



FISH PASSAGE CENTER

847 N.E. 19th Avenue, #250, Portland, Oregon 97232

Phone: (503) 833-3900

Fax: (503) 232-1259

www.fpc.org

e-mail us at fpcstaff@fpc.org

March 18, 2014

Mr. Orri Vigfússon
North Atlantic Salmon Fund
Skiopholti 35
105 Reykjavík, Iceland

Dear Mr. Vigfússon,

We understand that pursuant to our last correspondence relative to the 2011 Master Plan Review, the Ministry for the Environment and Natural Resources appointed a Specialist Group to provide an evaluation of the impact of development on salmonids in the Thjorsa River, stemming from the proposed Hvammur, Holt and Urridafoss hydro-electric plants in the lower reaches of the river. The group was charged with assessing the uncertainty associated with existing information. The draft recommendation of the Specialist Group (December 19, 2013), now in consultation, is to re-classify the Hvammur hydroelectric plant from the “on hold” category to the “utilization” category, while retaining the Holt and Urridafoss plants in the “on hold” category.

It has been duly recognized that hydro development has significant impacts on the survival of fish stocks in the Thjorsa. Skulason and Ingvason (2013) conducted an independent evaluation of available research on the ecology of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) in the Thjorsa in relation to the proposed hydroelectric power plants and dams in the lower part of the river and concluded that “the overall impact of the hydroelectric power plan in the lower Thjorsa system would have significant and irreversible negative effects on their populations.” The question remains whether the proposed mitigation and countermeasures presented can ameliorate the significant impacts imposed by development. It appears that by recommending the re-classification of the Hvammur project, the Specialist Group accepts that the countermeasures offered can address the impacts of the development and maintain fish stocks in the Thjorsa.

The justification for the mitigation and countermeasures offered appears to rely heavily on the research conducted on the Columbia River in the USA. However, based on the experience of the efficacy of the mitigation measures implemented on the Columbia River, it must be cautioned that the assumptions made for the success of the engineered mitigation solutions are overly optimistic, given what we know regarding implementation in the Columbia River as well as in other river systems. There is considerable data available to suggest that mitigating for the

installation of hydroelectric projects is rarely successful in maintaining naturally spawning, self-sustaining populations of salmon. We have previously stated, and will reiterate here, that in spite of an estimated 11.9 billion U.S. dollars spent between 1979 and 2008 attempting to recover Columbia River salmon stocks by implementing, and continuing to modify mitigation efforts, we have failed to recover natural populations that remain as endangered species and are at risk of extinction.

These comments focus on the recommended development of the Hvammur project, but recognize that one of the primary justifications for developing the Hvammur plant is to research the proposed mitigation using this plant for future application to the other two proposed hydroelectric projects. We received several specific questions from you relative to these documents. To facilitate our review you provided an English translation of the following documents:

Skulason, S and H.R. Ingvason. Evaluation of Available research on salmonids in the river Thjorsa in S-Iceland and proposed countermeasures and mitigation efforts in relation to three proposed hydroelectric power plants in the lower part of the river. October, 2013.

Specialist evaluation of uncertainty of existing information on the impact of salmonids in the Thjorsa River, stemming from the proposed Hvammur, Holt and Urridafoss hydro-electric plants in the lower reaches of the river. Report to the Master Plan Steering Committee, November 4, 2013.

Response from the National Power Company regarding the October 22, 2013 request. Letter Dated October 31, 2013.

In general, the documents seem to suggest that mitigation for the presence of a Hvammur hydroelectric project will successfully mitigate the damage caused from hydro development. The National Power Company offers limited details, but suggests that mitigation is simple and can be very effective. This is an overly optimistic stance and is based on many questionable assumptions with large uncertainties. In response to your request we have the following answers to your questions.

Is the juvenile passage structure proposed for installation at Hvammur likely to meet the passage and survival estimates proposed by the National Power Company?

No, it is highly unlikely that the juvenile passage structures will meet the suggested passage and survival estimates provided by the National Power Company. In the October 31, 2013, letter from Landsvirkjun it is stated that a juvenile fish bypass structure will be included at Hvammur with a design similar to that proposed for Urridafoss. The National Power Company projects that based on their studies 91% of fish will pass the project via the surface flow bypass, with nearly 100% survival. The remaining 9% of fish are predicted to pass through the turbine units. The proposed Kaplan turbines are “fish friendly” turbines that have minimum gap runners, and a higher juvenile fish survival rate. Consequently, one is led to believe that the installation of the hydro project will be benign to the passage of juvenile and adult migrants.

