

## Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee Conference Call

**Microsoft Teams**  
**Tuesday, October 22, 2024**  
**1:00 p.m. to 2:40 p.m.**

### Conference Call Minutes

#### **PRCC Representatives, Alternates, and Facilitation**

---

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

#### **Meeting Attendees**

---

Tom Dresser, GPUD Rod O'Connor, GPUD Tim Taylor, GPUD Bill Gale, USFWS	Keely Murdoch, YN Pete McHugh, CRITFC (CTUIR) Larissa Rohrbach, Anchor QEA, Facilitator Kristi Geris, Anchor QEA, Technical Support
---	--

#### **Action Items**

- R. O'Connor will inform the PRCC of any updates to the 2025–2027 Smolt Survival Study data plan, should they arise. *(This item is ongoing.)*
- L. Rohrbach will work with T. Dresser to identify a date for a 2024 PRCC Policy Committee meeting. *(This item is ongoing.)*
- K. Truscott will verify the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (CTCR) PRCC Policy Committee representation.
- T. Lorz will provide an updated CRITFC PRCC Representation Designation Letter.
- K. Truscott will coordinate with H. McLellan (CTCR) regarding an update on the Northern Pike Removal (2022 to 2024) effort once the PRCC November and

December 2024 meeting dates are confirmed. *(Note: a presentation will be provided during the December 2024 meeting.)*

- L. Rohrbach will connect with A. Murdoch about his draft agenda for further discussing Subyearling Chinook Salmon Workshop topics and will connect with J. Ferguson (HCP-CC Chair) about a joint session with the HCP-CC.
- L. Rohrbach will reach out to K. Truscott, S. Carlon, C. Jackson, and T. Lorz to obtain approvals of the September 24 minutes. *(Note: C. Jackson approved via email on October 29, and S. Carlon, T. Lorz, and K. Truscott approved via email on November 4.)*
- L. Rohrbach will reach out to K. Truscott, S. Carlon, C. Jackson, and T. Lorz about adding P. McHugh (CRITFC) and D. Moore (CTCR Policy Analyst) to the PRCC email lists.
- L. Rohrbach will provide P. McHugh with the 2013 PRCC Policy Committee statement of agreement (SOA) regarding White River Spring Chinook Mitigation.
- PRCC representatives will review the PRCC No Net Impact (NNI) Fund Specifications Sheet and Guidance document (distributed on October 15) and will reach out to Grant PUD with questions.
- L. Rohrbach will distribute the 2024 Quincy Northern Pikeminnow Derby results that were shared during today's PRCC conference call.

### **Review Items**

- White River Hatchery Program Expert Panel Review "framework and structure" documents are to be distributed following the November 20 PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee meeting.
- The NNI-Funded Project Specifications and Guidance Document was distributed on October 15.

### **Decisions and Approvals**

- None.

#### **I. Welcome, Announcements, Agenda Review, and Meeting Minutes Approval**

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

The draft minutes from the September 24 meeting were distributed on October 7. No revisions were received, and the minutes were approved by members who attended that meeting. K. Murdoch abstained. L. Rohrbach will reach out to K. Truscott, S. Carlon, C. Jackson, and T. Lorz to obtain approvals of the September 24 minutes. *(Note: C. Jackson approved via email on October 29, and S. Carlon, T. Lorz, and K. Truscott approved via email on November 4.)*

L. Rohrbach has now been transitioned into the role of PRCC Facilitator. T. Dresser said L. Rohrbach will also now be the PRCC Policy Facilitator.

T. Dresser is now the primary PRCC Representative for Grant PUD. R. O'Connor and T. Taylor will serve as alternates for Grant PUD. L. Rohrbach distributed an updated Grant PUD PRCC representation designation letter after the conference call on October 22.

P. McHugh (CRITFC) and D. Moore (CTCR Policy Analyst) will be added to PRCC email lists. L. Rohrbach will reach out to K. Truscott, S. Carlon, C. Jackson, and T. Lorz about these additions.

## II. Actions Items Review

Action items from the PRCC September 24 meeting and follow-up discussions were as follows: (*Note: Italicized text corresponds to agenda items from the September 24 meeting.*)

- *R. O'Connor will inform the PRCC of any updates to the 2025–2027 Smolt Survival Study data plan, should they arise.*  
There are no updates on the study plan, but Grant PUD is moving forward with contracting. The study tag and external consultant contracts are out for bid and are due soon. Grant PUD is also working on purchasing loggers. This item is ongoing.
- *L. Rohrbach will work with T. Dresser to identify a date for a 2024 PRCC Policy Committee meeting.*  
There will be additional outreach following today's conference call, including identifying a few suggested agenda topics for discussion. This item is ongoing.
- *K. Truscott will verify the CTCR PRCC Policy Committee representation.*  
This item is ongoing.
- *T. Lorz will provide an updated CRITFC PRCC Representation Designation Letter.*  
This item is ongoing.
- *K. Truscott will coordinate with H. McLellan (CTCR) regarding an update on the Northern Pike Removal (2022 to 2024) effort in the November or December 2024 meetings.*  
This item is ongoing.
- *L. Rohrbach will connect with A. Murdoch and J. Ferguson (HCP-CC Chair) about a joint session with the HCP-CC Subyearling Chinook Salmon Workshop topics.*  
L. Rohrbach spoke with J. Ferguson and hopes to convene this joint session in November; however, L. Rohrbach still needs to connect with A. Murdoch to get his perspective on a path forward. This item is ongoing.

