

Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee (PRCC) Meeting

**In Person at Wanapum Hydro Office Building
and Microsoft Teams
Tuesday, September 23, 2025
1:15 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.**

Meeting Minutes

PRCC Representatives, Alternates, and Facilitation

Tom Dresser, Rod O'Connor (Alt),	Keely Murdoch, Brandon Rogers (Alt), YN
Tim Taylor (Alt), GPUD	Tom Lorz, Pete McHugh (Alt), CRITFC
Scott Carlon, NMFS	Clayton Buck, Wanapum
Bill Gale, USFWS	Larissa Rohrbach, Anchor QEA, Facilitator
Chad Jackson, Andrew Murdoch (Alt), WDFW	Kristi Geris, Anchor QEA, Technical Support
Kirk Truscott, Casey Baldwin (Alt), CTCR	

Meeting Attendees

Larissa Rohrbach, Anchor QEA, Facilitator	Tim Taylor, GPUD
Kristi Geris, Anchor QEA, Technical Support	Scott Carlon, NMFS
Kirk Truscott, CTCR	Chad Jackson, WDFW
Pete McHugh, CRITFC	Andrew Murdoch, WDFW
Tom Dresser, GPUD	Bill Gale, USFWS
Rod O'Connor, GPUD	Keely Murdoch, YN

Action Items

- L. Rohrbach will work with T. Dresser to identify proposed dates for a PRCC Policy Committee meeting, including a timeline for materials preparation. (*This item is ongoing*).
- Grant PUD will develop a draft Conceptual Approach Statement of Agreement (SOA) with revisions to the Guiding Principles to move forward (i.e., Nos. 1 to 3) and an updated background section to clearly identify and explain unresolved discussion topics (i.e., Guiding Principles Nos. 4 to 7),¹ for discussion during the

¹ Based on the draft *Conceptual Approach to Evaluating Survival Study Outcomes* (Path Forward – Conceptual Discussion Document), last distributed on September 2.

PRCC meeting on October 28. (Note: A draft PRCC SOA was distributed to the PRCC by K. Geris on October 21, 2025.)

- Grant PUD will respond to edits by the Joint Fisheries Parties (JFP) to the draft SOA *Decoupling Summer Subyearling Survival Estimates From Juvenile Steelhead Survival Estimates* for discussion during the PRCC meeting on October 28. (Note: A revised SOA was distributed to the PRCC by K. Geris on October 21, 2025.)
- PRCC representatives will review the draft *White River Spring Chinook Program Public Outreach and Stakeholder Engagement Guide* and suggest edits to the stakeholder list, populate Table 1, and provide feedback on the talking points for discussion during the PRCC meeting on October 28, 2025.

Review Items

- The second revised draft SOA, *Decoupling Summer Subyearling Survival Estimates From Juvenile Steelhead Survival Estimates*, was distributed to the PRCC by K. Geris on October 21, 2025.
- A draft *White River Spring Chinook Program Public Outreach and Stakeholder Engagement Guide* was distributed to the PRCC by K. Geris on September 22.
- The draft PRCC SOA, *Survival Evaluations - Path Forward*, was distributed to the PRCC by K. Geris on October 21, 2025.

Decisions and Approvals

- None.

I. Subyearling Workshop Recap (Joint Session 9 with Habitat Conservation Plan Coordinating Committee)

The PRCC and Habitat Conservation Plan Coordinating Committee (HCP-CC) convened Joint Session 9 to discuss the 2024 Subyearling Chinook Salmon Workshop (see separate joint session minutes).

II. Welcome, Announcements, Agenda Review, and Meeting Minutes Approval

L. Rohrbach welcomed the PRCC and reviewed the agenda. No additions or changes were requested by PRCC members, and the agenda was approved by all parties in attendance.

The draft August 26 PRCC meeting minutes were distributed by K. Geris on September 8. One edit was received. The revised minutes were distributed on September 22. A second set of revised minutes were distributed later that same day. The PRCC reviewed all edits. The minutes were approved by members who attended that meeting. C. Jackson abstained because he did not attend the August 26 meeting.

III. Actions Items Review

Action items from the PRCC August 26 meeting and follow-up discussions were as follows (*Note: Italicized text corresponds to agenda items from the August 26 meeting.*):

- *L. Rohrbach will work with T. Dresser to identify proposed dates for a PRCC Policy Committee meeting, including a timeline for materials preparation.*
This item is ongoing.
- *Grant PUD will develop a first draft of talking points for the White River hatchery program assessment process for engaging with the public.*
A draft White River Spring Chinook Program Public Outreach and Stakeholder Engagement Guide was distributed to the PRCC by K. Geris on September 22.
This will be discussed during today's meeting.
- *Grant PUD will inquire internally with Public Affairs about obtaining assistance with developing a community outreach plan for the White River hatchery program assessment process.*
This will be discussed during today's meeting.
- *PRCC representatives will consider consistency of the guiding principles with the Salmon and Steelhead Settlement Agreement (SSSA) in the Conceptual Approach to Evaluating Survival Study Outcomes (Path Forward – Conceptual Discussion Document) and will prepare for additional discussion on mitigation-related guiding principles (Nos. 4 to 7) during the PRCC September 23, 2025, meeting.*
This will be discussed during today's meeting.
- *PRCC representatives contributing edits to the Path Forward – Conceptual Discussion Document will include citations for specific SSSA sections.*
This will be discussed during today's meeting.
- *PRCC representatives will consider modifications, if any, needed to approve the draft SOA Decoupling Summer Subyearling Survival Estimates From Juvenile Steelhead Survival Estimates for discussion during the PRCC September 23, 2025, meeting.*
This will be discussed during today's meeting.
- *Grant PUD will inquire with Real Time Research (RTR) about an interim update on the 2025 RTR Avian Predation Study, Objective 4.1.*
T. Dresser recalled questions for the PRCC from RTR, and that clarification was provided by Grant PUD and A. Murdoch. Allen Evans (RTR) requested that any further clarification from the PRCC be received as soon as possible. A. Evans committed to being available at the October meeting to provide an update on the Objective 4.1 analysis, as well as an overview of what has been analyzed to date

under the overall No Net Impact (NNI) funded evaluation. L. Rohrbach shared on Microsoft Teams these questions and clarifications:²