There are three reasons why we do not agree that the juvenile passage structure will achieve the high performance suggested by the National Power Company: (1) Due to fish behaviors and variability, it is unlikely that the surface collection outlet systems (SFO) will achieve the assumed 91% efficiency; (2) the assumed 100% survival through the SFO is based on flawed studies; and, (3) the relation between bypass and powerhouse passage to latent mortality associated with these passage routes is ignored.

Assumption of 91% Fish Passage via Surface Flow Bypass

Surface collection outlet systems (SFO) are effective because juvenile salmonids typically migrate near the surface. However, in order to collect and pass fish, conditions in a dam forebay must be favorable to fish discovering, entering, and being retained in the system (Coutant and Whitney, 2000; Johnson and Dauble, 2006). The National Power Company expects that 91% of the juvenile fish approaching the project will pass via the surface flow bypass system. This assumption is based on two Master of Science theses (Gunnarsson, 2012; Gudmundsson, 2013) that have been completed developing either a physical model (Hvammur) or a physical model with validation using a numerical model (Urridafoss). The concept of a surface bypass collector for fish passage is based on the hydro-combine dam arrangement at Wells Dam on the Columbia River, USA. At Wells Dam the juvenile bypass system sits on top of the turbine units and has been very effective in passing juvenile migrants. Consequently, given the success at Wells Dam, this arrangement has been proposed for consideration as mitigation at other dams. What has been found from these other applications is that each project is unique and what works well in the case of Wells Dam, may not be applicable at other projects. For example, the Urridafoss thesis mentions the SFO at the Cowlitz Falls Dam, and recognizes that it has not worked as expected. It is a good illustration, since even with knowledge of juvenile fish behavior, this surface collection system has not worked as predicted.

The Cowlitz Falls Dam, located on the Cowlitz River in Washington State, is a concrete gravity dam with spill bays located directly above the generating units. Two Kaplan turbines are located below the two center spillways in a hydro-combine design. The initial juvenile bypass structures were installed in 1996 and annual estimates of fish passage collection via the surface flow collector has been less than stellar over those years. Studies have shown that discovery rates of the surface collection system routinely exceed 90 percent at Cowlitz Falls Dam (Hausmann et al., 2001; Farley et al., 2003; Liedtke et al., 2010). However, mark-recapture findings indicate that only about 50 percent of juvenile steelhead, 21 percent of juvenile coho, and 20 percent of juvenile Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) were bypassed annually during 1996–2012 (Serl and Heimbigner, 2013). Significant modifications have been made to improve passage through the surface passage routes, but as recently as 2013 turbine passage was the most common route for fish passage at this project.

Estimates of 100% juvenile survival through Surface Flow Bypass Structures

The near 100% juvenile survival estimates are derived from performance standards testing studies conducted in the Columbia River. While performance standards tests conducted at Columbia River dams often report survival estimates near 100%, both the applicability and development of these estimates has been in question. Acoustic tag studies provide only short-

term survivals for specific projects, and current performance testing does not include important metrics such as forebay residence time, travel time, or indirect mortality expressed a short distance below the dam. The location of juvenile bypass exits and the environmental conditions can greatly affect survival below the hydroelectric project. Increased avian and piscivorous predation can contribute to mortality at the juvenile exit location if conditions are not sufficient in terms of flow and hydrology.

In addition to the inappropriate use of these limited application performance standards estimates, there have been serious questions raised regarding the study design and conduct for these experiments. These concerns include the high-grading of the sample population, artificial inflation of estimates through the use of multiple control groups, effects of handling and tag burden, and the lack of assessment of long-term or delayed mortality (Fish Passage Center, January 4, 2013).

Due to size and fish condition, not all smolts can be tagged with the JSATS tags used in the survival studies. The number of fish rejected indicates that the study fish do not represent the population in the river, and so the results may not be applicable to estimating population survival. Rejection rates as high as 18% have been reported for these studies.