### III. PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee Update – White River Hatchery Program

R. O'Connor said the PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee (HSC) is still working toward finalizing the six framework documents for the expert panel. Once approved, hopefully by next month, these will be presented to the PRCC for review and approval. Additionally, the PRCC HSC is contemplating which data to use for modeling exercises that will inform some of the questions asked of the panelists. The PRCC HSC is also considering components of a hypothetical White River program, including requesting input from the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) about source of brood, size of fish at release, program size, and other permissible components. B. Gale asked that Grant PUD reach out to him or Mat Maxey (USFWS PRCC HSC representative) to arrange a conversation with USFWS Ecological Services (Stuart Fety), if needed.

T. Dresser said that, regarding public outreach, he has reached out to Mike Kaputa (Chelan County Natural Resources Department), and he has not yet scheduled a meeting with the county commissioners, but he plans to in the next month or so. These commissioners are new to this topic, so this meeting will be informational to provide background and updates on PRCC HSC progress to date. He envisions public outreach meetings in January or February 2025, in the Leavenworth and Plains, Washington, areas; however, these will not be scheduled until the PRCC HSC has a finalized timeline. K. Murdoch is concerned about public outreach before knowing the outcome of the expert panel, the panel's recommendation, and subsequent PRCC HSC, PRCC, and policy discussions. She does not want the public process to influence these things. T. Dresser agreed this is a good point, which is why Grant PUD is being very thoughtful about how to proceed. However, in hindsight, he thinks last time public outreach could have started sooner. He thinks many folks believed Grant PUD was not fully transparent. B. Gale said this is his recollection, and he agreed transparency is important. He agreed meeting with the commissioners is a good first step, and then he suggested a news release, rather than a meeting, to keep the public informed. He believes convening the panel, determining a recommendation, and making a policy decision before informing the public will backfire. L. Rohrbach asked, in terms of process, when is the right time for initial public outreach, whether it be a news release or a meeting? What are the triggers? Should these align with engaging the PRCC Policy Committee so there is consistent messaging? T. Dresser said last time, Grant PUD distributed a press release and is open to this idea again. He is unsure about the right time. He understands K. Murdoch's concern, but if something starts to come apart, Grant PUD has to react. This is what happened last time, and Grant PUD does not want to be put in this reactive position again. K. Murdoch appreciates these comments, and she agreed with B. Gale's suggestion of a news release that describes the process and extent of the expert panel review. She also thinks guidance on public outreach would be a good policy meeting topic. B. Gale suggested asking the county commissioners about the right time to engage with the public.

B. Gale recalled that the concern last time was about building a facility. It was not about the program. T. Dresser agreed and said the issue was about building a facility in a pristine area and in a floodplain. L. Rohrbach will provide P. McHugh with the 2013 PRCC Policy Committee SOA regarding White River Spring Chinook Mitigation, which summarizes these background discussions.

#### **IV. NNI-Funded Project Specifications and Guidance Document**

T. Dresser said the PRCC NNI-Funded Project Specifications and Guidance Document (Attachment A), distributed on October 15, was updated to be consistent with the PRCC Habitat Subcommittee guidance document. The primary update was adding insurance coverage requirements (page 3 of Attachment A). This improves efficiency between Grant PUD and contractors, so it is clear what insurances are required. Grant PUD has flexibility in negotiating some coverages based on frequency of activities. Additionally, the contractor or bidder can include these coverages in their budgets.

B. Gale asked, when the federal government, which is self-insured, is the contractor, does it need to find a partner to be the lead? T. Dresser said it is extremely difficult to work with a federal entity due to this self-coverage piece. In the past, a government entity found another entity that could carry these coverages and contracted worked through them. B. Gale said that in some isolated incidences, the federal agency is best to do the work (e.g., at federal fish hatcheries). He suggested that Grant PUD discuss possible workarounds, because it will be difficult to contract with agencies like the U.S. Geological Survey. T. Dresser said Grant PUD can discuss this on a case-by-case basis.

K. Murdoch asked whether there are any other differences between the old document and the updated document. T. Dresser said the breakdown of the proposed budget is new (page 2 of Attachment A), but this is typically included anyway. Lastly, a 2013 NNI Funding Guidance Document is attached for reference (page 4 of Attachment A). This summarizes the discussions about what NNI funds could and could not be used for.

