

High Head Bypass Fish Passage Investigations Year Two: Truck Transport vs. Bypass

April 12, 2022

Stephanie Liss, Eric Fischer, Ryan Harnish, Ben Vaage, James Hughes, Jarrod Ver Steeg, Robbert Elsinghorst, and Daniel Deng



PNNL is operated by Battelle for the U.S. Department of Energy





The Willamette Basin

Juvenile salmon and steelhead passage



- High Head Bypass Product Delivery Team
 - Investigate alternatives to improve downstream fish passage
 - Intact bypass system for research
- Copepod-infected fish
 - Increased prevalence at Cougar Dam
- Is there a downstream passage conveyance that best minimizes stress in fish?





Mimic Potential Stressors for the **Cougar Dam Trap and Haul Alternative**

Two Full-Scale Fish Passage **Evaluation Studies:**

- Healthy Fish
- Infected Fish

Conduct bypass pipe and trap and haul treatments and analyze sub-samples for:

- Stress hormone
 - Cortisol
- Stress metabolites
 - Glucose and lactate
- Presence of major injuries
- Rate of survival







Study Design Assumptions

- Alternative stressors for Bypass Pipe and Transport simulations would be appropriate for imitating real world stressors for juvenile fish
 - Logistical constraints
 - Lack of infrastructure
- Surrogate wild fish would have similar stress response as wild fish
- Glucose and lactate would provide additional data on fish stress levels
- Year Two design improvements to Bypass Pipe holding tanks would mitigate for tank location effects identified in Year One
 - Shade tarp to provide cover and reduce direct sunlight
 - Insulating and sound absorbing wrap



100000000

00000000000

Green Peter Dam

BypranterFipsh Collector

Mark Ylen – Democrat Herald

Bypass Pipe Treatment Relocate fish Acclimate (2 wk) Pull center standpipe



Flex pipe to bypass pipe Chute from FSS into bypass Bypass pipe passage Bypass pipe passage Release into river

Release into collector – blood samples (x6)



Enter Floating Screen Structure (FSS)



Transport Treatment



Relocate fish







Forklift/ Flex hose/ Pod holding Enter FSS/ Chute passage/ Pod holding



Forklift (x2) Crane (x2)



Truck drive (x2) Boat drive/ Truck drive



Release into collector – blood samples (x6) Release into river



Forklift drive Monorail trip



Replicates and Sample Sizes for Blood Sampling Healthy and Infected

- Bypass Pipe: 4 replicates (*N*=120)
 - Controls: 4 replicates (N=20 total)

- - Different pod holding times



lactate (top) and glucose (bottom)



• Transport = 12 replicates (*N*=360) \checkmark 1 h = 4 replicates (*n*=120 total) \checkmark 12 h = 4 replicates (*n*=120 total) \checkmark 24 h = 4 replicates (*n*=120 total) Controls = 12 replicates (N=60 total) New for Year Two: field readings of





- Water Temperature

- Water Temperature

* *P* < 0.05

Pacific Northwest

Healthy Fish True Cortisol Concentrations Peaked at 0.5 or 1 h

- No differences in control fish cortisol: compared true cortisol concentrations
- Treatment replicates were combined at each post-treatment blood sampling time
- Cortisol response curves peaked at 0.5 or 1 h post-treatment and trended towards decreasing by 24 h post-treatment



Post-Treatment Sampling Time (h)



 No differences in *control* fish glucose: compared true glucose concentrations

Pacific

Northwest

- Treatment replicates were combined at each post-treatment blood sampling time
- Glucose response curves varied with peaks ranging from 3-6 h post-treatment, and decreasing by 24 h post-treatment



Post-Treatment Sampling Time (h)



Healthy Fish True Lactate Concentrations Followed Cortisol Trends

- No differences in *control* fish lactate: compared true lactate concentrations
- Treatment replicates were combined at each post-treatment blood sampling time
- Lactate response curves followed cortisol curves, peaking at 0.5 or 1 h post-treatment and trended towards decreasing by 24 h post-treatment





Infected Fish Differences in Water Temperature; Differences in Control Fish Cortisol



- Water Temperature
- Dissolved Oxygen

- Water Temperature

* *P* < 0.05

Infected Fish Lower Cortisol Ratios through 6 h Post-Treatment for Bypass Pipe

 Differences identified in control fish cortisol: compared treatment:control cortisol (T:C) ratios

Pacific

Northwest

- Treatment replicates were combined at each post-treatment blood sampling time
- Median cortisol concentrations were used for T:C ratios



Post-Treatment Sample Time (h)

