



# COLUMBIA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE AUTHORITY

851 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 300 | Pacific First Building | Portland, OR 97204-1339  
Phone: 503-229-0191 | Fax: 503-229-0443 | Website: [www.cbfga.org](http://www.cbfga.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 and 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:** October 26, 2009

**TO::** Fish Screening Oversight Committee

**FROM:** Dave Ward, CBFWA Staff

**SUBJECT:** Final Action Notes for October 22, 2009 FSOC Meeting

FSOC Teleconference  
October 22, 2009  
8:30 AM PDT

## Final Action Notes

**Attendees:** Dave Ward (CBFWA)

**By Phone:** Brian Zimmerman (CTUIR), Jamie Swan (BPA), Jody Brostrom (USFWS), Bryan Nordlund (NOAA), Sean Connolly (USFWS), Ray Hartlerode (ODFW), Alan Ritchey (ODFW), Les Perkins (FCA), Julie O'Shea (FCA), Pat Schille (WDFW), Lynn Stratton (IDFG), Matt Mesa (USGS), Mark Lere (MDFWP)

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

**ITEM 1: Introductions**

**ITEM 2: Approval of Agenda**

**Discussion:** The agenda was approved with some re-ordering of items to accommodate schedules. A brief discussion of screen and passage training was subsequently added to the end of the agenda.

**ITEM 3: Approve Action Notes from September 16, 2009 FSOC Meeting.**

**Discussion:** The FSOC approved the draft action notes.

**ITEM 4: Mitchell Act and FRIMA Follow Up**

**Discussion:** Sean Connolly updated the FSOC on the status of a letter to the states and the FSOC (1) confirming that BPA funds can be used as cost share, (2) clarifying whether or not BPA cost share can be retroactive, and (3) clarifying the process for dividing the overhead costs between the USFWS and the states. Sean reported that the letter has been drafted and is in the review process within the USFWS. Sean is unsure at this point about the interpretation of cost share being retroactive. Sean expects the letter to be completed within a few weeks.

Ray Hartlerode requested that the USFWS check on the amount of unallocated FRIMA funds available, and Sean agreed.

Sean also pointed out that the letter concludes with a summary of the status

of funding for future years. The FSOC agreed that receipt and review of this letter should serve as a foundation for discussions on how to best ensure adequate FRIMA funding. This discussion will be on the agenda of the January teleconference.

- ACTION:**
- Sean will have the letter sent directly to the state agencies implementing FRIMA projects, with a copy to the FSOC.

**ITEM 5: Fish Passage and Screening Workshop Report and Recap**

**Discussion:** Ray Hartlerode provided a brief and general recap of the workshop. Registrations included 89 workshop attendees, plus 21 vendor booths with 31 individual vendors. All feedback about the workshop, including content and venue, has been positive. The CBFWA account for workshop funding increased from \$6,278 to \$8,558 as a result of the workshop's success.

**ITEM 6: Discussion of Issues Related to NMFS Letter Regarding FCA Screens**

**Discussion:** Copies of the NMFS letter, responses from the Farmer's Conservation Alliance (FCA) and the USGS, and an evaluation of Herman Creek screens by the USGS were all posted on the FSOC website for review. Bryan Nordlund framed the discussion by summarizing his (and NMFS') three major areas of concern regarding the screens. The three areas are:

- (1) Uncertainty as to the behavioral effect (bypass rejection and/or migration delay) when fish pass from an open canal onto the shallow depths (less than 12") on the screens;
- (2) Concern about the proper cleaning functioning of the screens when flow depths fall below the design range, as stated in numerous operational reports provided by FCA and in the Widow's Creek site visit report by Melissa Jundt;
- (3) Lack of criteria to determine where these screens are appropriate in regard to the range of diverted flows.

There is no concern about the screens causing injury, if properly operated. This led to a discussion regarding the potential for operator error (or intent) leading to improper operation of the screens. Les assured the group that designs are now revised to preclude this from happening, and will provide the group with specifics on how this will be accomplished.

Each of these major areas of concern was discussed at length. It was pointed out by FCA that, where appropriate, the screens performed well.

Some discussion centered around moving forward with the screens considered experimental, or under some sort of adaptive management scenario. Bryan noted that this was possible, but would be time consuming compared to installing screen technology that already exists. This might defeat the purpose of getting screens installed rapidly where appropriate. He noted that a particular screen site was probably not conducive to an adaptive management process, unless the facility was designed with hydraulic flexibility to modify the design.

Another focus of discussion was defining "where appropriate" and what is

“ample water” for proper screen function. Les Perkins and Julie O’ Shea noted that various criteria and check lists exist that could be pulled together to establish whether a site is viable for a horizontal screen.

After considerable discussion, Bryan thought that some of his concerns could be alleviated with a criterion or process for eliminating sites that are not viable for horizontal screens. He would take some of the information presented during this discussion back to NMFS engineers. The FSOC agreed that developing criteria for appropriate use of the screens would be useful.

All agreed that:

- (1) Specific egress/delay evaluations of the screens at a 6” depth could be done with a mark/recapture study. Nordlund expressed this was a key piece of biological performance that needed measurement to assure performance on par with existing screen technology;
- (2) Flow range criteria need to be specific and operations guaranteed; and
- (3) The check list and flow range criteria for eliminating sites not appropriate for installation of horizontal screens need to be developed.

**ACTION:**

- Bryan Nordlund will brief the NMFS engineers on this discussion.
- Les Perkins and Julie O’ Shea will provide the existing FCA check list along with an explanation of terms and criteria to Dave Ward by November 17 for distribution to the FSOC. This will include decision points for culling out sites where horizontal screens are not appropriate.
- FSOC members will provide initial comments and feedback on the FCA materials to Dave Ward prior to the January 28, 2010 FSOC teleconference.
- The FSOC will begin discussions on developing criteria for use with horizontal screens during the January 28, 2010 teleconference.

**ITEM 7: Potential Effect of Invasive Species on Screens**

**Discussion:** Alan Ritchey provided background on a California study that showed screen material made from copper and nickel was far less prone to bio-fouling than stainless steel material. A project at Lake Oswego near Portland has screens of both types, and found the cost difference to be minimal (unlike the California project).

The point of this information is to begin discussions about the potential impact that invasive species such as zebra mussels could have on screens and the ability to operate within criteria.

**ITEM 8: Screen and Passage Training**

**Discussion:** Ray Hartlerode expressed a desire to provide screen and passage training during years in which the workshop is not held. All agreed. Bryan Nordlund noted that NMFS was in the process of planning training for BPA staff, and that widening the scope would be good. Training would likely encompass at least three days including field observations. Bryan will

report back on this subject during the January 28, 2010 teleconference.

**ITEM 9: Next FSOC Teleconference**

**Discussion:** The next FSOC teleconference is scheduled for Thursday, January 28, 2010, from 8:30 AM to 11:30 AM PST.