PRCC representatives will review the PRCC NNI Fund Specifications Sheet and Guidance document and will reach out to Grant PUD with questions. If there are questions, Grant PUD and the PRCC can revisit this.

#### **V. 2024 Fish Passage Operations Report**

##### ***A. Fish Ladder Inspections***

T. Dresser said typically at the end of August through September, there are high wind events, particularly in the Priest Rapids Pool, where huge clumps of aquatic vegetation move downstream and collect in the corner near the fish ladder exit. This vegetation builds up on the fish crowder screens, creating a dam that backs up the water into the fishway resulting in high water alarms.

This year, from September 10 to 16 and September 29 to October 3, crews had to open the fish crowder on the right bank at Priest Rapids Dam to let vegetation through. When the crowdere are open, fish move through the open crowder resulting in inaccurate fish counts. The crowdere were open for a total of 5,964 minutes, or 99.4 hours, which is just under 2% of total operational time this year. The majority of this time was after 1900 hours through the morning hours, when there tends to be less fish passage. As for process, crews made sure the screens were clean as best as possible, including extra time and crew support. When the cleared screens could not be maintained and water started backing up into the fishway, the crowdere were opened.

For the other fishways, the time that crowdere needed to be open was similar to last year with very limited need for opening. In 2024, the left bank fish crowder at Priest

Rapids Dam has only been opened 0.07% of the time, while the fish crowders at Wanapum Dam have been opened 0.06% on left bank and 0.09% of the time on the right bank. This was the worst year in the last 3 to 5 years in terms of aquatic vegetation buildup. Grant PUD assembled an internal team to contemplate potential operational measures or modifications at the fish ladder exits to catch debris. There were several back injuries due to leaning over railings with long-handled rakes to lift vegetation. Cleaning these screens is all handwork, with no machinery. K. Murdoch asked whether there is a way to automate the cleaning. T. Dresser said Grant PUD is looking into this option and has considered this in the past; however, the automation will not help with fish counts. The automation would swing the gates open to reduce injury to humans. Ten years ago, Grant PUD considered traveling screens, but these have impacts on juvenile salmonids and juvenile lamprey. Grant PUD will look into this again, because this aquatic vegetation issue is expected to continue.

K. Murdoch said fish ladder inspections are complete for the year. For October, Mike Clement (Grant PUD) already submitted the data.

**B. Fish Spill Updates**

No updates were shared.

**C. Adult Fish Counts for 2024 (April 15 to November 15)**

L. Rohrbach reviewed the adult fish counts through October 12, shown below.

VI. Project	Spring Chinook Salmon (Adult + Jack) <sup>a</sup>	Summer Chinook Salmon (Adult + Jack) <sup>b</sup>	Fall Chinook Salmon <sup>c</sup>	Sockeye Salmon	Coho Salmon	Steelhead
Priest Rapids	15,720	40,766	23,845	699,755	35,861	9,539
Wanapum	16,810	37,622	12,454	697,903	20,865	8,631
Rock Island	15,679	44,621	8,483	728,862	22,249	8,602

Notes:

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

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

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

T. Dresser said there is a lot of spawning in the Wanapum Dam tailrace, so it is typical to see higher counts at Priest Rapids Dam. He is curious about Coho Salmon, so he asked Dave Duvall (Grant PUD) to double-check these counts. Everything else is tracking well.

**UPDATES**

**VI. Review of Outstanding NNI-Funded Projects**

- **Lower Wenatchee Instream Flow Enhancement Project Phase II**  
No updates were shared.
- **Northern Pike Removal (2022 to 2024)**  
No updates were shared.
- **Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Passive Integrated Transponder Tag Detection Barge**

No updates were shared.

- **2024 Quincy Northern Pikeminnow Derby**

T. Dresser shared the 2024 Quincy Northern Pikeminnow Derby results (Attachment B), including a summary of all derbies funded by the PRCC back to 2011. L. Rohrbach will distribute these results and summary after today's PRCC conference call. The derby was held October 4 to 6. This year, participants included 101 individuals and 20 boats representing 19 towns. A total of 1,058 fish were removed. No adult steelhead and no non-predators were reported. T. Dresser attended the derby and tried talking to every angler. There did not seem to be a reliable system in place to track the number of bass, walleye, or channel cat collected. He heard from anglers that some were encountered, but there are no hard numbers. L. Rohrbach recalled that this derby was shifted from spring to fall to better accommodate anglers, but there was concern about making sure this shift in timing still met the goals of the NNI funds. T. Dresser agreed, and said Quincy conducted a survey that suggested that there were not a lot of participants in the past 4 years due to competing with hunting season in fall, so the preference was to move the derby to spring. However, in talking with the anglers, most thought the fishery was better in the spring when there are more smolts in the system. Based just on numbers, there is not a lot of difference. Fish size appears to be smaller in the fall. It is hard to come to conclusions based on these data. L. Rohrbach asked about moving the derby back to spring. T. Dresser said based on feedback from anglers and staff running the event, it will probably shift back to spring. From the host's perspective, it was a good event for removing pikeminnow. Other benefits unrelated to Grant PUD NNI included tourism, getting the communities together and engaged with fishing, and there was more youth participation this year.