1. For wild yearling Chinook, releases occur nearly year-round. Is there a cutoff date (s) where we can assume that fish will be out-migrating in a specific year (e.g., fish with release dates from November 2024 to May 2025 out-migrated in 2025)? Fish that hold-over are problematic for a variety of reasons, so we're hoping for criteria that is definitive in terms of assigning a migration year to wild smolts. Grant PUD (Rod): • Tim and I use the following criteria to identify yearling spring Chinook smolts: ◦ NOR spring Chinook with last PIT detections in the Wenatchee basin before July 1 are yearling smolts ◦ NOR spring Chinook with last PIT detections in the Wenatchee basin after July 1 are hold-overs that will migrate the following year. • Most NOR summer Chinook migrate out as subyearlings. I don't have a suggestion for identifying the yearling migrant summers. • I'm sure PRCC reps will also provide guidance but wanted to share how GPUD approaches this question in the context of M&E work. WDFW (Andrew): The proposed approach seems consistent with the data. yearling summers are lumped with yearling springers. Only about 2%. Minor life history from natal tribes. 2. In what year was the Lower Wenatchee Barge fully operational for detections? We'll start sleuthing models that incorporate these detections the first year the barge was fully operational. WDFW (Andrew): Really only CY 2024 and 2025.

K. Murdoch said the term “holdover” is confusing. Would this more appropriately be a subyearling? The July 1 cutoff is good for yearlings, and anything after would be a subyearling that would probably overwinter somewhere. She suggested clarifying this with RTR. L. Rohrbach said it depends what RTR is doing with these data. R. O'Connor was also treating the term “holdover” as a subyearling, and he believes RTR wants to know which of these fish were tagged and were expected to migrate. He expects to hear more on this next month.

IV. 2026 Smolt Survival Study

R. O'Connor said the helicopter contract is secured, and all contracts and resources are now in place as described in the study plan. He proposed removing this agenda topic until closer to the study, then he suggested around the February time frame when crews will be preparing to deploy in-water equipment. Grant PUD can provide updates if anything comes up in the interim.

R. O'Connor noted that (Wanapum) “Fish Town” has been watered up and everything is working great. Fish Town is the facility where tagging and handling of study fish occurs and is located across the river from the Wanapum Hydro Office Building.

V. Conceptual Approach to Evaluating Survival Study Outcomes

A draft Path Forward – Conceptual Discussion Document was distributed to the PRCC by K. Geris on May 27. PRCC live edits and comments from the July 22 and August 26 meetings were distributed on September 2.

² Distributed in an email dated September 18, 2025.

L. Rohrbach recalled discussing this Path Forward – Conceptual Discussion Document over the past several months. Guiding Principles Nos. 1 to 3 focus on how the data will be analyzed, while Guiding Principles Nos. 4 to 7 focus on mitigation. Based on discussions to date, there seems to be traction among the PRCC with some principles and others might be more challenging. One path could be identifying which principles can move forward now, and which principles need more discussion.

T. Dresser said there seems to be general agreement on Guiding Principles Nos. 1 to 3, and he suggested that Grant PUD draft an SOA that focuses on these principles, including a flowchart to capture what has been discussed over the last few meetings. He recognized the difficult discussions around alternative mitigation, but he has appreciated hearing these comments about listed and non-listed fish. It is beneficial to understand that for listed fish, if Grant PUD does not meet the standard, this will require reconsultation. This is a different track than adaptive management under the SSSA. He does not believe a clause about alternative mitigation needs to be included in this SOA to keep it moving forward, but the PRCC does need to keep thinking about this in case the standards are not met. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) will likely look to the PRCC and ask what Grant PUD can do for listed fish.

A. Murdoch asked whether alternate mitigation is in lieu of meeting survival standards or it is an interim measure until survival standards are met. T. Dresser said it could be both, but this requires further discussion. NMFS was clear, the standard is the standard, as described in the Biological Opinion and SSSA. If the standard is not met, Grant PUD could implement interim measures, e.g., hatchery production, habitat improvements, or another special project that benefits the resources. This could be contributions to the NNI Fund, although Grant PUD believes this terminated once standards were met for those species the first time. If there are new discussions, maybe NNI funds are a future tool. A. Murdoch asked for a scenario of alternative mitigation. Could this be alternate operations? T. Dresser said if the standard is not met, Grant PUD would need to dig deeper into project operations; however Grant PUD has already made significant changes to optimize operation for fish passage in Fish Mode and provide juvenile spill, so it would be difficult to consider additional changes. If there are no issues at the concrete or operational-related, maybe it is something else in the reservoir, maybe its predators. Ultimately, the data will drive where to go. A. Murdoch agreed: let the data identify where the problem is occurring and drive where to go. Just adding more mitigation does not solve the problem. He suggested getting creative. K. Truscott agreed, and he added that each species has its own life history, and what is acceptable alternative mitigation may vary by species. For example, additional artificial propagation may be fine for hatchery-origin fish but not for natural-origin fish. T. Dresser agreed this will be a hard discussion. Maybe it is not project-related or reservoir-related, maybe it is something else. If it is outside the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

boundary, this could require policy involvement. S. Carlon agreed with this tiered approach. When measuring compliance, the first step is to look within the project boundary. It gets more difficult outside the boundary.

K. Murdoch clarified that implementing actions toward meeting the standard is different than alternative mitigation. For example, predator dissuasion is not mitigation, this is an action toward meeting the standard. Mitigation is doing something because the standard cannot be met. Mitigation is something to offset the impacts. P. McHugh agreed. T. Dresser said Grant PUD will work on more consistent terminology while drafting the SOA. Regarding interim actions versus mitigation, one example is the Wanapum bypass. Standards were not met, and Grant PUD thought the only way to get there was operational, so the bypass was created. In this case, this was an action toward meeting the standard.