The virtual/paired-release design used in most of the tests utilizes two control groups, one released in the tailrace of the dam and one released further downstream. The further downstream group is intended to account for any handling mortality experienced by the tailrace group, which could inflate survival estimates. Under this experimental design, however, upward biasing of survival estimates could be caused by high mortality in the tailrace group. It is unlikely that tagged fish in both stretches of river encounter the same environmental conditions, especially since predation rates are higher in the forebay and tailrace than mid-reservoir at many projects (Petersen 1994, Ward et al. 1995). If survival in the tailrace group is lower than survival in the further downstream group, the ratios of survivals artificially increase estimates of dam survival.

Survival estimates generated with this multiple-release design may further increase dam survival estimates due to random sampling effects. If there is limited handling and transportation mortality, the use of the further downstream group will introduce additional variation to the study. Beeman et al. (2011) concluded that this result is “contrary to the goal of adjusting a paired-release estimate downward to account for handling mortality.”

In addition, in the Virtual-Paired Release design, fish are released upstream of the dam so they achieve a distribution through passage routes that reflects the run at large. Fish that die between tagging and the forebay of the dam are not included in the study. However, this means that fish that have lower survival through the reaches will not be included in the study. Mortality between tagging and detection was as high as 12.5% in yearling Chinook in 2012. As with the effects of tagging only healthy fish, this means that only the healthiest of tagged fish are included in the dam survival estimates.

Given all of these limitations associated with the studies, it is unlikely that actual survivals through the bypass systems are actually anywhere near 100%.

Failure to Incorporate Delayed Effects of Dam Passage

Similar to the link between cigarette smoking and subsequent development of cancer at a later life stage, the long-term effects of hydro project passage routes for juvenile fish have been well documented in recent years. It has been demonstrated that fish that survive juvenile bypass systems or powerhouse passage are less likely to survive the first ocean year, and less likely to return as adults (Haeseker et al., 2012; Petrosky and Schaller, 2010; Tuomikoski et al., 2010; Fish Passage Center Memos October 6, 2010, January 19, 2011, and July 14, 2011; Schaller and Petrosky, 2007).

Reservoir mortality in the Columbia River can be significant after fish have experienced bypass passage through hydroelectric dams. The cumulative effect of passing through dams and reservoirs can also have direct and delayed impacts on salmon survival (Schaller and Petrosky 2007, Tuomikoski et al. 2012, 2013). The delayed mortality from the accumulation of dam and reservoir passages can manifest into poor survival during estuary and marine life stages (Budy et al. 2002, Schaller & Petrosky 2007, and Schaller et al. 2014).

Has adequate pre-development baseline data been collected to allow accurate monitoring of the impacts of development to all species at risk?

The fact that the development of the Thjorsa will have impact to salmonid and other species survival is not disputed. The question is how large an impact and whether that impact can be mitigated. The ability to determine the magnitude of an impact is only as good as the information available before the perturbation. There has been insufficient collection of the appropriate biological data and an insufficient evaluation of the potential impacts using population viability analyses. The previous focus of the agencies that operate the Columbia River hydrosystem has been to approach mitigation as addressing the immediate impact of the structure. What we have learned over years of research is that, while the at-dam survival is important, the latent effects, which can be greater than direct effects, must be addressed if the viability of the population over the long term is of interest. As we have learned through recent research, the link between the routes by which juvenile fish migrate through hydro projects and subsequent survival to adulthood is extremely important.

Previous guidance according to the US National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS 2008) at a minimum the following biological information should be provided for the development of the preliminary design for hydro-development:

1. Type, life stage, run size, period of migration, and spawning location and timing for each life stage and species present at the site.
2. Other species (including life stage) present at the proposed fish passage site that also require passage.
3. Predatory species that may be present.
4. High and low design passage flow for periods of upstream fish passage. The design streamflow range for fish passage, bracketed by the designated fish passage design high and low flows, constitutes the bounds of the fish passage facility design where fish

passage facilities must operate within the specified design criteria. Within this range of streamflow, the fishway design must allow for safe, timely, and efficient fish passage.

5. Any known fish behavioral aspects that affect salmonid passage.
6. What is known and what needs to be researched about fish migration routes approaching the site.
7. Document, or estimate, minimum streamflow required to allow migration around the impediment during low water period.
8. Poaching/illegal trespass – describe the degree of human activity in the immediate area and the need for security measures to reduce or eliminate illegal activity.
9. Water quality factors that may affect fish passage at the site. Fish may not migrate if water temperature and quality are marginal, instead seeking holding zones until water quality conditions improve.

