CENWP-OD 17 December 2015

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Subject: DRAFT minutes for the 17 December 2015 FPOM Fish Condition Sub-sampling Task Group meeting.

The meeting was held at the NOAA offices, Portland OR. In attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Last** | **First** | **Agency** | **Email** |
| Bettin | Scott | BPA | swbettin@bpa.gov  |
| Conder | Trevor | NOAA | trevor.conder@noaa.gov  |
| Cordie | Bob | NWP-TDA | Robert.P.Cordie@usace.army.mil |
| Filardo | Margaret | FPC | mfilardo@fpc.org |
| Fredricks | Gary | NOAA | Gary.Fredricks@noaa.gov  |
| Grosvenor | Eric | NWP-JDA | Eric.Grosvenor@usace.army.mil |
| Lorz | Tom | CRITFC | lort@critfc.org  |
| Mackey | Tammy | NWP | Tammy.m.mackey@usace.army.mil |
| Morrill | Charlie | ODFW | Charles.Morrill@dfw.wa.gov  |
| Rerecich | Jon | NWP | Jonathan.G.Rerecich@usace.army.mil  |
| Royer | Ida | NWP | Ida.M.Royer@usace.army.mil  |
| Setter | Ann | NWW | Ann.l.setter@usace.army.mil |
| VanDyke | Erick | ODFW | Erick.s.vandyke@state.or.us |
| Wright | Lisa | NWD-RCC | Lisa.S.Wright@usace.army.mil  |
| Zorich | Nathan | NWP-FFU | Nathan.a.zorich@usace.army.mil  |

Filardo called in.

Documents may be found at: <http://www.nwd-wc.usace.army.mil/tmt/documents/FPOM/2010/Task%20Groups/Task%20Group%20Condition%20Monitoring/>

1. **Decisions made at this meeting**
	1. The 16 Dec 2015 memo from Fredricks will be placed in Appendix J of the FPP. Comments on the memo are due by 31 Jan 2016.
	2. Next task group meeting will be after the Feb FPOM.
2. Fredricks said the only one he’s asking anything of is the USACE. Setter said an action agency would be the one this should go to. Morrill said some of the language was conflicting, and what was the intent of the memo. He said this would provide a snapshot and not a long-term image. Fredricks said that the RPA 53 in the BiOp is very specific about what’s required, i.e. condition monitoring. He wanted to establish what exactly that means. It has nothing to do with smolt monitoring (SM). It’s only meant to be for the places where an SM program isn’t in place, or places where SM sites are taken away. He wants something in place in the vacuum of a SM program. The April 2015 memo is meant to define what RPA 53 is. He wanted to include FPOM to define what the process should be.
3. Fredricks went through the memo. He doesn’t want to sample all the fish in the river when numbers are really low. He said the changes from April memo are in numbers 1, 4, 5, 6 in the Dec memo.
4. For number 6 [sampling numbers posted within 12 hours], Fredricks said if that can’t be done then just send a report. He just wants to know if descaling, injuries are going up and down. Setter said they would be open to working with the FPC to report and present data. Fredricks said he just wants info, even if it’s on a piece of paper. Setter said that IHR is not currently doing that, and that a contract has been put out and that they will work with the FPC. The problem NWW has had is just interaction between the two programs, a next step may be determining if they could use FPC equipment so that it’s uploaded automatically. Setter said if they can’t do it electronically in 2016, they could in 2017. Setter said that one place for progress is reporting info out onto FPC website, specifically at IHR. Filardo clarified how the uploading works and equipment necessary. Morrill said he doesn’t see data transfer as a significant issue. **ACTION: IHR/NWW will coordinate with FPC to set up IHR for reporting data out.**
5. Setter said there’s another place where there’s not agreement, reporting number descaled vs number handled. Filardo said the FPC website lists the number sampled and the number descaled. It’s in the detailed report. There’s a few different tables. Setter asked if the number sampled is always the number used, when indexing is used it effects the number. **ACTION: Filardo will show NWW the FPC website and where details are reported.**
6. Fredricks said the one of the items he’s most adamant about is monitoring twice per week and emphasized that’s a minimum. He believes MCN should be more frequent, for example. Setter said that the time they were not doing this was early in season, pre-transport. The data was needed for transport, then it became apparent the data was also used for troubleshooting. Condor pointed out there were times where there were 5 to 6 days between sampling. There’s a regulation that stipulates only 3 days between sampling. Fredricks said if there’s a problem that crops up (debris, etc) that sampling should be more frequent. Setter said that every other day would be more palatable for the personnel vs every day. Fredricks said that would be an FPOM discussion, that he wants to establish a minimal standard. **ACTION: Fredricks will determine how frequent problems were from FPC to aid discussion of monitoring frequency.**
7. Filardo said that a grab sample isn’t representative of what happens throughout a day and that’s a major concern. Fredricks said that isn’t addressed in the memo and he doesn’t believe it’s necessary to get a representative sample. Filardo thought there was data that showed a grab sample was biased, Fredricks said he would look into it but he didn’t remember seeing it.
8. Fredricks said the time of day the grab sample was taken would have an impact. Setter said they’re mainly looking for injuries that indicate problems in the collection system and time of day wouldn’t matter. Fredricks said that there is a condition difference in day vs. night fish. Setter said that night fish sampling would be a serious funding issue and that would require a BiOp requirement. Morrill said he understands that 100 fish of the predominant species are sampled, but that there’s a big difference in scope at different locations. Timing is important. Setter said that a new 24-hr spill program may change the samples, and so data from years ago may no longer be relevant. Morrill said expanding data beyond the time period couldn’t happen. Fredricks just wants the sampling snapshot to be most relevant. Setter said she can’t say they’ll be able to change sampling time of day at IHR for 2016. Morrill said maybe data could provide information on an applicable time of day. Setter said changing sampling time by a couple hours may be possible, but not much more. Fredricks said they may have to agree to disagree. Hours likely won’t change for 2016, but may go into the next BiOp.
9. Where SMP is currently not happening, the memo takes its place. Setter said the only place they asked for a change was LWG, there will be new personnel. **ACTION: If you have comments on the memo, send them to Lorz or Fredricks by the Feb meeting so that it can be formalized so that the larger FPOM group can comment.**
10. The next task group meeting will be after the Feb FPOM.
11. Comments are due by end of January. Fredricks requests comment on memo item #1, the 10% sampling rate. van Dyke suggested a table to determine how many fish you sample at low fish numbers. Setter said that the info is still used even if fish numbers are low, so they may want to take a larger portion for sampling. Condor asked what a reasonable time frame is then. **ACTION: Condor will look at PIT data to see when the most fish are passing.**