Infected Fish True Cortisol Concentrations Peaked at 0.5 or 1 h

 Compared true cortisol concentrations for comparability with glucose and lactate

Pacific

Northwest

- Treatment replicates were combined at each post-treatment blood sampling time
- Cortisol response curves peaked at 0.5 or 1 h post-treatment and trended towards decreasing by 24 h post-treatment



Post-Treatment Sampling Time (h)



Infected Fish **True Glucose Concentrations Varied Among** Treatments Median bypass pipe 250 250 Median bypass pipe control

- No differences in *control* fish glucose: compared true glucose concentrations
- Treatment replicates were combined at each post-treatment blood sampling time
- Glucose response curves varied with peaks ranging from 3–6 hours post-treatment, and decreasing by 24 h post-treatment







Infected Fish True Lactate Concentrations Followed Cortisol Trends Median bypass pipe 11 Median 1 h transport 11

- No differences in *control* fish lactate: compared true lactate concentrations
- Treatment replicates were combined at each post-treatment blood sampling time
- Lactate response curves followed cortisol curves, peaking at 0.5 or 1 h post-treatment and trended towards decreasing by 24 h post-treatment







Year Two: All Fish Were Stressed; **Recovering by 24 h Post-Treatment**

- Healthy and Infected fish evaluations
 - All fish stressed, regardless of treatment; recovering by 24 h post-treatment
 - Cortisol and lactate followed similar trends, peaking 0.5 or 1 h post-treatment ✓ Bypass Pipe had higher peaks; however, they were within the range of normal peak concentrations ✓ Other variables may affect stress response
 - Social hierarchies within different tanks (subordinate fish more stressed than dominant fish)
 - Fish genetics and stock
 - Alternative stressors used (potentially did not provide same intensity or duration as a real world stressor)
 - Bypass Pipe and Transport
 - ✓ Holding time in the FSS or pod
 - Bypass Pipe = no holding of fish, less likely to be exposed to human contact or air
 - Transport = holding of fish (particularly of concern if copepods are present with high densities of fish in the pod), potential for exposure to human contact or air (minimal)
 - Injuries and Survival
 - \checkmark Healthy fish = no differences among four treatments for injury or survival
 - \checkmark Infected fish = Bypass Pipe fish had a greater number of injuries than 1 h and 12 h Transport fish
 - No differences among the four treatments for survival

18



High Head Bypass Fish Passage Investigations: **Years One and Two**

- First of its kind laboratory study that occurred in the field, simulating
 - Bypass pipe through an intact bypass system
 - Truck transport using a new technique
 - Study Assumptions
 - \checkmark Alternative stressors were as applicable to the real world techniques as possible
 - Stress response may be different for fish that undergo the bypass pipe and transport conveyances in the real world (i.e., with a fully functioning FSS)
 - ✓ Surrogate wild fish would respond similarly to stressors as wild fish
 - Previous studies have shown higher cortisol and glucose concentrations in wild fish compared to hatchery fish; stress response may be different for wild fish compared to surrogate fish
 - ✓ Glucose and lactate to provide additional stress response information
 - Lactate had similar trends as cortisol
 - Glucose a bit more variable, potentially because it is also a metric for nutrition
 - ✓ Bypass Pipe holding tank improvements were successful in reducing stress for healthy fish compared to Transport holding tank location
- Perform a real world field study using a fully functioning FSS to provide most realistic evaluation of the stress response



Acknowledgments

Army Corps of Engineers

- Fenton Khan •
- Greg Taylor
- Foster Dam Staff
 - Thomas Voldbaek
 - Justin Barrowcliff
 - Dave Israel
 - Jessi Jernigan
 - Nathan Jones
 - Jerry Murphy
 - Bau Nguyen
 - **Bill Plucker**
 - Tom Porter
 - Neal Rose
 - Curtis Rutherford
- Foster Dam Operators
 - Tony Parillo
 - Mark Scherer
 - Mike Shirley
 - **Jim Williams**
 - Mark Woodrow
- **Engineering Staff**
- Reservoir Control Staff

Mainstem Fish Research

- Geoff McMichael •
- Aleah Dew
- Caleb Price

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Brett Boyd

Oregon State University

- Carl Schreck
- **David Noakes**
- Rob Chitwood
- Olivia Hakanson
- Crystal Herron
- Lauren Norris
- **Jim Peterson**
- **Justin Sanders**
- Michelle Scanlan
- Travis Neal
- Wild Fish Surrogate Team







Oregon State University

- John Stephenson

This research was conducted in compliance with a protocol approved by PNNL's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee.

PNNL

Brandon Boehnke Kate Deters Jill Janak • Tim Linley Kailan Mackereth Frin McCann Brett Pflugrath Aljon Salalila Julie Snook



20



Questions?