Biological data has been collected by the Institute for Freshwater Fisheries (IFF) that address some of the items listed above relative to life stage, timing of juvenile salmon migration, and abundance. However, several of the listed information needs appear insufficiently addressed based on the available information reviewed.

Additionally, as we have stressed repeatedly, newer research has clearly demonstrated the link between hydro project passage and its effect on salmon survival at a later life stage. Consequently, it is of extreme importance to collect a significant time series of smolt-to-adult return rates (SARs) and conduct a Population Viability Analysis (PVA). It is impossible to apply a risk assessment without some measurement of life cycle survival, like SARs. The PVA will likely identify critical uncertainties associated with the potential impacts of dams over variations in marine conditions and climate change. This analysis would provide a risk assessment of hydro development for Thjorsa populations, while considering the variation in marine conditions and the impacts of climate change.

Are the countermeasures and emergency plan described in the Oct. 31, 2013, letter from the National Power Company likely to protect anadromous species in the Thjorsa and mitigate for the hydropower development?

Based on the information provided in the October 31 letter and the experience in the Columbia River, it is unlikely that the proposed countermeasures and emergency plan will mitigate for the hydro power development. In general, the proposed countermeasures include: constructing juvenile bypasses and adult fishways; providing managed and minimum flows in parts of the riverbed with reduced flow and avoidance of sudden flow fluctuations; opening up new habitat for migrating fish; and designing structures and turbines to avoid the oversaturation of dissolved gasses or death of fish. In addition, the National Power Company recommends additional research on (1) the effects of hydro projects and results of countermeasures, (2) the downstream and upstream migration of fish in Thjorsa, and (3) the effects of Hvammur on bottom fauna in Thjorsa.

All of the countermeasures described by the National Power Company, and more, are presently implemented in the Columbia River hydro system. However, in the Columbia River these countermeasures do not provide for sustainable natural populations. Hydro projects in the Columbia impose sufficient mortality upon populations such that populations are maintained at a level that warrants their existence as species at risk of extinction.

Additionally, the proposed countermeasures and emergency plan specifics are poorly defined and/or rely on future research. For example, the National Power Company recommends “providing managed and minimum flows in parts of the riverbed with reduced flow and avoidance of sudden flow fluctuations,” without specifically defining operations beyond establishing a minimum flow below each of the projects. In the Columbia River extensive modifications and restrictions on flow regimes are used. Fall Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) have suffered severe impacts from the hydroelectric development. Fall Chinook salmon rely heavily on mainstem habitats for all phases of their life cycle, and mainstem hydroelectric dams have inundated or blocked areas that were historically used for spawning and rearing (Dauble et al., 2003, Anglin et al., 2006). The natural flow pattern that existed in the historic period has been altered by the dam development, and the operation of the dams to produce power to meet short-term needs in electricity (termed power peaking) produces unnatural fluctuations in flow over a 24-hour cycle. These flow fluctuations alter the physical habitat and disrupt the cues that salmon use to select spawning sites, as well as strand fish in near-shore habitat that becomes dewatered. Furthermore, the quality of spawning gravels has been affected by dam construction, flood protection, and agricultural and industrial development. In some cases, the riverbed is armored such that it is more difficult for spawners to move, while in other cases the intrusion of fine sediment into spawning gravels has reduced water flow to sensitive eggs and young fry. To address some of the impacts of development in the Columbia significant restrictions on seasonal and daily flow variations have been established. These restrictions are in place throughout spawning, incubation, emergence and juvenile rearing; often extending over a six month period.

The National Power Company also mentions a commitment to ten years of monitoring, but does not specify the extent and funding level of commitment. In the Columbia River the operation of the dams requires continued real-time monitoring throughout the lifetime operation of the hydro project. In addition, millions of dollars are annually committed to fund research for the protection, mitigation, and enhancement of fish and wildlife affected by the construction and inundation impacts of the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS).

Are there any additional concerns that you would like to indicate at this time?