L. Rohrbach said Grant PUD will draft an SOA and will refine the word choices for the concepts that can move forward. She asked how to capture this mitigation discussion, which may not move forward as a clause in the SOA, so it is not lost. T. Dresser suggested capturing unresolved issues in the background section of the SOA, which has been done in other SOAs. L. Rohrbach also noted the sequence of actions is important and agreed that capturing as many steps as possible in a flowchart will help, e.g., to show how interim actions may come before mitigation. K. Truscott said it will be important to have common nomenclature. L. Rohrbach suggested a definition section in the SOA.

A. Murdoch asked about a timeline. R. O'Connor said the next test will be in 2026, considering the results, there could be a retest in 2027, then again, maybe in 2028. This will be driven by the data. L. Rohrbach said conceptually there are 3 years on the table. K. Murdoch said three total tests is consistent with the SSSA and HCPs. R. O'Connor said if standards are not met on the third test, this means Grant PUD is not achieving the standard, so then the PRCC needs to decide what to do next. K. Truscott noted that invalid studies do not count. R. O'Connor agreed and reviewed examples of invalid tests as described a couple months ago.³ A. Murdoch hopes the retests are designed differently so the studies are not just testing the same thing. K. Truscott said this may not be true if the year before had non-representative river conditions.

P. McHugh asked, at what point does the Policy Committee get involved if resolution cannot be reached within the PRCC? L. Rohrbach recalled that the PRCC discussed this and agreed an SOA is a good approach. The direction was to handle this within the PRCC and reach out to Policy, if needed. K. Truscott said it will also help to include citations to the SSSA in the SOA. T. Dresser said over the last 20+ years of

³ See PRCC July 22, 2025, meeting minutes.

implementing the SSSA, only two topics have been elevated to policy.⁴ The PRCC has functioned really well and has accomplished major things without having to involve Policy. The Wanapum bypass was done pre-SSSA, all within the PRCC, and without involving policy. L. Rohrbach said Policy has only been involved in a couple of cases: first, per the SSSA when there is a dispute, or second, if the PRCC identifies inconsistency with the SSSA. K. Murdoch said this has been discussed before.⁵ The PRCC's role is implementing the SSSA, and there is a difference between implementing the SSSA and not being consistent with it.

Grant PUD will develop a draft Conceptual Approach SOA with revisions to the Guiding Principles to move forward (i.e., Nos. 1 to 3) and an updated background section to clearly identify and explain unresolved discussion topics (i.e., Guiding Principles Nos. 4 to 7),⁶ for discussion during the PRCC meeting on October 28, 2025. *(Note: A draft PRCC SOA was distributed to the PRCC by K. Geris on October 21, 2025.)*

VI. Decoupling Summer Subyearling Survival Estimates From Juvenile Steelhead Survival Estimates

The revised draft SOA *Decoupling Summer Subyearling Survival Estimates From Juvenile Steelhead Survival Estimates* (Attachment A) was distributed to the PRCC by K. Geris on September 22.⁷ L. Rohrbach said this revised draft is from the JFP, which is a modified form of the first draft by Grant PUD that was distributed on July 18.

K. Murdoch said this revised draft SOA includes the two main concepts the JFP discussed last month: 1) a sunset clause; and 2) the expectation of developing a subyearling survival study plan and ultimately measuring subyearling survival. She reviewed each bullet, as follows:

- First bullet: This was shortened to be more succinct. Some extra language was moved to the background section.
- Second bullet: This is largely the same, except for the addition of “for the duration of this SOA”.
- Third bullet: This describes the time frame. If Grant PUD is conducting a study in 2026, the earliest NNI funds could change is 2027. This is the reasoning for including, “(2027-2032).”
- Fourth and fifth bullets: These are essentially the same.
- Sixth bullet: This addresses the study plan.

⁴ See PRCC July 22, 2025, meeting minutes.

⁵ See PRCC July 22, 2025, meeting minutes.

⁶ Based on the draft Path Forward – Conceptual Discussion Document, last distributed on September 2.

⁷ The revised draft SOA in tracked changes was distributed to the PRCC by P. McHugh during the meeting on September 23.

- Seventh bullet: This is what happens at the end of the SOA, which will largely depend on whether subyearling studies can be conducted by 2032. This will also likely depend on steelhead survival.

R. O'Connor asked for an example of results that would lead to recoupling subyearling Chinook Salmon survival estimates to the steelhead estimates. K. Murdoch views the sunset clause as giving Grant PUD time, if needed, to retest before being penalized for subyearlings through NNI funds. The sunset clause holds the value constant while Grant PUD attempts to re-achieve the standard before recoupling. Recoupling depends on whether subyearling survival can be measured, and she hopes by 2032 this will be achievable. Then it comes down to how to design the best study, e.g., finding a fish source that is actively migrating. This is needed to design a study. The 5-year sunset holds everything constant while working on subyearling studies. If at the end of the day, the PRCC decides subyearling survival cannot be studied, this is when recoupling to steelhead would be considered.

R. O'Connor said that in 2026, Grant PUD will begin laboratory studies to address data gaps. If Grant PUD is showing good faith by pursuing information needed to apply to field studies, he is having a hard time understanding the proposal to recouple.

K. Murdoch does not believe steelhead are the worse surrogate. The SSSA first coupled to spring Chinook Salmon minus 3.6%, then to steelhead minus 3.6%, and this was all based on off-site data. Now there is information from passive integrated transponder (PIT) tags showing that subyearlings survive at lower rates than steelhead, and steelhead have some of the lowest measured survival rates. Considering that subyearlings are lower than steelhead, maybe steelhead are the best surrogate. Yes, these are different species, but so are all of the other species.

B. Gale said recoupling is not the ideal situation; the preference is to have measured subyearling survival. This part of the SOA was trying to identify what to do if there is no consensus, which is go back to the status quo. T. Dresser said in this scenario, Grant PUD has no voice. All these things are being done in good faith, and maybe things do not work out as planned—so then just go back to status quo? He has issues with this last bullet. B. Gale said maybe status quo is the wrong term. After 5 years, if there is no consensus, the PRCC goes back to the start. K. Truscott believes the options laid out in the last bullet are consistent with the SSSA. L. Rohrbach noted it seems the intent of Option 2 is a choice by the PRCC to recouple, versus the last sentence is a default to recouple, which are essentially the same, except it seems Grant PUD would struggle to actively choose to recouple.