- **2024 Real Time Research Avian Predation Study**

The most recent updates were emailed on June 28.

## **VII. Subcommittee Updates**

L. Rohrbach will continue to forward subcommittee notes and materials to PRCC members and alternates.

- Priest Rapids Fish Forum – met October 2, next meeting November 6.
- Habitat Subcommittee – met October 10, next meeting November 14.
- Fall Chinook Work Group – met October 8, next meeting May 6.
- Hatchery Subcommittee – met September 19, next meetings October 16 and 17.

### VIII. SOAs Discussed in 2024

SOA number	Key Words	Last Discussed	Status
SOA-2024-1	Fish Mode Exceptions	July 23, 2024	Approved

### IX. Next Meetings

The next PRCC meeting will be Monday, November 18, to be held virtually. This will occur before the PRCC HSC November meeting. If any PRCC decisions are needed after the PRCC HSC November meeting, these will be requested via email. The 2025 PRCC meeting schedule will be discussed next month. A joint subyearling session with the HCP-CC is possible next month. T. Dresser will try to have Fish Mode data available by next month.

The PRCC December meeting is also 1 week early on Monday, December 16, to be held virtually.

### X. Attachments

- Attachment A – NNI-Funded Project Specifications and Guidance Document
- Attachment B – 2024 Quincy Northern Pikeminnow Derby Results





## **Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee No-Net-Impact Project Specifications Sheet**

**Date submitted:**

**Project Sponsor:** (include name, title, mailing address, phone number and email).

**Project Liaison:** (Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee (PRCC) representative as an additional point of contact).

**Project Title:** (Sponsor to provide a project title. Grant PUD will add a special title for contract management purposes only).

**Project Type:** (The Project Liaison is encouraged to review the No-Net-Impact Funding Guidance Document approved by the PRCC on August 28, 2013, to ensure consistency with that document).

**Location:** (Give a description of the project location within the Upper Columbia including the lat. and long.).

**Requested funding amount from PRCC:**

**Short description:** (Two to three sentences should suffice).

**Project Description/Justification/Full Study Plan:** (Should attached and provided for review by the PRCC).

**Project cost:** (Provide an itemized budget for the funding requested from the PRCC and describe the reimbursement process and/or type of contract to be drafted. For example, do you prefer an actual cost reimbursement, fixed cost, monthly invoicing, etc.?).

PROPOSED BUDGET			
BUDGET ITEM	PRCC REQUEST	OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS	TOTAL COST
<b>TOTAL</b>			

**Estimated Timeline:** (Populate the table so that the committee can foresee the projected timeline).

Item	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Acquire Permits												
Select Contractor												
Construct Project												
Project completion												
Monitoring												
Stewardship												

**Final comments and instructions:**

Sponsors need to be aware that Grant PUD Contracting and Risk require certain amounts of insurance coverage for implementing restoration projects. Every project is unique and not all insurance coverage will be required if not found applicable (e.g., pollution, watercraft, aircraft,



etc.). Also, depending on the nature of the project, there may be times when the maximum amounts listed below may not be sufficient. To avoid delays in contracting, sponsors should include cost estimates for these requirements in their proposed budget. These requirements include:

- General Liability Umbrella Insurance (minimum \$1M limit, maximum of \$10M)
- Pollution Insurance (minimum limit of \$1M, maximum of \$5M)
- Watercraft Insurance (minimum limit of \$1M, maximum of \$5M)
- Workers' Compensation and Stop Gap Employers Liability Insurance (minimum limit of \$1M for each accident, each employee, and policy limit, maximum of \$5M)
- Automobile Liability Insurance (minimum limit of \$1M per accident, maximum of \$10M)
- Professional Liability Insurance (minimum limit of \$1M per claim, maximum of \$5M)
- Aircraft Insurance (minimum limit \$10M)

If applicable, the sponsor needs to provide contact information for the following: contracting, financial, legal, project manager, and the contract signatory (if different than the project sponsor).

Please include an electronic copy of this specification sheet in Word format to the PRCC Facilitator and PRCC Liaison Representative when submitting your proposal.

**For appraisals associated with fee simple land acquisition, please provide the following:**

Property Information

Owner Name:

Address:

General Directions:

Parcel Number:

Inspection Contact & Phone:

Other Considerations:

Appraisal Type:

Intended Users:

Reminder: When discussing potential appraisals, be sure to communicate with the Project Liaison in advance.