There are several additional concerns that warrant comment at this time. The most serious additional concern is the complete lack of information or attention that has been given to the iteroparous nature of the fish stocks in the Thjorsa. Unlike Pacific salmon, Atlantic salmon, brown trout, and char are all repeat spawners migrating to the sea at various times of the year, sizes and physical condition. Iteroparous populations generally have higher population abundance and productivity over their lifetime. All of the proposed countermeasures and mitigation address only the seaward migration of juveniles, primarily based on information collected in the Columbia River where fish only spawn once. The exception to salmon spawning

once in the Columbia is a small portion of the steelhead salmon. In the Snake and Columbia River systems, fish passage facilities at hydroelectric dams were not designed or constructed to accommodate downstream-migrating, post-spawning steelhead adults (kelts). From the passage mortality estimated for the few steelhead kelts it has been established that the mortality on these fish has been very high when migrating downstream to the sea. Given that the overall productivity of the Thjorsa population is dependent on kelts, and what information exists suggests that considerable mortality is incurred during downstream kelt passage, it is of significant concern that they are not considered or addressed.

The Icelandic populations of salmon represent the northern extent of the distribution of salmon. Consequently, these salmon likely have unique adaptations given the unusual geology of Iceland. Given that, the salmon populations of Iceland likely function as metapopulations (Hanski, 1999), where populations are not completely isolated and are connected by the movement of individuals (immigration and emigration) among them. The Thjorsa salmon populations are considered the largest in Iceland and consequently, increasing the risk to the Thjorsa salmon could affect many of the salmon populations in other parts of Iceland. Additionally, impacts to the Thjorsa population, which is likely a unique segment of the population, could also put other Atlantic salmon populations at risk.

The Specialist Group makes a differentiation between natural distribution areas of migratory fish in the Thjorsa river system, and distribution areas arising from human intervention. The Thjorsa is already a perturbed river system. Significant modification to seasonal and annual river flow has occurred as a result of the building of storage projects above the range of salmonid passage. Currently there are six hydroelectric power plants in the upper parts of the system. Due to this development the peak river flows that historically occurred during May through July have been reduced. That change in flow regime and development was partly mitigated by the installation of the fish ladder at Buddafoss. The installation of this fish ladder significantly increased the available range and habitat for anadromous species. However, the present range reflects the viable population. Reduction of this range could impact the viability of the population. Consequently, the reflection that the population above the historic range of the species is not vital to the continued viability of this population is premature and not based on any specific data.

Water quality can likely be an issue at the project, related primarily to temperature and changes in levels of dissolved gases. The Columbia River is managed to both national and state criteria for these potential pollutants. There have been no studies provided detailing the expected changes in total dissolved gases or temperature, water quality standards, and proposed mitigation for the Thjorsa River. Based on the predicted flows and the size of the power station, there are periods of the year when flow in excess of the hydraulic capacity of the proposed hydro project will occur and water will be spilled over the spillway. While the National Power Company says they will “Design structures and turbines to avoid oversaturation of dissolved gasses or death of fish,” no information is available as to how they will accomplish that goal and whether, for example, they will design the project to include spill deflectors at the base of the spillways or construct gas dissipating tailraces below the project.

There is no mention of the restriction of operating turbines to a specific efficiency range to maximize fish survival. Kaplan turbine operating efficiency has a relatively direct effect on fish

passage survival where the relationship between survival of juvenile fish passing through Kaplan turbines is positively correlated and roughly linear to the efficiency at which the turbines are operated. Bell (1981) recommended making every effort to operate turbines at best efficiency at a given head during periods of peak fish passage to minimize fish mortality. Turbine units at Columbia River projects are operated within 1% of peak efficiency, less than maximum rated output. This restriction on turbine energy production remains in effect throughout the juvenile fish migration period.

The National Power Company has suggested that a buy-out of net fishers will provide increased angling upstream and overall increases in numbers of fish returning. While it is true that decreasing fishing pressure in the lower river will lead to an immediate increase in the numbers of fish migrating through the river, the long-term sustainability of these increased numbers depends on the ability of the proposed mitigation to address the impacts of the projects.

Fishery impacts and adult passage are fairly established for anadromous salmon species, but very little information is available for arctic char and brown trout, or eels. Unlike salmon species that are anadromous, eels are catadromous where the adults migrate downstream to the ocean and juvenile migrate upstream from the ocean. In addition to migrating at different life stages, eels also tend to exhibit demersal behavior, while juvenile salmon are located in the upper parts of the water column. The passage countermeasures applied to the anadromous model of fish mitigation may not be at all applicable to this species. Arctic char populations, similar to bull trout in the Columbia River basin, (Anglin et al. 2010; Budy et al. 2005 and 2009) may migrate at multiple ages. Therefore, fish much larger than salmon smolts migrating to sea may be attempting to negotiate downstream passage structures designed for fish of different sizes. In addition, the time period during which juvenile migration takes place is different than observed for salmon smolts.