R. O'Connor said Grant PUD is moving forward with laboratory studies, doing good science, and addressing data gaps for the region. This seems like a real contribution,

and it seems this should be captured in the decision-making process on where to go at the end of 5 years.

P. McHugh recalled that the JFP was trying to provide clarity about what to do at the end of 5 years, and there was not much time to discuss this within the JFP. He sees this as malleable. K. Murdoch said the PRCC can wordsmith the last bullet, and more than one option can be chosen here. A. Murdoch suggested providing examples or scenarios that would lead to extending the SOA (Option 1). There seems to be a lot of uncertainty here, and maybe there is language to add to make Grant PUD feel more comfortable.

K. Truscott said, regarding the second to last bullet, the JFP is also interested in behavioral studies and identifying data needs that would aid in the development of a survival study in this 5-year block. R. O'Connor recalled discussing during today's joint subyearling session how Grant PUD's laboratory studies will be used to inform future studies, behavioral, survival, or other. K. Truscott suggested taking advantage of the project being wired up for the 2026 survival study.

T. Taylor asked whether the expectation is to develop a subyearling survival study that is similar in scope to the "standard" smolt survival study plan—meaning, find an appropriate combination of fish sources, all active migrants, no tag effects, battery life is adequate, all of these details. This seems a bit optimistic without knowing information from the laboratory studies, and he suggested clarifying what is expected for this study plan. K. Murdoch said the goal in this 5-year period is to collect the data needed to inform a study plan that evaluates subyearling survival. A. Murdoch added that this study plan will then incorporate this information learned about studying subyearling survival, so the plan may not look like a typical survival study plan. T. Taylor asked what happens if there are issues that arise that may come into conflict with the SSSA. A. Murdoch said the choice could be Option 1, extending the SOA. T. Taylor said the way this is currently written, it seems there needs to be a study plan by the end of 5 years. K. Murdoch said this can be edited. P. McHugh recalled the JFP discussing the language, "make progress towards" a study plan. A. Murdoch said the point of the 5 years is to learn. B. Gale said the assumption is this will require more than just laboratory studies. K. Murdoch recalled K. Truscott's comment that Grant PUD has an opportunity now with acoustic telemetry arrays in the water.

T. Dresser appreciates the discussion and clarification. Grant PUD will respond to edits by the JFP to the draft SOA *Decoupling Summer Subyearling Survival Estimates From Juvenile Steelhead Survival Estimates* for discussion during the PRCC meeting on October 28. (Note: A revised SOA was distributed to the PRCC by K. Geris on October 21, 2025.)

VII. White River Hatchery Program

A draft *White River Spring Chinook Program Public Outreach and Stakeholder Engagement Guide* (Attachment B) was distributed to the PRCC by K. Geris on September 22. T. Dresser clarified that this is not a communication plan; rather, this is a guidance document and roadmap toward what the PRCC wants to do with external stakeholders. Grant PUD wants the PRCC to be aligned on timing of public engagement, identification of key stakeholders, types of outreach and tools, getting accurate information to the public, among other things. T. Dresser reviewed the *Key Principles, Public Engagement, and Stakeholders* sections in Attachment B.

L. Rohrbach asked under definitions of “Stakeholders,” No. 3, could “species conservation” include NMFS? That is, agencies outside the local area but interested in the conservation aspect? T. Dresser said yes. Last time, a number of outside agencies were actively engaged in the process, ranging from the layperson to heavy scientific perspectives.

T. Dresser reviewed the list of stakeholders on pages 2 to 4 of Attachment B. He notably requested input on this list. Are there different or additional stakeholders to include here? L. Rohrbach noted that the PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee (HSC) has been very careful to separate the White River Expert Panel from program or facility implementation decisions. The PRCC HSC intentionally did not want the panel to have stake in the implementation, to ensure that group is independent, and asked whether they could be stricken as stakeholders. T. Dresser said this is a good clarification.

B. Gale suggested adding Cascades Fisheries Enhancement Group and Trout Unlimited. T. Dresser agreed and said these are the types of comments Grant PUD is looking for.

S. Carlon recalled there were several scientific questions about whether to implement a supplementation program in the White River, but another big reason this did not move forward was about developing a facility up there, correct? T. Dresser said yes, it came down to that facility moving forward or not. Grant PUD brought a site plan to the Chelan County Hearing Board, who denied all permits associated with this facility. This meant Grant PUD was not in compliance with FERC, so Grant PUD asked FERC to supersede the local and state regulators, and FERC said no. This resulted in involving the PRCC Policy Committee, the White River program SOA,⁸ and now convening this White River Expert Panel.

⁸ *Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee – Policy Committee Statement of Agreement White River Spring Chinook Mitigation* (Policy Committee SOA 2013-01). Approved by the PRCC Policy Committee on February 8, 2013.

T. Dresser reviewed *Engagement Tools & Methods*, *Table 1*, and *Table 2*. He would like the PRCC to populate *Table 1*. K. Truscott asked whether Grant PUD anticipates needing more process steps beyond what is necessary for public outreach under the National Environmental Policy Act. T. Dresser said not at this point. He views this as multiple phases. The PRCC agreed there needs to be some level of engagement soon. What does this look like now? Down the road (next phase), this may look different. This is a living document as the PRCC goes through distinct phases. L. Rohrbach summarized that the task is for the PRCC to populate *Table 1*. She noted that the PRCC's responses can be different based on timing in the process and asked whether there will be a different table for each phase and whether the PRCC should fill this out relative to where we are now in the process. T. Dresser said this is correct. The phase now is the PRCC approved the Expert Panel package and there is a forthcoming Expert Panel recommendation. The next phase comes after the recommendation.

T. Dresser reviewed the *Talking Point List*. He asked the PRCC to help expand this list. These questions were received from the general public during the last workshop meetings and public meetings, and some questions were received individually. T. Dresser reviewed *Table 3*, which he believes is current but can be updated with additional entries.