***Disclaimer:** Any habitat proposals presented to the PRCC for review should meet the terms and conditions outlined in the 2008 NMFS Biological Opinion, the Priest Rapids Salmon and Settlement Agreement, and the FERC-ordered Habitat Plan issued on 5 March 2010. For more information, please contact a member of the PRCC.*

## **Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee**

### **NNI Funding Guidance Document**

**Submitted to the Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee: August 28, 2013**

**Approved by the Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee: August 28, 2013**

**Objective:** Clarify process and coordination of projects funded with No Net Impact (NNI) and Habitat Funds.

**Background and Authority:** The basic settlement agreement principle for all of the Upper Columbia FERC licensed hydropower projects is no net impact in regard to project effects on the species the agreement covers. In context of the Wanapum and Priest Rapids dams and reservoirs (Project), NNI refers to the condition whereby operation of the Project does not produce unmitigated Project related mortality of the following Covered Species: spring, summer and fall Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), sockeye salmon (*O. nerka*), steelhead (*O. mykiss*) and coho salmon (*O. kisutch*). For purposes of the FERC license agreements for Douglas, Chelan and Grant County PUDs, NNI is achieved when there is a minimum of 91% combined adult and juvenile survival rate for each Covered Species past each dam and through each reservoir (survival standard), and when the PUD implements 2% mitigation in the form of funding habitat restoration and conservation work in mid-Columbia tributary streams, and 7% mitigation in the form of hatchery supplementation.

Funding requirements for habitat restoration and conservation work and for hatchery supplementation are virtually identical for the three PUDs in the Upper Columbia River (UCR). For each PUD, funding for these activities is proportional to the number of fish impacted by passage through each development. All five dams in the UCR have identical passage standards which are measured by calculating an average of three years of mark and recapture survival studies for each Covered Species, or by potentially using a surrogate species as agreed to in settlement agreements, or by statement of agreement by the appropriate Coordinating Committee. Survival studies are designed and results evaluated by the Coordinating Committees for each agreement.

On a percentage basis, all is equal in the PUD settlements for purposes of habitat and hatchery mitigation and for passage survival for the five dams and reservoirs in the UCR Basin.

Unique to the Project's Salmon and Steelhead Settlement Agreement (Agreement) is a NNI Fund. Because prototype juvenile downstream passage designs for either dam in the Priest Rapids Project had not been proven successful at the time license settlement were in discussion, agency and tribal representatives desired provision of an impetus and guaranteed funding for Grant PUD to develop a successful juvenile bypass system and maintain a form of NNI in the interim. Prior to and during settlement discussions with Grant PUD, passage success at the Project came in the form of maximizing spill up to the TDG limits, a passage concept that some settlement parties felt was not durable in the long term for a variety of reasons. In contrast, at the upstream mainstem dams, Chelan and Douglas PUDs had measured passage performance for a prototype or a permanent juvenile bypass facility and achievement of passage survival standards seemed viable in the near term. The NNI Fund was the last issue resolved between the Priest Rapids Settlement Parties.

The Parties recognized that the performance standards specified may not be achieved for certain stocks. Therefore the purpose of the NNI Fund is to provide the Parties with additional financial capacity to undertake measures to improve survivals of Covered Species prior to the time when the Project attains applicable juvenile Project survival standards. The NNI Fund is intended to provide near-term compensation for annual survivals that are less than the survival objectives in the performance standards for the Project for spring Chinook, steelhead, summer Chinook and sockeye.

If Project survival is measured below the standard, the Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee (PRCC) can investigate means and methods to increase survival by use of NNI Funds, depending on the nature of the study. If Priest Rapids Project survival remains below the standard for a Covered Species, Grant PUD is required to develop a plan with the PRCC to investigate mortality and improve survival of that species (example: Steelhead Action Plan).

Per the Agreement, the NNI Fund is not a habitat restoration or conservation fund per se, although through consensus vote of the PRCC it can be used as such within some constraints. Compensation for 2% of Project mortality is provided by Habitat Funds. Any benefit derived from a habitat project provides a faster path to recovery, but failure of a habitat project to demonstrate any benefit does not mean that Grant PUD is in conflict with the terms of their FERC license. Identifying

incremental Project survival improvements from NNI Funds is more critical, because anything below the survival standards is unauthorized take in terms of the BiOp (at least after 2013), and the terms of the BiOp are embedded as requirements in the FERC license. As such, remedying Project mortality impacts is the priority for NNI Funds, assuming that those remedies exist and are agreed to by the Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee (PRCC). The PRCC and its Habitat Subcommittee (HS) will meet annually, as needed or as able, to discuss potential NNI fund projects for the upcoming year.

### **Function of the Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee**

Per the Agreement, there is a fundamental difference between the role of the PRCC and the HS in the selection of projects. The role of the HS, as defined in the Agreement and in the BiOp, is to assess and fund habitat projects. The role of the PRCC, as defined in the Agreement and in the BiOp, is to assess Project survival and employ means to achieve Project survival for each Covered Species.

