

Whooshh Innovations

Sockeye salmon in the Pacific Northwest

PASSAGE PILOT FOR SOCKEYE REINTRODUCTION AT CLE ELUM USING THE WHOOSHH FISH TRANSPORT SYSTEM



PROJECT AREA









Reservoir Fish Passage

Reservels Fash Passage et. 1. Cher Lake 2. Cle Burn 3. Burging 4. Tatan (Birmock) 5. Kenthelue 6. Kachest 0



Provide fish passage at:

1. Clear Lake

2. Cle Elum

3. Bumping

4. Tieton (Rimrock)

Sasir.

projects to transfer water from

the Culumbia liber to the Yakima

5. Keechelus

KlickRat County

6. Kachess

by a water market and/or a bank to improve water supply takima River basin. Market ution would be conducted in in the second ear-term phase would conwater marketing and ing programs in the basin, but additional steps to reduce herto water transfers. ong-term program would focus tating water transfers beimpation districts. This would an impation district to fallow within the district and issue rights for that land outside



bruct pilot projects to

uste rectarging shallow

offers via groundwater

Renertation may follow.

ild an squiter storage and

overy facility allowing Yakima

to elthdraw water from the

sches River during high flow

periods and store it underground

for use during low flow periods.

Itration. Full scale

Cle Elum Dam – 1,100' X 165'





CLE ELUM AND REINTRODUCTION

• Cle Elum Dam

- USBR irrigation dam
- Blockage to anadromous fish since early 1900s
- Yakama Nations reintroduction program
 - 5 species planned, sockeye first
 - Lake seeded with adults for several years
 - New "helix" for downstream
 - Ladder estimate \$50M+
 - New sorting/handling facility planned
 - At dam rap and transport planned



Goals for Whooshh Passage study

Can we get fish safely over a dam this size?

- Distance
- Height/grade
- Survival

Can we get fish to volitionally pass Cle Elum? Will Whooshh technology scale to this size challenge?



SITE CHALLENGES

1. Technical

- Two roads
- Height and length
 - \checkmark 1100' furthest accomplished before this test
 - ✓~100' highest to date
- Grade
 - ✓ Low overall
 - ✓ 35% at steepest point near road crossing
- Forebay fluctuation
 - ✓ 70' drop during test period
- Tailrace variability
 - ✓ 5-10' rise during test period



SITE CHALLENGES

2. Biological

- Available population
 - ✓ No ESA listed so no NMFS delay
 - ✓ Low return numbers from program
 - No prior in-river fish (all trapped and trucked from Rosa)
 - ✓ Introduced fish Wenatchee or Okanagan origin
- Temperature
 - ✓ Ambient temperature 45-95 degrees
- Attraction flows
 - Limited site placement choices given timing and temporary nature



ENTRANCE CONFIGURATION

Key components

Steep pass for returning fish Flume/pipe for trucked fish Observation/holding tank False Weir Autonomous scanner Sorter Accelerator Bypass tank



Scanner /sorter

Delivery pipe for trucked fish

Accelerator

Observation tank Alaska steep pass

Tube routing and Length

Total length 1700' Rise 175' 35% maximum angle Routing Under road 1 (existing bridge over spillway) Over road 2 (dam crest road) Cooling jacket Continuous misting



TUBE ROUTING



Under.....

....over





EXIT CONFIGURATION

Floating platform Accommodate forebay fluctuation Anchor/winch Deflector Angle fish for ideal lake entry after tube exit Booster station before dam crest Provide speed control prior to fish exit Increase throughput of system



EXIT







What actually happened

System setup in less than 90 days

- Probably a first for high head dam fish passage
- Worst sockeye return on Columbia for 10 years

Fish considerably smaller than 2016 Priest Rapids migration study test

- Only ~100 total fish available for Whooshh
 - None of Cle Elum origin
 - All trucked from Priest Rapids
 - ✓ Okanagan or Wenatchee origin



Results

Caveats ✓Not yet published ✓ Very limited sample size ✓ All non-native fish Both controls and test fish "fell back" in significant numbers Multiple detections below the dam "System shakedown" fish not distinguished from test fish



INITIALOBSERVATIONS

- Needed more fish
- Yes, fish can be successfully transported this distance
- After 2-3 days of tuning, survival performance was equal for both population groups
 Bodes well for adaptive management
- Once system fully operational, no significant differences from prior tests



Considerations for Permanent High Head Solutions

Entrance placement

- Consider fish behavior
- Floating option
- Flexibility to change based on results

Ancillary components – place in building

Tube routing

Permanent enclosure for protection

Exit

Enclose barge end/permanent shore exit to accommodate wave conditions





SAFE Survival, Reproduction, Injury, Behavior, Disease Transmission

EFFECTIVE MIGRATION HOMING DURABLE

TIMELY & EFFICIENT VOLITIONAL Selective Passage Time ENERGY RESERVES TRAVEL TIME DISTANCE



Ē

HOW HIGH CAN WE COS



Distances in feet				
Tube length	10	20	30	40
500	86.8	171.0	250.0	321.4
1000	173.6	342.0	500.0	642.8
1500	260.5	513.0	750.0	964.2
1750	303.9	598.5	875.0	1124.9

Dworshak	~ 640′ vs 717′
Grand Coulee	~ 400' vs 550'
Chief Joseph	~ 180′ vs 236′



KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Capital costs typically <20%
- O&M costs < 50%
- Deploy in months not years
- Transit in seconds not hours/days
 - Low energy consumption for fish
- PLUS
 - Scanning enables selective passage (keep invasive species out of the system)
 - Low water usage -> increased power/irrigation options





Autonomous, Volitional, Selective, Adult Fish Passage



That Was Awesome!

0

Can we go again?

Questions?

l Feel Good