PRCC representatives will review the draft *White River Spring Chinook Program Public Outreach and Stakeholder Engagement Guide* and suggest edits to the stakeholder list, populate *Table 1*, and provide feedback on the talking points for discussion during the PRCC meeting on October 28, 2025.

VIII. 2025 Fish Passage Operations Report

A. Fish Ladder Inspections

K. Murdoch said the last in-person inspection will be tomorrow, and the last inspection of the year will be in October, which will be conducted electronically. P. McHugh will join her and Mike Clement for the inspection tomorrow.

B. Fish Spill Updates

T. Dresser said both projects are in adult steelhead fallback fish spill until November 15.

C. Adult Fish Counts for 2025 (April 15 to November 15)

L. Rohrbach reviewed the adult fish counts through September 13, as shown below.

Project	Spring Chinook Salmon ^a		Summer Chinook Salmon ^b		Fall Chinook Salmon ^c		Sockeye Salmon	Coho Salmon	Steelhead
	Adults	Jacks	Adults	Jacks	Adults	Jacks			
PRD	15,932	842	38,260	920	3,493	544	141,467	58	4,852
WAN	15,784	1,470	41,157	993	1,813	388	139,574	35	4,564
RIS	14,532	1,017	39,868	1,194	1,503	131	139,643	15	3,493

Notes:

a: Chinook Salmon counted from April 15 to June 13 are considered spring Chinook Salmon.

b: Chinook Salmon counted from June 14 to August 13 are considered summer Chinook Salmon.

c: Chinook Salmon counted after August 14 are considered fall Chinook Salmon.

PRD = Priest Rapids; WAN = Wanapum; RIS = Rock Island

UPDATES

VIII. Review of Outstanding NNI-Funded Projects

- **Lower Wenatchee Instream Flow Enhancement Project Phase II**

T. Dresser spoke with Tracy Hillman, who indicated this project will move forward this fall. It has been hung up with permitting delays from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

- **Northern Pike Removal**

No updates were shared.

- **WDFW PIT-Tag Detection Barge**

No updates were shared.

- **2025 Quincy Northern Pikeminnow Derby**

No updates were shared.

- **2025 RTR Avian Predation Study**

No updates were shared.

IX. Subcommittee Updates

K. Geris will continue to forward subcommittee notes and materials to PRCC members and alternates.

- Priest Rapids Fish Forum – met September 3, next meeting October 1.
- Habitat Subcommittee – met September 11, tour of Habitat Projects in Canada October 8-9, next meeting November 6.
- Fall Chinook Work Group – met May 6, next meeting October 7.
- Hatchery Subcommittee – will meet September 17 and 18, next meeting October 15 and 16.

X. SOAs Discussed in 2025

SOA number	Key Words	Last Discussed	Status
2025-XX	Decoupling Summer Subyearling Survival	September 23, 2025	In Review

XI. Next Meetings

The next PRCC meeting will be on Tuesday, October 28, 2025, from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., to be held in person at the Wanapum Hydro Office Building in Beverly, Washington. There will be a virtual option. A joint session with the HCP-CC for a Subyearling Chinook Salmon Workshop Recap (Joint Session 10) will be held from 12:30 p.m. to 1:00 p.m. (schedule TBD).

XII. Attachments

Attachment A – Draft JFP SOA, *Decoupling Summer Subyearling Survival Estimates From Juvenile Steelhead Survival Estimates*.

Attachment B – Draft *White River Spring Chinook Program Public Outreach and Stakeholder Engagement Guide*.

**Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee
Statement of Agreement**

**Decoupling Summer Subyearling Survival Estimates
From Juvenile Steelhead Survival Estimates**

Submitted to the Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee: _____

Approved by the Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee: _____

-
- **Statement:** The Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee (PRCC) recognizes that the actual No Net Impact contribution rate for summer subyearling Chinook is unknown, as survival studies for this species have not yet been conducted. With this in mind, the PRCC approves this Statement of Agreement (SOA) with the following provisions:
 - The PRCC agrees that the current estimated baseline survival for summer subyearling Chinook (83.43%) will be used to calculate the annual NNI contributions for the duration of this SOA.
 - This SOA will remain in effect for five (5) years (2027-2032)
 - Methodologies for NNI calculations, as described in Section 15.7 of the Priest Rapids Salmon and Steelhead Settlement Agreement (Agreement), will remain unchanged.
 - In accordance with Section 15.6 (New Survival Estimates) of the Agreement, updated survival estimates for summer subyearling Chinook will be based on the arithmetic three-year average annual estimates, once survival studies are completed.
 - During this five-year decoupling period, Grant County PUD will develop a survival study plan for subyearling Chinook. To support development of this plan, pilot studies may be required to address key questions such as fish source, travel time, tag effects, fish size, and emigration behaviors (including residualism). Information generated through this process will aid future PRCC decisions and support the eventual implementation of survival studies.
 - At the conclusion of this SOA, the PRCC may elect to: (1) extend the SOA; (2) terminate the SOA and recouple subyearling Chinook with steelhead; and/or (3) proceed with subyearling Chinook survival studies. If the PRCC

is unable to reach agreement at the conclusion of this SOA, subyearling Chinook will be recoupled with steelhead until such time as the PRCC develops a consensus solution.

Background:

In 2006, the Parties to the Agreement acknowledged that study methodologies to measure project passage survival rates had not been sufficiently established to conclusively measure summer subyearling Chinook survival. As a result, the Parties agreed that baseline survival for summer subyearling Chinook would be based on 2003 Project operating conditions for spring Chinook minus 3.6% (Agreement, Tables 1 & 3), transitioning to steelhead minus 3.6% in 2009 following the anticipated first three years of steelhead survival studies (Agreement, Table 3).