In summary, the PRCC coordinates implementation of the Agreement by:

- Investigation and documentation of fish survival through the Project (from Rock Island tailrace through Priest Rapids tailrace), including hydro operations that may affect fish survival.
- Oversight of the PRCC Habitat and Hatchery subcommittees.
- Review and approval of filings with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) that pertain to implementing the Agreement.

Per the Agreement and BiOp:

**Appendix A, Action 39:** *Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee: Grant PUD shall establish and convene a Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee (PRCC) comprised of NOAA Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Yakama Nation, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation, and Grant PUD. The PRCC shall oversee the implementation of the anadromous fish activities associated with the Priest Rapids Project, including the requirements of this opinion. Among other things, it shall approve or modify annual Progress & Implementation Plans; approve or modify*

*the Performance Evaluation Program; review Performance Evaluation Reports; advocate decisions of the Committee in all relevant regulatory forums; establish such subcommittees as it deems useful (in addition to the Habitat and Hatchery Subcommittees required above); resolve disputes elevated from subcommittees; and conduct other business as may be appropriate for the efficient and effective implementation of these measures.*

**5.5.1 Coordination and Oversight.** *The PRCC shall serve as a forum to coordinate the implementation of this Agreement and to consider issues that arise. This oversight and cooperation function shall not diminish the specific commitments and implementation responsibilities of individual Parties under this Agreement.*

### **Function of the Habitat Subcommittee**

In summary, the HS implements habitat improvement measures of the Agreement by:

- participating in directing and coordinating habitat restoration or conservation programs;
- considering habitat restoration or conservation projects;
- consensus approval (agencies and tribes) of projects through habitat restoration or conservation outside the Project area and in the UCR basin;
- consensus approval (entire HS) for habitat restoration or conservation projects specified in annual Habitat Plans or in the Project area, and in the UCR basin;
- referral of non-habitat projects to the PRCC by any HS member.

Per the Agreement and BiOp:

**Agreement Appendix A, BiOp Action 32:** *Within 6 months of the date of this opinion, Grant PUD shall convene a Habitat Subcommittee of the PRCC to undertake and oversee the planning and implementation of the necessary program elements to support habitat protection and restoration programs.*

*The Habitat Subcommittee shall be the primary forum for implementing and directing habitat protection and restoration measures for the Project's anadromous fish program. This subcommittee is comprised of NMFS, USFWS, WDFW, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Yakama Nation, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation and Grant PUD.*

*Since January 2005, the Habitat Subcommittee has met monthly to undertake and oversee the planning and implementation of the necessary program elements to support habitat protection and restoration programs. The committee (PRCC) operates on consensus regarding decisions directly linked to Project management. Unresolved disputes may be elevated to the PRCC, which shall use the February 10, 2006, Salmon and Steelhead Settlement Agreement process for dispute resolution if necessary. Decisions regarding management of anadromous fishery resources in the UCR basin not directly linked to the Project are the purview of the agencies and Tribes.*

### **Purpose and use of NNI Fund**

In summary, the NNI Fund:

- requires consultation and approval by the PRCC for fund expenditures;
- is established to fund measures or activities to improve near term Project survival;
- can fund habitat projects that are included in the annual Habitat Plan.

**From Agreement Section 7.8:** *“No Net Impact Fund” refers to the fund established by Part XV of this Agreement for the purpose of providing an increment of mitigation during the early years of the license term, specifically to address the gap between measured or estimated Project survival and the survival standards outlined in Sections 9.3, 10.3 and 11.3, so long as steady progress is made toward achieving the survival standards in accordance with the terms and schedule provided for in this Agreement.*

**From Agreement Section 15.3, Function of (NNI) Fund:** *The Parties recognize that the performance standards specified herein may not be achieved for certain stocks through current (2003) Project operations. The purpose of the Fund is to provide the Parties with additional financial capacity to undertake measures to improve survivals of Covered Species prior to the time when the Project attains applicable juvenile Project survival standards. The NNI Fund is intended to provide near-term compensation for annual survivals that are less than the survival objectives in the performance standards for the Project for spring Chinook, steelhead, summer Chinook and sockeye. Grant PUD will reduce its annual NNI Fund contributions as progress toward meeting these performance standards is achieved. When the Parties determine that the performance*



*standards have been achieved on a species-by-species basis, the NNI Fund annual contributions for that species will be terminated.*

*Grant PUD shall develop annual plans for the expenditure of funds from the NNI Fund in consultation with the PRCC and with the approval of the Parties. These annual plans may be developed as a part of the annual Habitat Plans required by Appendix A or they may also include other measures or activities designed to improve survivals for Covered Species and contribute to the achievement of applicable performance standards for the Project. Grant PUD shall report annually on the activities associated with the NNI Fund in its Annual Progress and Implementation Plans required by Action 36 of Appendix A.*

### **Funding Habitat Projects with NNI Funds**

The Agreement is not entirely clear on flexibility of using NNI Funds for a habitat project. To clarify this, the PRCC will use the following process.

