

PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Meeting

Wednesday, July 19, 2017

GPUD Wenatchee Office

Via Conference Call

PRCC HSC Members

Matt Cooper, USFWS

Brett Farman, NOAA

Peter Graf, GPUD (alt)

Keely Murdoch, Yakama Nation

Todd Parsons, GPUD

Other Participants

Deanne Pavlik-Kunkel, GPUD

Pat Wyena, Wanapum Tribe

Elizabeth McManus, Facilitator

Andy Chinn, Facilitator

Decisions

There were no decisions during the June meeting.

Actions

1. Ross Strategic will redistribute the draft June meeting summary.
2. Ross Strategic will contact the PRCC facilitator to check in on Coho NNI discussions.
3. GPUD will review the revised YN smolt trapping proposal and respond within three weeks.
4. HSC members will provide comments (if any) on the YN smolt trapping proposal.

I. Updates and Meeting Summary Review

- A. **HCP** – The HCP discussed the pathway for 4d versus Section 10 permitting associated with unlisted programs and NOAA will be setting up a call for further discussion of the issue. *See Appendix A for summary of joint HSC-HCP discussion during July HCP meeting.*
- B. **PRCC** – The PRCC discussed the need for a conversation around guidance for the Coho NNI calculation. After the NNI guidance is settled, the PRCC can move forward with data and calculation methods.
- C. **Next Steps**
 - Ross Strategic will redistribute the draft June meeting summary.
 - Ross Strategic will contact the PRCC facilitator to check in on Coho NNI discussions.

II. White River Rotary Trapping

- A. **Proposal to Use 8 Foot Trap** – YN's proposal to deploy the 8 foot smolt trap simultaneously with the 5 foot trap is intended to bolster catch numbers. YN looked at the depth profiles at the trapping site to determine optimal placement for running the 8 foot trap and 5 foot trap. YN also consulted with other smolt trappers to confirm that the setup/rigging is sufficient to support both traps. YN's preference is to implement the proposed set up as soon as possible, to begin trapping prior to fish migration and make position adjustments before water levels begin to rise.
 - GPUD asked whether the additional stress of adding an 8 foot trap to the same cable as the 5 foot trap would risk losing the 5 foot trap and also possibly pulling the 5 foot

trap out of its normal fishing location. GPUD also commented that if the YN smolt trapping crew observe efficiency changes then the HSC will need to revisit the setup to see if any adjustments are needed because this could influence the long-term data set and associated trend monitoring.

- The YN said that the cable system holding the traps is similar to others that are currently in operation so they were confident that it wouldn't increase the risk to the 5 foot trap. They also thought that the trap operators would be able to operate the two traps together in a way that would maintain the existing efficiency of the 5 foot trap.
- GPUD requested a briefing from YN approximately one month after the new smolt trap setup is in place to provide an assessment of whether the 5 foot trap can be fished similarly to what it has in the past.

B. Next Steps

- GPUD will review the revised YN smolt trapping proposal and respond within three weeks.
- HSC members will provide comments (if any) on the YN smolt trapping proposal.

III. Wrap Up and Next Steps

A. Next Meeting: Wednesday, August 16, 2017

B. Potential Agenda Items:

- Coho NNI

Meeting Materials

The following documents were provided to HSC members in advance of this meeting:

- July meeting agenda
- Draft June meeting summary
- June PUD hatchery report
- May PUD hatchery report
- June White River rotary trap summary
- May Nason Creek rotary trap summary

Appendix A

I. Joint HCP-HC/PRCC HSC

A. USFWS Bull Trout Consultation Update (Matt Cooper)

Tracy Hillman said Matt Cooper (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS]) sent him an email update for this topic because USFWS staff are unable to attend today's meeting. Hillman summarized the update as follows:

- Karl Halupka is finishing revisions to the Biological Opinion for the batch of Wenatchee subbasin programs and expects it will be finalized by early August 2017.
- The USFWS reviewed a draft proposed action for mainstem unlisted hatchery programs and provided comments to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). After NMFS responds to comments, the USFWS will decide on a consultation approach for this batch of hatchery programs. Currently the batch does not include Similkameen summer Chinook salmon programs, which USFWS has asked NMFS about. (Note: Emi Kondo [NMFS] stated that she spoke with Halupka regarding this consultation and said the Similkameen summer Chinook salmon program has been analyzed as part of the Okanogan Tribal Resources Management Plan and therefore does not need further consultation or coverage.)
- The USFWS has begun reviewing the proposed action for the Methow summer steelhead program. The primary objective of the review is to inform the USFWS' selection of a pathway to take for completing consultation on this program. A memo similar to the one USFWS completed for the Methow spring Chinook salmon program is one of several options being considered. One key factor in this decision is the degree to which changes in the program since prior consultation may change the program's effects on bull trout and bull trout critical habitat.

Kondo said Charlene Hurst and Halupka have a coordination call on July 24, 2017, to discuss the upper Columbia River (UCR) unlisted programs consultation.

B. NMFS Consultation Update (Brett Farman/Emi Kondo)

Emi Kondo said she has an update on the UCR unlisted programs consultation. She said she received comments on the draft proposed action and expects a few more comments as well. She said the Hatchery Committees discussed the pathway for Endangered Species Act (ESA) coverage for these programs during the June 21, 2017, Hatchery Committees meeting. She said the next step for consulting on this bundle of programs is deciding on the ESA pathway (i.e., Section 10 or Section 4(d) coverage). She said Douglas PUD has indicated that they prefer pursuing Section 10 coverage, while Chelan PUD and Grant PUD have indicated they want to have more discussion with NMFS

General Counsel before deciding. She said coordination calls are occurring next week and she can also set up additional calls for anyone interested. She said in addition to deciding on the ESA pathway, another important step is formally initiating consultation. She said the applicants will need to send a letter requesting initiation of consultation, to which NMFS can reply with a submissions letter. Kondo said the letter should describe the consultation process, and once the proposed action is finalized it can be submitted with the letter. Greg Mackey asked Kondo for an example of the letter.