Because site-specific studies had not been completed at the time of signing, inferences about Covered Species' survival (and NNI contributions) were initially based on surrogate data from off-site studies. Those data supported the assumption that spring Chinook survival was an adequate surrogate for steelhead survival. Accordingly, the baseline estimate for steelhead survival, until studies were conducted, was assumed to be equal to spring Chinook. Off-site data also supported the assumption that sockeye and summer subyearling Chinook survivals were likely to be lower than those for spring Chinook and juvenile steelhead (Agreement, Table 3). Therefore, the baseline survival values for both sockeye and subyearling summer Chinook were established at 2.7-3.6% lower than spring Chinook and juvenile steelhead (Agreement, Table 3)

To date, performance standards evaluations for summer subyearling Chinook have not been conducted, as study methodologies have not been sufficiently established to conclusively measure survival. Nor has the PRCC determined the best path forward to conduct survival evaluations. It is the PRCC's expectation that data will be collected to inform the development of a survival study plan by 2032.

Literature Cited:

Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County, Washington (Grant PUD). 2024. Priest Rapids Project Annual Progress and Implementation Report to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Grant PUD, Priest Rapids Project No. 2141. Ephrata Washington 98823.

Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County, Washington (Grant PUD). 2006. Priest Rapids Salmon and Steelhead Salmon and Steelhead Settlement Agreement. Grant PUD, Priest Rapids Project No. 2141. Ephrata Washington 98823.

Public Outreach and Stakeholder Engagement Guide

White River Spring Chinook Program

Version #1: Sept. 3, 2025

Overview: This document is intended to lead to the development of a Public Outreach and Stakeholder Engagement Plan, which would be implemented by the Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee (PRCC), its associated subcommittee hatchery representatives (PRCC-HSC), committee Facilitators, and the Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County, Washington (Grant PUD) Public Affairs Department. The plan developed through this exercise is intended to be a living document that would be reviewed, updated and adjusted as necessary throughout the outreach and engagement development process.

Purpose: The purpose of this document is to help the PRCC, PRCC Facilitator, PRCC-HSC, determine the following: (1) appropriate level and timing of public engagement, (2) identification of key stakeholders, (3) determine outreach, education and engagement methods, (4) timelines and strategies that fits the White River spring Chinook Program decision process, (5) ensure that the public has access to accurate information, and (6) ensure that the Grant PUD, PRCC, PRCC facilitator are aligned on a process forward and supported.

Key Principles: Working through this document, the intent is to ensure that the PRCC is aligned on the role of stakeholders in the process, to agree on activities and materials that need to be developed; and to ensure these items are meaningful, carefully planned, and are prepared in advance of engaging with the public and key stakeholders.

Public Engagement: One of the first and most critical steps the PRCC needs to take is to determine the appropriate level and timing of public and stakeholder engagement as this will be the foundation of the Public Outreach and Stakeholder Engagement Plan. The level of public engagement can range from keeping the public and key stakeholders informed to being involved and participating in the decision-making process.

In an effort to align the PRCC to what they believe the appropriate level of stakeholder engagement should be; seven assessment questions are posed below in Table 1. The intent is that each PRCC member would respond individually and then collectively discuss their responses in an effort to determine the appropriate and agreed upon level of public engagement (Table 2).

Stakeholders (Identification, Roles and Responsibilities): Stakeholders refer to anyone that has a stake or interest in the outcome of the White River spring Chinook Program and the potential benefits and unintended consequences associated with the implementation of the program. When creating a list of stakeholders, the PRCC should consider some of the following questions when developing the stakeholder list:

- (1) who will be impacted (positively or negatively) by this decision,
- (2) who needs to know about this (e.g. from legal perspective, good neighbor, etc.),
- (3) who can or will contribute to the species' conservation,
- (4) who or what is missing e.g. missing stakeholders, interested parties, etc.),
- (5) who could stop the project (e.g. stakeholders),
- (6) who could make the project better, and
- (7) what questions I might ask as a citizen.

Below is an initial effort to develop a comprehensive stakeholder list for the White River Spring Chinook Program public and stakeholder outreach effort. This list needs to be reviewed, updated and expanded as necessary by the PRCC. Contact information has been included in Table 3 for current identified stakeholders.

- NOAA Fisheries (NOAA) issued the 2008 biological opinion (BiOp) for the Priest Rapids Project (PRP) which assessed the federal action to relicense the PRP and how it may affect endangered and threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. Ultimately, if alternatives were selected to counter to what is currently in the 2008 BiOp, Grant PUD would need to reconsult with NOAA on the White River Spring Chinook Program.
- US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) issued the 2007 biological opinion (BiOp) for the Priest Rapids Project (PRP) which assessed the federal action to relicense the PRP and how it may affect endangered and threatened species under the Endangered Species Act (bull trout). Ultimately, if alternatives were selected to counter to what is currently in the 2007 BiOp, Grant PUD would need to reconsult with USFWS on the White River Spring Chinook Program.
- Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee – Policy (PRCC-Policy) serves as the forum which provides overall policy guidance and serves as the body to resolve disputes if they should arise related to the implementation of Priest Rapids Salmon and Steelhead Settlement Agreement. If the PRCC and PRCC-HSC are unable to reach consensus on a recommendation for the White River Spring Chinook Program and/or local, state or Federal processes prevent implementation of the program, then the PRCC-Policy would need to convene and determine a path forward. Voting representatives (signatories) include staff NMFS, USFWS, WDFW, Yakama Nation, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, and Grant PUD. Other active participants include Wanapum People and CRITFC.
- Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee (PRCC) serves as the forum which coordinates the implementation of Priest Rapids Salmon and Steelhead Settlement Agreement and considers issues that arise. The PRCC coordinates the design and implementation of research and monitoring programs, the sharing of data and information, and the conduct of other activities under the Priest Rapids Salmon and Steelhead Settlement Agreement. Voting representatives (signatories) include staff from NMFS, USFWS, WDFW, Yakama Nation, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, and Grant PUD. Other active participants include Wanapum People and CRITFC.
- Priest Rapids Coordinating – Hatchery Subcommittee (PRCC-HSC) responsible for developing a suite of critical questions, assembling relevant technical information, and overseeing an expert panel process that would review and provide recommendations to the PRCC-HSC for consideration. This committee will serve a critical role in supporting the White River Public Outreach and Stakeholder Communication Plan.
- White River Expert Panel will develop responses to biological/scientific questions developed by the PRCC-HSC and provide recommendations to the PRCC-HSC for consideration on the future of the White River Spring Chinook Program. This panel is strictly scientific as all decisioning making is the responsibility of the PRCC-HSC, PRCC or PRCC-Policy Committee(s).