Each year, on April 15th, Grant PUD is required to submit documentation to FERC regarding the implementation of the Agreement (Annual FERC Activities Report). Prior to this date, upon request by the HS, a coordination meeting between the PRCC and HS will be conducted to discuss potential habitat projects to be funded with NNI Funds in the future, or to reserve NNI Funds for specific habitat projects in the conceptual stage that involves negotiations, uncertain permitting, assembling co-sponsors or other obstacles that prevent immediate decision making on a particular habitat project. For example, the Okanagon River Restoration Initiative (ORRI) project re-connected flood plain habitat and is expected to provide habitat improvement for sockeye, but will not improve survival at the Grant PUD hydroprojects. Due to high initial cost and protracted implementation schedule, the ORRI project could have been a candidate for reserved NNI funding.

A habitat project is defined as any measure designed to restore riparian habitat, conserve riparian habitat, evaluate or monitor species response to habitat improvements, improve Upper Columbia River tributary fish passage, improve water quality, improve water quantity to improve riverine conditions necessary for the completion of the life cycle of Covered Species, or otherwise contribute to the recovery or maintenance of Covered Species.

A NNI reserve fund project must include an expiration date and a specific dollar amount estimate. No more than 40% of the NNI Fund unencumbered balance should be encumbered by reserve fund projects. The PRCC has the authority to adjust the reserve fund amount when better cost estimates are available, and can otherwise modify reserve fund projects per coordination meetings with the HS. For habitat projects to be funded from NNI Funds, the project liaison from the HS is responsible for assembling and distributing pertinent information (project specification sheet) for a habitat project to the coordination meeting participants at least thirty days prior to the meeting. Similarly, a project liaison is the HS or PRCC member that compiles information on a project proposed for NNI funding and provides this to the PRCC.

Upon request of the PRCC the party implementing the proposed NNI project will also participate in the presentation of project.

### **NNI Funded Project - Selection Process**

So long as a NNI proposed habitat project identifies a connection to improving the survival or status of a Covered Specie(s), the PRCC will accept the opinion of the HS as to the merit of the project per the project specifications sheet, and will consider NNI Funding based on the response of the HS to the following;

- NNI Fund projects must have clear rationale as to how the project will increase Project survival, investigate a potential means to reduce Project mortality, or contribute to overall survival or status of Covered Species. Project survival is defined as the number of tagged fish that survive Project passage (reservoir and dam) as measured in a Project survival study for Covered Species. Reducing Project mortality is defined as eliminating or investigating a source of Project mortality for Covered Species, either in the reservoir or through dam passage. Contributing to overall survival/status of Covered Species is defined as providing a habitat project with rationale demonstrating how habitat conditions (eg. increased instream flow, improved passage, habitat preservation, riparian and instream habitat modifications, improving water quality, and others) will be improved by implementing the habitat project. Contributing to overall survival or status of Covered Species is independent of measured Project survival.

- If a non-habitat project is proposed for NNI Funds and not every member of the PRCC agrees that the project will help achieve Priest Rapids Project survival or investigate sources of mortality, subsequent discussion within the PRCC may reject the project.
- The HS provides reasonable rationale as to why NNI Funds are being requested for a habitat project. The PRCC has no intent to second guess a habitat project's merit, so long as it is clearly a habitat project and well described in the project specification sheet, and the HS provides clear rationale as to why NNI Funds are being requested for a habitat project in lieu of utilizing habitat funds.

The project liaison (PRCC or HS member bringing the project for committee decision making) is responsible for providing the preceding information on the project specification sheet, and for setting up a presentations requested by the PRCC or HS.

For all habitat projects, the intent of the proposal may have policy considerations beyond the technical merit of the project. All PRCC or HS members are responsible for understanding and conveying policy considerations when voting for a project.

### **Conflict of Interest**

Members of the Priest Rapids Coordinating Committee (PRCC members) represent a variety of federal, state, and tribal governments, and the Grant County Public Utility District. In the normal course of business, PRCC members review and vote on research or other monitoring and evaluation activities to be funded with NNI funds. The PRCC members may also be requested to review and vote on habitat restoration proposals, for potential NNI funding, submitted by the HS. These study and/or habitat restoration proposals may have been prepared by PRCC or HS members, their agency, professional colleagues, persons with whom they may share a personal relationship, or where there may be a financial interest.

Because the PRCC recognizes that such relationships may influence or appear to influence a member's judgment or views regarding the merits of a proposal or study plan, or the capability of an organization or individual to undertake a study, the PRCC has established the following policy for managing conflicts of interest.

PRCC members have a responsibility to alert the PRCC of any possible conflict of interest that may influence or appear to influence their position on a proposed study or program. In such situations the policy shall be that the PRCC member with the potential conflict of interest will simply recuse themselves from the voting process. The PRCC member may however continue to participate in all discussions of a proposal or study plan.

