



COLUMBIA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 300 | Portland, OR 97204-1339 | Fax: 503-229-0443 |
Phone: 503-229-0191 | Fax: 503-229-0443 | www.cbfwa.org

Coordinating and promoting effective protection and restoration of fish, wildlife, and their habitat in the Columbia River Basin.

The Authority is comprised of the following tribes and government agencies:

Burns Paiute Tribe

Coeur d'Alene Tribe

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation

Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation

Idaho Department of Fish and Game

Kootenai Tribe of Idaho

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks

National Marine Fisheries Service

Nez Perce Tribe

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Fort Hall

Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of Duck Valley

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Coordinating Agencies

Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission

Upper Columbia United Tribes

Compact of the Upper Snake River Tribes

DATE: June 25, 2009
TO: Lamprey Technical Workgroup (LTWG) Passage Standards Subgroup
FROM: Dave Ward, CBFWA staff
SUBJECT: June 22, 2009 Passage Standards Subgroup Teleconference Draft Action Notes

Lamprey Technical Workgroup – Passage Standards Subgroup Teleconference Monday June 22, 2009 2:00 – 4:00 PM (PDT) @ CBFWA – Portland, Oregon

Draft Action Notes

Attendees: Dave Ward (CBFWA)
By Phone: Mike Clement (Grant County PUD), Chris Peery (USFWS), Josh Murauskas (Douglas County PUD), Jeff Osborne (Chelan County PUD), Bao Lee (Longview Associates), Dave Statler (Nez Perce Tribe), Bob Mueller (Battelle), Chris Caudill (University of Idaho)

Time Allocation:	Objectives 1. Committee Participation	100%
	Objectives 2. Technical Review	0%
	Objectives 3. Presentation	0%

ITEM 1: Introductions

ITEM 2: Clarification of Task

Discussion: In 2007 the MAG tasked the LTWG to “work with the Corps and other interested parties to develop lamprey passage objectives and related performance standards and measures.” A subgroup of the LTWG volunteered to work on this assignment.

ITEM 3: Effort to Date

Discussion: A teleconference was held on September 24, 2007. The subgroup spent a considerable portion of the teleconference discussing the inherent difficulties in determining passage objectives, standards, and measures for Pacific lamprey.

The subgroup determined that both interim and long-term objectives should be developed for juveniles and for adults. The subgroup determined that for both life stages, a one-day workshop would be required to (1) develop interim passage objectives, and (2) develop a list of information needs (studies) for long-term objectives.

At its meeting on April 15, 2009, the full Lamprey Technical Workgroup (LTWG) found that the goal “success must be as good as the best dam in the region” was weak. The group thought we should be doing everything we can to get passage efficiency as high as possible but it is impossible to put a number on it.

The workgroup questioned what the next steps should be on this issue. The work group determined that Dave Ward will get the notes from the previous subgroup meeting and redistribute them. The subgroup will meet/call and report to the whole workgroup at our meeting in August (subsequently re-scheduled for October/November). The goal is to put together a progress statement and post it on the LTWG website.

ITEM 4: Moving Forward

Discussion: The subgroup discussed various difficulties and needs in making progress on the assignment. The subgroup generally agreed that an initial product should not be difficult to complete. This product should include:

- Definition(s) of passage. Multiple definitions may be possible (e.g., percentage of fish entering fishways that successfully pass a dam vs percentage of all fish desiring to pass that successfully do so).
- Catalogue potential metrics to be used. Potential metrics may include some that are not currently being measured.
- Describe the data needed to assess the metrics and standards. What are the data needs? What is already being collected? What is measurable and what isn't?
- Describe the previous three items at multiple scales (e.g., basin-wide, project-specific, etc.)

Points to consider when developing the product include (1) not waiting for “certain” answers before implementing passage improvements, and (2) identifying obvious passage problems (either a specific project or an areas within projects) to address first. Another consideration is to not limit this assessment to mainstem hydro projects, but to include smaller projects such as irrigation diversions and screens.

Chris Caudill and Josh Murauskas volunteered to prepare a preliminary draft of this initial product. The draft will be distributed to the subgroup by July 31 for comment. Comments will be due back to Chris and Josh by August 14. A revised draft will be distributed to the subgroup prior to the next teleconference on August 28. A review draft, approved by the subgroup, will be distributed to the full LTWG at least two weeks prior to the next meeting and workshop,

which will be held between early October and early November.

ITEM 7: Next Teleconference

The next teleconference of this subgroup is scheduled for August 28, 2009, from 10:00 AM to Noon (PDT).