- Chelan County Board of County Commissioners (Chelan BOC) are responsible for the overall administration of Chelan County government. The Board is comprised of three officials elected from designated County districts. The Board's duties include adopting and enacting ordinances and resolutions, levying taxes, establishing County policies, and conducting general administration of the County. During the 2006-2010 public and stakeholder outreach process, the Chelan BOC was extremely influential in the White River Spring Chinook outreach process.
- Chelan County Natural Resources Department (Chelan –NRD) addresses federal, state, and local natural resource mandates and issues and increases the organizational efficiencies of the County in addressing these natural resource mandates and issues. The Chelan – NRD places emphasis on the impact of local, state, federal, tribal, and other initiatives, both regulatory and non-regulatory, on the natural resource and economic base of Chelan County and responds to the general policy direction of the Chelan BOC. During the 2006-2010 public and stakeholder outreach process, the Chelan NRD was extremely influential in the White River Spring Chinook outreach process.
- Upper Columbia River Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB) role is to develop and coordinate implementation of the Upper Columbia Spring Chinook and Steelhead Recovery Plan, coordinate funding for recovery efforts, track and report progress to NOAA Fisheries, and coordinate with partners to implement the statewide salmon strategy. During the 2006-2010 public and stakeholder outreach process, the UCSRB helped Grant PUD coordinate the public and stakeholder outreach process (e.g. identifying key stakeholders, meeting organization, material review, etc.).
- Central Washington Audubon Society is a local chapter of the National Audubon Society, whose mission is to enhance, protect, and restore healthy natural ecosystems and native biodiversity using science, advocacy, education, and on-the-ground conservation to promote the welfare of birds in North Central Washington. During the 2006-2010 public and stakeholder outreach process a past president of the Central Washington Audubon Society was extremely active and a strong proponent against developing artificial supplementation facilities within the White River basin due to its natural and scenic state and questioned the existing data (at that time) for the need to develop a hatchery program in the basin.
- Chelan-Douglas Land Trust works with local organizations, businesses, and individuals to protect and preserve the rural and natural areas of North Central Washington. They work with local businesses and private landowners, to preserve thousands of acres to benefit the entire community and protect the character of this region. During the 2006-2010 public and stakeholder outreach process the Chelan-Douglas Land Trust voiced strong concerns regarding the need for an artificial supplementation program for spring Chinook in the White River based on existing scientific data and also raised a concern regarding development of facilities in a floodplain and impact on the natural and scenic state of the White River Basin. Chelan-Douglas Land Trust is also an adjacent stakeholder.
- Washington Department Fish & Wildlife (WDFW) is an adjacent landowner. During the 2006-2010 public and stakeholder outreach process the WDFW Habitat branch had concerns regarding the need for an artificial supplementation program for spring Chinook in the White River based on existing scientific data and also raised concerns regarding

development of facilities in a floodplain and impact on the natural and scenic state of the White River Basin.

- US Forest Service (USFS) is an adjacent landowner. During the 2006-2010 public and stakeholder outreach process USFW had concerns regarding the need for an artificial supplementation program for spring Chinook in the White River based on existing scientific data and also raised concerns regarding development of facilities in a floodplain and impact on the natural and scenic state of the White River Basin.
- Adjacent Landowners This group included approximately 2-3 individuals that live adjacent to the parcel of property that Grant PUD purchased for the White River Spring Chinook Program back in 2006. During 2006-2010 this group of individuals voiced concerns regarding impacts to their view-scape, development of facilities in a floodplain and impacts on the natural and scenic nature of the White River Basin.
- Other Interested Stakeholders included approximately 25-30 individuals that voiced strong concern regarding development of facilities in a floodplain, impacts on the natural and scenic nature of the White River Basin, and questioned the existing data (at that time) for the need to develop a hatchery program in the White River Basin.

Engagement Tools & Methods: Engagement tools and methods used will depend on the level of participation chosen by the PRCC and the stakeholders that may need to be engaged. The information completed and finalized by the PRCC in Table 1 and 2 will be important to determine who exactly constitutes “the public” and how best to reach the greatest number of people that are most affected and/or may have the greatest interest in the outcome of the White River Spring Chinook Program.

A combination of active or passive public outreach methods may be used. In an active approach, the PRCC and/or Grant PUD would directly approach and reach out to individuals or groups. In a passive approach, the public would reach out directly to the PRCC and/or Grant PUD.

Notification can be accomplished through a variety of mediums and techniques, including one-on-one meetings with key stakeholders (e.g. Chelan County Commissioners, adjacent landowners), presentations to organizations (e.g. Upper Salmon Recovery Board, Chelan-Douglas Land Trust), townhalls, newsletters, social media, e-mails to individuals and groups, letters via postal mail, phone calls to community leaders, creating/posting to a webpage, FAQ’s, etc.

Table 1. Assessment Questions used to guide decision on stakeholder involvement level in the White River Spring Chinook Program and associated expert panel recommendations.

Assessment Questions	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	Comments
What amount of public participation is legally required?						
How much public involvement does the PRCC members believe could help improve the outcome?						
At what level do the PRCC members perceive public interest in this project?						

How much do PRCC members think the public can influence the decision-making process?						
What level of media interest do you anticipate?						
What level of resources are likely to be available to support public participation?						
What is the anticipated level of controversy?						
Total checks in each column						
Multiply number of checks by the weight	x1	x2	x3	x4	x5	
Enter column score						
Total all columns, divide total score by the number of questions.	Total score ____ divided 7 = Average score of ____					

If Average Score = 1 - 2 "A" Level (Inform & Consult)
 2 - 3 "B" Level (Involve)
 4 - 5 "C" Level (Collaborate)

Table 2. Levels of stakeholder involvement for consideration.