Todd Pearson said when Grant PUD submitted hatchery and genetic management plan (HGMP) documentation, they submitted a letter requesting coverage, and asked if sending a second letter requesting consultation would be duplicative. Kondo said she will check internally to see if the letter submitted with HGMP documentation is sufficient.

C. M&E Plan for PUD Hatchery Programs 2017 Update (All)

Tracy Hillman said he revised the M&E Plan for PUD Hatchery Programs to reflect changes discussed during the June 21, 2017, Hatchery Committees meeting and also made some editorial edits. Sarah Montgomery distributed the draft revised plan to the Hatchery Committees before the meeting on July 19, 2017 (Attachment C).

Hillman said he added footnotes to Table 1 and Table 2, indicating that more detailed information is included in the appendices. He said he revised the objective in Table 1 "Determine if *recipient* stray rate of hatchery fish is acceptable" (italics are new text) and added a clarifying paragraph to Objective 6 describing the different types of stray rates and stray rate metrics. He added clarifying language to Objective 3 (HRRs), and added references for the appropriate appendices throughout the descriptions of objectives.

Hillman asked the Hatchery Committees why length and weight targets are missing from Appendix 4, which includes fish per pound (FPP), coefficient of variation (CV), and condition factor targets. He said in the M&E Plan, there are targets for size, length, weight, and condition factor. He said Appendix 4 also does not include the number of fish targeted for release (currently in Appendix 2). He asked if Appendix 4 should be revised to include number of fish targeted for release and length and weight targets. Greg Mackey said adding those values to Appendix 4 might make the table unwieldy. Mackey said the statistical test for length was used more to compare the length of hatchery fish to wild fish, and was used less as a true target. Hillman recalled in the last comprehensive report, there were both length and weight targets at release for programs. He said he and Andrew Murdoch (WDFW) performed the analyses for the comprehensive report, and found that size and weight targets often cannot be achieved (i.e., either one can be met, but not both). He said the targets should be revised to better reflect how fish grow, but they have not yet been revised. He suggested adding these targets to Appendix 4. This will place all within-hatchery targets in one

appendix. Hearing no objections, Hillman said he would make these revisions for the Hatchery Committees to review.

Hillman said he added clarifications to Objectives 4, 5, and 6 to redirect readers to related appendices. In Objective 5, he said he edited the language about spawn timing to be consistent with Appendix 4 and added an additional hypothesis, "Ho_{5.2.1.3}: The relationship between elevation and spawn timing of hatchery-origin fish = the relationship between elevation and spawn timing of natural-origin fish." Mackey asked if the term elevation is accurate or if the hypothesis should address river kilometer. Hillman said the analysis uses elevation, at least in the Chiwawa River; however, river kilometer can be used as a surrogate for elevation.

Todd Pearson asked about Hillman's edits to the possible statistical analyses for Objective 5. Hillman said he changed the use of an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to "Graphic and regression analysis to assess relationships between elevation and spawn timing" because ANCOVAs use discrete variables and elevation is not a discrete variable. He said using continuous variables retains the most information in the data and this regression analysis would be similar to analyses for productivity. He said using an ANCOVA would not be wrong, but it is cleaner to perform regressions for spawn timing and elevation for both wild and hatchery fish, then compare the regressions.

Hillman said he added a paragraph to Objective 6 that the Hatchery Committees should review in detail and clarified percent stray rates throughout the section. Mackey said the paragraph is a good synopsis and asked if annual stray rates and brood-year stray rates would converge to approximately the same rate over a long period, for example 25 years. Hillman said that would typically be the case and was true for the Chiwawa River analysis. However, he said in the Twisp River the rates did not converge and depend on the size of the hatchery program and the size of the recipient population. He said all three stray rates should be examined, but brood-year stray rate targets are not included in the Recovery Plan or Technical Recovery Team documents.

Hillman said he also revised the title of section 6.1.1 to be "Brood-Year Stray Rates" instead of "Stray Rates among Populations by Brood Return," to match the statistical analyses being performed. Mackey agreed and said the title now reflects the analyses being performed and originally stray rates analyses may have been intended to be limited to populations.

Hillman said he also made edits to Objective 9. He asked whether length and weight targets (Q9.1.1) should be added to Appendix 5 and if the targets are going to be revised. Pearson suggested using the broodstock collection protocol targets (FPP and CV), because they directly represent management guidance given to hatchery staff. Hillman agreed and said using FPP targets is easier and should be considered as a target instead of length and weight. Mackey agreed and said FPP can be extrapolated to determine length or weight per fish if those metrics are needed. Hillman said he will make this edit in the next revised version of the plan for review. Hillman said regarding Q9.3.1,

that program K (condition factor) targets are listed as "TBD" in Appendix 5. Hillman said regarding Q9.4.1, the release targets currently identified in Appendix 2 could be moved to Appendix 5 for ease of finding information quickly.

Hillman said he is still working on Appendix 1, which discusses carrying capacity, and expects it will be finished in September 2017.

Pearsons asked about the timeline for finalizing the 2016 Hatchery M&E Annual Report. Hillman said he has received comments on the draft and is incorporating comments and revising the document. He said the report is due on September 15, 2017, but will likely be completed before that date. Persons said it would be good to provide the annual report and the revised Hatchery M&E Plan for PUD Hatchery Programs (2017 Update) to the Independent Scientific Advisory Board in early fall so they can incorporate the most recent documents in their review and said he has no problems with the current timelines for finalizing these documents.