

## COLUMBIA RIVER TECHNICAL MANAGEMENT TEAM

September 30, 2020

DRAFT Facilitator's Summary

Facilitator: Emily Stranz; Notes: Colby Mills

*The following Facilitator's Summary is intended to capture basic discussion, decisions, and actions, as well as point out future actions or issues that may need further discussion at upcoming meetings. These notes are not intended to be the "record" of the meeting, only a reminder for TMT members. Official minutes can be found on the TMT website: <http://pweb.crohms.org/tmt/agendas/2020/>.*

### Review Meeting Summaries & Minutes

TMT members approved the official minutes and facilitator's summary for the September 2 meeting. Minutes and summaries for the September 18 and 23 meetings will be reviewed at the next TMT meeting.

→ **ACTION regarding the September 18 minutes:** Dave Swank, USFWS, noted that a statement on page 2, paragraph 3, needs to be reworked for clarity. Melissa Haskin, BPA Notetaker, will revisit the meeting recording to clarify the comment.

### SOR 2020-06 Snake River Zero Nighttime Flow

The TMT revisited SOR 2020-06 (posted on the TMT website), which recommends the continued application of the historical Zero Nighttime Flow timing and criteria at the Snake River projects. The operation in the 2020 BiOps and the CRSO EIS Record of Decision (ROD) removed the steelhead abundance criteria and formalized an October 15<sup>th</sup> start date.

Fish Managers posed questions for the Corps and BPA at the previous TMT meeting. Questions and resulting discussion points included:

***What would the AAs expect the new proposed BiOp operation to look like?*** Tony Norris, BPA, noted that BPA can only speak to how the operation has been implemented in the past. A presentation on the historical implementation of zero generation over a 32-year period is posted to the TMT website. BPA intends to use zero generation when power market conditions warrant, and river conditions make it feasible. Individual project limitations can also influence zero generation implementation. Conditions that could prevent implementation include: high river levels and limited pool or discharge capacity, project and maintenance limitations, transmission system limitations/maintenance, project maintenance that would require minimum generation during the winter, or cold air temperatures requiring operation of the turbines in order to provide station service for workspace heat.

Tony pointed to zero generation hours from 2008-2019, stating that it is a good estimation of how zero generation is used. Tom Lorz, Umatilla, observed that based on the data, when times of zero generation implementation were feasible it was used more frequently. Under the new decision, the zero generation operation can be implemented during "nighttime hours" for a total of 6 hours/night between October 15-December 14; and then for 9 hours, with up to 3 hours during the daytime, between December 15 and the end of February. Tony noted that nighttime hours will vary across the time period, and if the operation varies greatly from NOAA's expectation, a conversation will be had. As stated in the proposed action, the most commonly used nighttime hours are from 2300 to 0500 hours. Tony noted that NOAA has not communicated that BPA could not operate outside those hours.

Claire McGrath, NOAA, explained that during NOAA's review of the AA's proposed action, they reviewed the available data and did not anticipate measurable impacts on juvenile and adult salmonids. She continued that NOAA expects to monitor the operation and is open to Co-Manager input on how that monitoring would occur. Tom raised the question of methodology for determining impact to juveniles,

and how NOAA concluded that the proposed action would not have a significant impact. Claire noted that she would like to bring others more familiar with the analysis into the conversation to provide detail.

→ **ACTION:** Claire agreed to coordinate a sub-group conversation to discuss monitoring, as well as to provide more detail on NOAA's analysis.

**Does the Juvenile Bypass System (JBS) remain operational when not running water through a turbine or a spillbay? What are the impacts to the JBS during zero flow conditions?** From an operational standpoint, the Corps does not anticipate any effects that the zero generation operation would have on the juvenile fish facilities. There will be sufficient power to the system to maintain PIT-tag operations and other electrical units that are associated with the JBS. However, the JBS sampling data collection will end on October 31. Additionally, the Corps acknowledged that without the turbines running, the only water passing the project will go through the ladders and gatewell orifices. Co-Managers noted that a change in flow will change conditions and likely impact fish guidance into the gatewell and bypass system; the level of impact has not been studied.

The Corps clarified that fish ladders will be in operation through December; however, winter ladder maintenance will begin in January and February. Typically, one ladder is down each month and passage is maintained through other ladders at the project, except for Lower Granite and Little Goose, which both only have one ladder and thus do not have upstream passage during the maintenance period.

**How is the frequency of this operation going to change from October through December; what are the load and economic benefits of this operation?** BPA noted that predicting the frequency of the proposed action is difficult to answer now, given the variability. The economic benefits are variable and based on power market conditions; a net positive benefit occurs when conditions exist and are utilized. There is also a need, as BPA works to integrate other renewable resources, for increased generation.