	Inform & Consult	Involve	Collaborate
Consider This Option When...	Routine or fairly routine matters, time constraints, clear legal process, manageable level of controversy, most issues have been heard, addressed through earlier processes, parties have tried but are unable to come to resolution.	Active and mobilized groups with competing views, strong need for dialogue (not just input), need for multiple types of input for different groups, fair amount of controversy, complex issues.	Intense controversy mobilized groups with competing views, need for education and buy-in by key constituencies, long-term, far-reaching effects, multiple jurisdictions, parties willing to meet, discuss, and recommendations likely to be followed by decisions makers.
May Not be Best Option When...	Unclear or competing jurisdictions, policy matters with unclear effects, strong controversy or polarized parties, public input will have no effect, need for 2-way dialogue.	Intensive input will not satisfy need of public to influence the decision	No negotiating room, other groups may intercede to invalidate any forthcoming proposals, key parties unwilling to meet.
Potential Tools & Techniques	Fact sheets (FAQ's) Public comment (via web, in writing) Newsletters Media releases Presentations	Workshops, stakeholder meetings, focus groups, techniques from the informed and consulting category.	Advisory committees, consensus building, participatory decision-making.
Citizen Role	Stakeholders engaged to be informed and to influence	Stakeholders engage to advocate and help to frame issues.	Stakeholders are collaborators.

The PRCC and Grant PUD will also need to develop talking points prior to engaging key stakeholders. Below is a draft list of potential talking points that the PRCC will need to edit, update and expand as necessary.

Talking Point List (Draft)

1. **Why is GPUD required to implement the WR Spring Chinook Program?**
2. **Why is GPUD doing work in Chelan County?**
3. **What will GPUD do with existing infrastructure on the WR Property?**
4. **Is the existing infrastructure currently permitted?**
5. **Why is supplementation being conducted in the WR?**
6. **What is the time-line of the WR Spring Chinook Salmon Supplementation Program?**
7. **Has a Scientific Review (Independent) been conducted on the WR Program?**
8. **What are results of Independent Scientific Review?**
9. **Who decides if this program moves forward?**
10. **Is the WR Spring Chinook Program genetically unique?**
11. **What activities have occurred in the White River drainage to date?**
12. **Why is GPUD allowed to develop facilities in the flood plain?**
13. **Does GPUD support this program?**
14. **What is my role in this process?**
15. **What type of permits would be required to implement this program?**
16. **Are other mitigation alternatives possible in lieu of this program?**

Table 3. Contact information for key stakeholders.

Affiliation	Individual	Title	Phone	Email
12 th WA Legislative District Senator	Keith Goehner	Senator	(360) 786-7622	
Chelan County Commissioners	Shon Smith, Kevin Overbay, & Brad Hawkins.	Commissioners	(509) 667-6215	shon.smith@co.chelan.wa.us , kevin.overbay@co.chelan.wa.us , Brad.Hawkins@co.chelan.wa.us .
Chelan County Natural Resources	Mike Kaputa	Director	(509) 670-6935	Mike.Kaputa@CO.CHELAN.WA.US
Chelan Douglas Land Trust	Hanne Beener	Executive Director/Adjacent Landowner	(509) 667-9708	Hanne@cdltrust.org
Upper Salmon Recovery Board	Amanda Ward	Executive Director	(509) 433-5231	
North Central WA. Audubon	Art Campbell	President		rapakivi@methow.com
North Central WA. Audubon Rep	Bill Deters			wedeters@nwi.net
Adjacent Landowner	Dallas Ferral	Adjacent Landowner		
Adjacent Landowner	Brian & Linney Amelia	Adjacent Landowner		
Adjacent Landowner	Mike McComas	Stakeholder		
External Stakeholder	Paul Gray	Stakeholder		
External Stakeholder	Rob Shrtleff	Stakeholder		
External Stakeholder	Bob Bugert	Stakeholder		

Table 1. Preliminary list of potential permits/authorizations expected timeframe for review and permit status for the White River Captive Brood Program.

PERMIT/AUTHORIZATION REVIEW/COMPLIANCE	EXPECTED TIMEFRAME FOR PERMIT REVIEW	STATUS
Hatchery Genetic Management Plan (HGMP – Section 10)	45-180 Days	
Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application (JARPA)	60-90 Days	
Shoreline Management Act (SMA) – Chelan County	60-90 Days	
Conditional Use Permit – Chelan County	60-90 Days	
Flood Plain Development Permit – Chelan County	Variable depending upon project complexity and impacts	
Chelan County Habitat & Mitigation Plan		
Hydraulic Project Approval (HPA)	15-45 Days	
Water Quality Certification 401	Minimum 90 Days	
Clean Water Act (CWA - 404 Permit)	45 days – 180 days or longer depending upon project complexity and impacts	
Water-right permit	Unknown at this time Expected 1-3 years	
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Waste Discharge Permit (NPDES)	Variable (180 days to more than 1 year) depending upon project complexity and impacts	
Construction Storm Water Permit	Minimum 60 days	
ESA - Section 7 Consultation	45 days – 180 days or longer depending upon project complexity and impacts	
Scientific Collection Permit – WDFW	7 – 15 days	
Fish Transport Permits	7 – 15 days	
Aquaculture Registration Permit	Variable depending upon project complexity and impacts	
Hazardous and Toxic Chemical Release Inventory Reporting Requirements	Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act	
Section 106 Compliance	Variable depending upon project complexity and impacts	
Land Clearing Burning Permit	15 – 45 days	
State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)	30 – 45 days	

Problem Animal Trapping Permit	7-21 Days	
Dam Safety Construction Permit	Due 30 days after construction is complete	
Building Permits – Chelan County	Minimum 14 Days	
Natural and Cultural Resource Review Procedure (NCRRP)	30 Days	
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or EA depending on complexity & regulatory obligations	Up to 2 Year or more depending on project complexity and impacts	No submittal; as specific activities, facilities, or location(s) of activities have not been developed.
FERC Compliance	As soon as possible	No submittal; as specific activities, facilities, or location(s) of activities have not been developed.