

# Meeting Brief: Fish Passage Working Group #6

Meeting Held: 04.30.19

Notes prepared by Consensus Building Institute

## Outcomes

The Fish Passage Working Group reviewed the results of scoring the fish passage scenarios, noting areas where the scoring sub-group had agreement on the promise of a passage option and also where sub-group members had expressed a range of opinions and why.

Outmigration, particularly for juveniles, is a significant challenge to manage in different fish passage technologies.

CBI will work with working group members to write up a policy brief that describes the fish passage options that the working group has evaluated. The group agreed on the reporting template content. Once the write up is developed, members will have an opportunity to review. The group may develop an online tool to see how participants might rank different options. Then, the group will hold a call to discuss and finalize its recommendations to the Ad Hoc. The goal is to develop a recommendations section or chapter, preferably by July 1 or shortly thereafter.

The working group had a preliminary discussion on its potential recommendations to the Ad Hoc. The primary drivers that impact the recommendations are the fish passage objectives, outmigration, long-term viability, volitional passage, and a 50-year solution. With these factors in mind and solely focused on fish passage, the group prioritized the following passage options.

*The following fish passage options could meet the fish passage objectives:*

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <i>“Best” meets fish passage objectives</i> | 4.1 Remove Scott Dam and Modify Cape Horn Dam | 4.2 Remove both Scott Dam and Cape Horn Dam With Diversion |
| <i>Next best</i>                            | 3.2 Lower Scott Dam to 50'                    |  |
| <i>Least best</i>                           | 1.3 Modified M&H Fish Ladder                  | 2.2 Trap & Haul, at Scott Dam                              |

The work of both the Fish Passage and Water Supply Working Groups will be integrated to help the Ad Hoc consider feasible options for a two-basin solution.

## Fish Passage Scenarios Summary Table

|                | <b>1 Fishway at Existing Scott Dam Options</b>   | <b>2 Trap &amp; Haul</b>  | <b>3 Partial Scott Dam Removal</b>   | <b>4 Remove Scott Dam and Modify Cape Horn Dam</b>   |
|----------------|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Options</b> | <p>1.1 Semi-Natural, Low-Gradient Bypass Channel</p> <p>1.2 Original Mead &amp; Hunt (M&amp;H) Fish Ladder</p> <p>1.3 Modified M&amp;H Fish Ladder</p> | <p>2.1 Trap &amp; Haul, Van Arsdale to Scott Dam</p> <p>2.2 Trap &amp; Haul, at Scott Dam</p> | <p>3.1 Lower Scott Dam to 80' - Meet PVID demand and environmental flows</p> <p>3.2 Lower Scott Dam to 50' - Retain accumulated sediment</p> | <p>4.1 Remove Scott Dam and Modify Cape Horn Dam</p> <p>4.2 Remove both Scott Dam and Cape Horn Dam</p> <p>1) With Diversion (provides another baseline for flows and fish)</p> <p>2) No Diversion</p> |

## Action Items

| <b>Assignee</b> | <b>Timing</b> | <b>Task</b>                                     |
|-----------------|---------------|---|
| CBI             | June          | Develop written summary of fish passage options |
| Scoring Group   | June          | Discuss explanation for divergent scores        |