A number of concerns and frustrations were expressed by TMT fish managers, including:

- Concern that co-managers were not able to provide comments to the BiOp before it was released and biological input into the operation is now limited.
- Current monitoring is PIT-tagged based which primarily focuses on adult steelhead and does not provide information on all the species of interest. Adequate monitoring mechanisms should be in place before the operation is implemented to allow for assessment and adaptive management if needed.
- It was concerning to many of the fish managers that a clear monitoring plan had not yet been established and thus, there would not be data to help inform if a change in operations is needed in order to protect fish. In the absence of a threshold of biologically significant impacts, there is no threshold on which the TMT can agree to adaptively manage from. Co-managers felt that the start date should be delayed allowing time to prepare a monitoring plan.
- The BiOp, as well as previous studies, relied on statistical insignificance rather than biological significance.

TMT members were polled on the SOR: \*

<b>NOAA</b>	Abstains	<b>USFWS</b>	No objection
<b>OR</b>	Supports	<b>ID</b>	No objection
<b>WA</b>	Supports	<b>MT</b>	Abstains
<b>Kootenai</b>	Absent	<b>Spokane</b>	Supports
<b>Colville</b>	No Objection	<b>Nez Perce</b>	Supports
<b>Umatilla</b>	Supports	<b>Warm Springs</b>	Supports
<b>BOR</b>	Objects without elevation	<b>BPA</b>	Objects without elevation
<b>Corps</b>	Objects without elevation		

*\* This SOR polling process was unlike other recent TMT polling on SORs because the polling responses outlined in the TMT Guidelines did not align well with the needs of the situation. As a result, parties that supported the SOR elevated the Action Agencies objection of the SOR to RIOG. The TMT will continue conversations to clarify and refine the SOR polling and elevation processes.*

For clarity and transparency, some TMT Members provided rationale for their polling responses:

- **NOAA:** NOAA clarified that their comments throughout the meeting applied to their “abstain” vote. NOAA was happy to see the conversation occurring and had no further comment.
- **OR:** Given the Corps’ decision not to implement the SOR, OR will elevate the issue to RIOG. OR felt that the zero generation operation as stated in the BiOp is not balanced and that fish protections need to stay whole. It seemed, to OR, that the operation shifts towards the benefit of power generation. OR sees serious flaws in the AA’s proposed action and noted that data are not available, and yet a decision has been made. Additionally, there is not a monitoring plan in place. OR expressed concern that this SOR process has not been about regional coordination, rather, it was one group stating their decision for moving forward. OR supports the SOR and has major concerns for fish passage and maintaining ESA expectations, and sees this as a serious issue that deserves broader conversation.
- **WA:** Given the Corps’ decision not to implement the SOR, WA will also elevate the issue to RIOG. WA echoed their original comments that the expanded zero generation operation as a significant biological concern. WA understands the Corp’s position and does not agree with it, emphasizing that the issue needs elevation to RIOG.
- **Colville:** Colville emphasized the need for monitoring to be able to assess impacts as the operation is implemented.
- **USFWS:** USFWS noted that the SOR is a challenge for the agency, as the action was analyzed for impacts to bull trout as part of their BiOp, however, there are few bull trout detected at the Snake River projects. USFWS would like to see more monitoring to allow more information on potential impacts. Generally, the best option for fish is volitional upstream and downstream passage and anything that restricts that may have an impact. Currently there is not a good sense of the magnitude of impact for this operation, which is why USFWS did not object.
- **ID:** ID recognizes that current data do not support using adult steelhead-based criteria for commencing zero generation operations; the criteria should better match biological concerns for adult steelhead and fall Chinook and coho adults and juveniles. Given the lack of uncertainty of biological impacts and a lack of a solid monitoring plan, ID believes that it is premature for BPA to implement the operation starting on October 15. ID thought it was prudent to delay the operation until after a monitoring plan is agreed upon and in place. Additionally, ID suggested that BPA should only implement the operation at one dam until there is a better idea of the impacts to fish species.
- **Nez Perce:** Given the Corps’ decision not to implement the SOR, Nez Perce will also elevate the issue to RIOG. Additionally, they raised concern with the justification provided by the Corps that the SOR could not be implemented due to the BiOp. The TMT process is designed to adaptively manage BiOp operations. If the Corps’ position was to not consider changes simply because the operation was approved via the BiOp, Nez Perce questions the purpose of TMT as a regional

management process. Nez Perce believed that there were other justifications for why the SOR was not supported and requested those justifications to be expressed by the individual voting members in trying to avoid the alliance voting that seemed to occur.

- **BPA:** BPA expects to implement the BiOp.
- Umatilla, BOR, the Corps, MT, Spokane, and Warm Springs did not have additional comments.