We realize that there are many more facets to each of the discussed issues, but we hope that we have addressed your questions adequately. Please feel free to contact us if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Margaret J. Filardo". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Margaret J. Filardo, Ph.D.
Fishery Biologist

References

Anglin, D.R., D.G. Gallion, M. Barrows, S. Haeseker, R. Koch, and C. Newlon. 2010. Monitoring the Use of the Mainstem Columbia River by Bull Trout from the Walla Walla Basin. Final Report prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Walla Walla, WA. (pdf 893kb). <http://www.fws.gov/columbiariver/publications.htm>

Anglin, D.R., S.L. Haeseker, J.J. Skalicky, H. Schaller, K.F. Tiffan, J.R. Hatten, P. Hoffarth, J. Nugent, D. Benner, and M. Yoshinaka. 2006. Effects of Hydropower Operations on Spawning Habitat, Rearing Habitat, and Stranding/Entrapment Mortality of Fall Chinook Salmon in the Hanford Reach of the Columbia River. USFWS Final Report.

Beeman JW, Kock TJ, Perry RW, Smith SG. 2011. Analysis of dam-passage of yearling and subyearling Chinook salmon and juvenile Steelhead at The Dalles Dam, Oregon, 2010: US Geological Survey Open-File Report 2011-1162, 38 p.

Bell, Milo C. 1981. Updated Compendium on the Success of Passage of Small Fish Through Turbines. North Pacific Division US Army Corps of Engineers, Portland, OR.

Bjornn T.C. and R.M. Piaskowski. 1999. Distribution and movements of Northern Pikeminnow and smallmouth bass during operation of a surface bypass and collection system for Juvenile salmonids at Lower Granite Dam, 1996–1997. U.S. Geological Survey Idaho Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit Technical Report 99-2.

Boggs CT and Peery CA. 2004. Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) Kelt Abundance, Condition, Passage, and Survival in the Lower Snake and Columbia Rivers, 2003. Report No. ICFWRU 2004-1, prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Walla Walla District.

Budy, P., G.P. Thiede, N. Bouwes, C.E. Petrosky, and H. Schaller. 2002. Evidence linking delayed mortality of Snake River salmon to their earlier hydrosystem experience. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 22:35–51.

Budy, P., R. Al-Chokhachy, and K. Homel. Bull trout population assessment in northeastern Oregon: a template for recovery planning. 2005 Annual Report. UTCFWRU 2006. (pdf 1.8 mb) <http://www.fws.gov/columbiariver/publications.html>

Budy, P., T. Bowerman, and G.P. Thiede. Bull trout population assessment in northeastern Oregon: a template for recovery planning. 2009 Annual Report. UTCFWRU 2010. (pdf) <http://www.fws.gov/columbiariver/publications.html>

Coutant, C. C., and R. R. Whitney. 2000. Fish behavior in relation to passage through hydropower turbines: a review. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 129:351–380.

Dauble D.D., T.P. Hanrahan, D.R. Geist, and M.J. Parsley. 2003. Impacts of the Columbia River hydroelectric system on main-stem habitats of fall Chinook salmon. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 23(3):641–659.

Farley, J.M., Perry, R.W., Shurtleff, D.J., Feil, D.H., and Rondorf, D.W. 2003. Migration behavior of juvenile salmonids and evaluation of a modified flume entrance at Cowlitz Falls Dam, Washington, 2001: Report by the U.S. Geological Survey to the Public Utility District No. 1 of Lewis County, 51 p.

Fish Passage Center Memoranda:

October 6, 2010 <http://www.fpc.org/documents/memos/135-10.pdf>

January 19, 2011 <http://www.fpc.org/documents/memos/08-11.pdf>

July 14, 2011 <http://www.fpc.org/documents/memos/102-11.pdf>

January 4, 2013 <http://www.fpc.org/documents/memos/02-13.pdf>

Guðmundsson, Agust. 2013. Model Investigations of a Juvenile Fish Bypass System at Urriðafoss HEP, M.Sc. thesis, Faculty of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Iceland.

Gunnarsson, Andri. 2012. Physical Model Investigation on the Hvammur HEP Spillway, M.Sc. thesis, Faculty of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Iceland.

