discussed	Status
2022-03	Fish Mode revision	January 24, 2023	Closed
2023-01	Sockeye Salmon Program	January 24, 2023	Closed
2022-02	Hatchery Production Objectives, 2024-2033	February 28, 2023	Closed

XIII. Next Meetings

The next PRCC meetings are scheduled for April 25, May 23, and June 27 at 9 a.m., in person at the Douglas PUD Auditorium and on Webex.