### **Dispute Resolution**

If disputes among the Parties occurs within a subcommittee established by the PRCC (e.g. a Hatchery or a Habitat subcommittee), the following procedures per the Agreement shall be followed;

- Seek Resolution (Section 6.3.1). *Within sixty (60) days of receipt of notice of a dispute under Section 6.2 (see Agreement), the subcommittee shall seek to agree upon a resolution of the dispute. Participants shall endeavor in good faith to reach a resolution of the dispute using the best available information.*
- Report to the PRCC (Section 6.3.2). *At the end of the sixty (60) day period, the appropriate subcommittee shall provide a report to the Chair of the PRCC describing the outcome of its efforts under Section 6.3.1. The Chair shall promptly distribute the report to the members of the PRCC. The report shall describe any proposed resolution, the basis for the proposed resolution, and such additional information as may be necessary to support the proposed resolution. In the alternative, the report shall describe the remaining issues in dispute, the efforts to resolve them, and any additional information that may be suitable to assist in resolving the outstanding issues in a timely manner.*
- PRCC Final Action (Section 6.3.3). *Upon receipt of a report under Section 6.3.2, above, the Parties shall, within thirty (30) days (or as otherwise agreed to) approve or disapprove the proposed resolution. In the event that it approves the proposal, the Parties will implement the resolution as accepted. In the event that the resolution requires the regulatory approval of FERC or another regulatory entity, Grant PUD, with the support of the Parties, shall seek prompt resolution by FERC or the relevant regulatory authority and shall proceed with its implementation upon receipt of the required approval.*
- PRCC Original Action (Section 6.4). *In the event that the Chair refers a disputed issue to the full PRCC, or a subcommittee is unable to resolve a dispute referred to it, the Parties shall have (90) days to seek agreement on the disputed matter. The Parties may elect to extend the time period for resolving the matter as it may judge appropriate prior*

*to the referral of an issue to the Policy Representatives of the Parties, as described below.*

- *Convening the Policy Representatives (section 6.5). In the event that the Parties fail to agree to a resolution of a disputed issue, the Chair shall within five (5) days notify the Policy Representative of each Party of the existence of the continuing dispute and to request that they convene to resolve the dispute. The Policy Representatives shall have sixty (60) days from the receipt of such notice to resolve the dispute. This period may be extended by consensus of the Policy Representatives.*
- *Final Action (Section 6.6). If, by the end of the sixty (60) day period (or the period otherwise agreed to), the Policy Representatives have not resolved the dispute, any Party may withdraw and/or petition FERC or other appropriate regulatory authorities with responsibility over the matter to resolve the issue as may be appropriate under existing law.*

**Quincy Valley Pikeminnow Derby 2011-2024 Results**

Year	Number of Participates	Number of Boats	WA Zip Codes	Total Number of Fish Removed	CPUE	Total Weight (lbs)	Average Weight	Season (Spr/Fall)	Budgeted Amount	Actual (PRCC)	QVCC Cost	Cost Per Fish	Number Adult Steelhead	Non-Predators Retained
2024	101	20	19	1058	10.5	551.61	0.5	Fall	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$1,270.00	\$23.63	0	0
2023	133	20	26	1498	11.3	949	0.6	Spr	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	.	\$16.69	0	0
2022	113	.	.	773	6.8	712	0.9	Spr	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$1,229.73	\$32.34	0	0
2021	152	.	.	2336	15.4	1306	0.6	Spr	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$6,692.77	\$10.70	0	0
2020 <sup>A</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
2019	73	.	.	1061	14.5	808	0.8	Spr	\$25,000.00	\$24,008.00	N/A	\$22.63	.	.
2018	95	.	.	1037	10.9	606.1	0.6	Fall	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	N/A	\$24.11	.	.
2017	94	.	.	1730	18.4	726.9	0.4	Spr	\$25,000.00	\$22,551.04	N/A	\$13.04	.	.
2016	68	.	.	885	13.0	670	0.8	Spr	\$25,000.00	\$18,647.30	N/A	\$21.07	.	.
2015 <sup>B</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
2014 <sup>C</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
2013	134	.	.	1810	13.5	944	0.5	Spr	\$25,000.00	\$24,823.84	N/A	\$13.71	.	.
2012	110	.	.	1044	9.5	596	0.6	Spr	\$25,000.00	\$23,669.00	N/A	\$22.67	.	.
2011 <sup>D</sup>	135	.	.	940	7.0	312	0.3	Fall	\$25,000.00	\$20,696.00	N/A	\$22.02	.	.
<b>TOTALS</b>				<b>13,114</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>6,681</b>	<b>0.6</b>		<b>\$275,000.00</b>	<b>\$259,395.18</b>	<b>\$9,192.50</b>	<b>\$20.24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

A = 2020 - No event due to Covid

B = PRCC decided not to fund event

C = Wanapum Fracture prevented event

D = Weight was only taken for top 20 places