 April 8, 2015

**FILE MEMORANDUM**

**FROM:** Gary Fredricks, NOAA Fisheries

**SUBJECT:** Minimum Smolt Condition Monitoring

The 2008 FCRPS BiOp RM&E Strategy 2 includes RPA #53 which states that the Action Agencies shall “Monitor and document the condition (e.g., descaling and injury) of smolts at all dams with JBS systems, identify potential problems, and evaluate implemented solutions.” This required action does not stipulate the level of monitoring necessary to achieve the condition monitoring goals and under most cases, the ongoing Smolt Monitoring Program index sampling has been sufficient. However, there have been a couple of instances where smolt condition monitoring and reporting have become an issue, either at projects where the SMP index sampling does not occur or at projects were this monitoring is postponed for a portion of the juvenile migration season. It is important to NOAA Fisheries that the intent of RPA #53 be achieved at all JBS equipped dams under all cases during the migration season. Therefore, it seems prudent that some guidelines establishing minimum sampling and reporting requirements be included in the Fish Passage Plan which, by reference, is a working part of the Biological Opinion.

These requirements can either take the form of a blanket minimum that applies to all dams with JBS systems or they can be tailored to fit the circumstances at each dam. My preference is to work with the Action Agencies and the regional fishery managers to establish and maintain project specific requirements.

I**t should be noted that this requirement would not affect the SMP index sampling where that activity already meets or exceeds requirements for minimum condition sampling**.

Specifically, for each JBS equipped dam, I suggest that a FPOM task group work out the minimum sampling frequency in terms of days and hours per day, the minimum number of fish per species or predominate species, and reporting schedule, content and routing. This group should also further define the term “condition” stated in the RPA language.

**The overall goal should be to minimize the number of fish sampled and the impacts to those sampled fish while maintaining a reasonable estimate of JBS facility impacts.** It will be important to keep in mind the terms and conditions of NOAA’s take determination permit for smolt monitoring of ESA listed fish.

**This FPP change would primarily effect the 2016 migration season**, however, some aspects might be easily adopted by the current 2015 monitoring effort.