Haeseker, S.L., J.M. McCann, J.E. Tuomikoski, and B. Chockley. 2012. Assessing freshwater and marine environmental influences on life-stage-specific survival rates of Snake River spring/summer Chinook salmon and steelhead. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, 141:1, 121–138.

Hanski, I. 1999. *Metapopulation Ecology*. Oxford University Press.

Hausmann, B.J., Feil, D.H., and Rondorf, D.W. 2001. Evaluation of an experimental baffle panel configuration to improve fish collection efficiency at Cowlitz Falls Dam, Washington, spring 2000: Report by the U.S. Geological Survey to the Public Utility District No. 1 of Lewis County, 16 p.

Johnson, G. E., & Dauble, D. D. 2006. Surface flow outlets to protect juvenile salmonids. *Reviews in Fisheries Science*, 14, 213–244.

Johnson, G. E., F Khan, MC Richmond, RP Mueller, JB Hedgepeth, CL Rakowski, GR Ploskey, NK Sather, MG Anderson JA Serkowski, Z Deng, JR Steinbecka. 2009. Smolt responses to hydrodynamic conditions in forebay flow nets of surface flow outlets, 2007. Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Contract DE-AC05-76RL01830.

Liedtke, T.L., Kock, T.J., Ekstrom, B.K., Royer, I.M., and Rondorf, D.W., 2010, Juvenile salmonid collection efforts in the upper Cowlitz River basin—2009 evaluations: Report by the U.S. Geological Survey to Tacoma Power, 135 p.

National Power Company. 2013. Response regarding the October 22, 2013 request. Letter Dated October 31, 2013.

NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2008. Anadromous Salmonid Passage Facility Design. NMFS, Northwest Region, Portland, Oregon.

Petersen, JH. 1994. Importance of spatial pattern in estimating predation of juvenile salmonids in the Columbia River. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 14:924–930.

Petrosky, C.E., and H.A. Schaller. 2010. Influence of river conditions during seaward migration and ocean conditions on survival rates of Snake River Chinook salmon and steelhead. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish* 19(4): 520–536.

Schaller, H.A and C.E. Petrosky. 2007. Assessing hydrosystem influence on delayed mortality of Snake River stream-type Chinook salmon. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* Vol. 27, NO. 3, August 2007 pp 810–824.

Schaller, H.A., C.E. Petrosky, and E.S. Tinus. 2014 Evaluating river management during seaward migration to recover Columbia River stream-type Chinook salmon considering the variation in marine conditions. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 71(2) 259–271.

Serl, J.D., and Heimbigner, D. 2013. Data summary for the 2012 operation of the Cowlitz Falls fish facility and related activities: Report by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission to the Bonneville Power Administration, 51 p.

Skulason, S and H.R. Ingvason. 2013. Evaluation of Available research on salmonids in the river Thjorsa in S-Iceland and proposed countermeasures and mitigation efforts in relation to three proposed hydroelectric power plants in the lower part of the river. October, 2013.

Specialist evaluation of uncertainty of existing information on the impact of salmonids in the Thjorsa River, stemming from the proposed Hvammer, Holt and Urridafoss hydro-electric plants in the lower reaches of the river. Report to the Master Plan Steering Committee, November 4, 2013.

Tuomikoski J, McCann J, Berggren T, Schaller H, Wilson P, Haeseker S, Fryer J, Petrosky C, Tinus E, Dalton T, Ehlke R. 2010. Comparative Survival Study (CSS) of PIT-tagged Spring/Summer Chinook and Summer Steelhead 2010 Annual Report.

Tuomikoski J, McCann J, Chockley, B, Schaller H, Wilson P, Haeseker S, Fryer J, Petrosky C, Tinus E, Dalton T, Ehlke R, Lessard, R. 2012. Comparative Survival Study (CSS) of PIT-tagged Spring/Summer Chinook and Summer Steelhead 2012 Annual Report.

Tuomikoski J, McCann J, Chockley, B, Schaller H, Wilson P, Haeseker S, Fryer J, Petrosky C, Tinus E, Dalton T, Ehlke R, Lessard, R. 2013. Comparative Survival Study (CSS) of PIT-tagged Spring/Summer Chinook and Summer Steelhead 2013 Annual Report.

Ward DL, Petersen JH, Lock JJ. 1995. Index of predation of juvenile salmonids by Northern Squawfish in the lower and middle Columbia River and in the lower Snake River. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society.* 24:321–334.