The Corps reiterated that the SOR process, as it relates to adaptive management, has been done in real time, and currently it is hard to pivot with so many moving parts. They stressed that the reality for “alliance voting” is that the ROD was a joint document on behalf of the Corps, BPA and BOR, and often the AAs do behave as a joint entity and work in partnership.

Moving forward, Doug clarified that the Corps would implement operations identified in the 2020 ROD and NOAA and USFWS BiOps. To be clear, the Corps will not implement the SOR as it is outside the scope of operations included in the ROD. Oregon, Washington, the Nez Perce and Umatilla Tribes clarified that they would elevate the desired SOR operation to RIOG.

In response to concerns from Co-Managers, the Corps confirmed that they continue to use TMT as a process to discuss adaptive management of BiOp operations in real time. As part of the regional forum process, any TMT member can elevate the issue to RIOG for a policy level discussion.

→ **ACTION:** Oregon, Washington, the Nez Perce and Umatilla Tribes TMT members will elevate the SOR to RIOG.

The TMT process for polling on SORs and subsequent elevation was discussed. In this case, TMT members who supported the SOR were also the ones who will elevate SOR to RIOG. More typically, the elevation to RIOG is associated with an objection to an SOR. TMT will work offline to further clarify and refine the SOR process to avoid future confusion.

### **Draft Water Management Plan**

Doug reported that the 2021 draft Water Management Plan (WMP) will follow the same schedule as previous years, and the process is designed to adapt to holiday schedules. Draft 1 will be posted by October 1, with comments requested by October 31. Draft 2 will be posted on November 18 with comments requested by November 25. All comments will be posted to the TMT website. Comments should be sent to Doug Baus and Lisa Wright (Corps); Scott Bettin and Tony Norris (BPA); and Joel Fenolio (BOR). The Corps requested red-lined comments with specific wording changes.

**Questions and comments from members of the public:** there were no questions or comments from members of the public.

**The next scheduled TMT meeting is a conference call on October 7 at 9:00 AM.**

*This summary is respectfully submitted by the DS Consulting Facilitation Team. Suggested edits are welcome and can be sent to Colby at [colby@dsconsult.co](mailto:colby@dsconsult.co).*

## **Columbia River Regional Forum**

### **Technical Management Team**

### **DRAFT OFFICIAL MINUTES**

**Wednesday, September 30, 2020**

**Minutes: Melissa Haskin, BPA (contractor, FLUX Resources)**

Discussions at today's TMT meeting largely focused on an SOR for Snake River Zero Nighttime Flow, SOR 2020-06. The meeting was held via conference call and webinar, chaired by Doug Baus, Corps, and facilitated by Emily Stranz, DS Consulting. See the end of these minutes for a list of attendees.

### **1. Review of Meeting Minutes**

The September 2 facilitator's summary and official TMT minutes were approved with no additional edits.

Dave Swank, USFWS, requested clarification in the September 18 official minutes regarding speed no load and the fish ladder. Swank felt the language was confusing and didn't make sense. Scott Bettin, BPA, noted that while the quote was attributed to him, it was likely Ann Setter that provided that information. The note-taker will listen to the audio and clarify the language.

*[NOTE: after the meeting, revisions were coordinated with Swank and posted to the website].*

### **2. SOR 2020-06 Snake River Zero Nighttime Flow - Jay Hesse, Nez Perce Tribe, and Doug Baus, Corps**

Since 2005, zero nighttime generation at the lower Snake River projects began when the adult steelhead abundance trigger was met, starting no earlier than December 1, as established in the 2005 SOR. This year, the operation that is included in the 2020 NOAA and USFWS Biological Opinions does not have a steelhead trigger and allows zero nighttime generation to begin as early as October 15.

In response, SOR 2020-06 was submitted to the Action Agencies at last week's TMT meeting to request implementing zero generation consistent with the 2005 SOR, with a slight modification to the start date for calculating the adult steelhead run-to-date. Signatories of the SOR were Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Nez Perce Tribe, Yakama Nation, Warm Springs Tribe, Spokane Tribe of Indians, and the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC).

Tony Norris, BPA, presented on the historical implementation of zero generation from 1988 through last year to show the wide variability in frequency and duration over the years. The data were pulled from the Corps' publically available Data Query website, so folks can look into the data further if needed. However, it is important to keep in mind that older data may be impacted by factors such as different operations, both at the project and the transmission system as a whole, as well as how many turbines had been installed at the dams at the time.

Norris noted that, as in the past, BPA intends to use zero generation whenever power market conditions are favorable and river conditions make it feasible. As seen in the graphs, it is not

always feasible to run zero generation. It typically has not been an operation that can be carried out every day due to conditions. Norris noted that it will be hard to forecast how BPA will take advantage of its new flexibility since the October 15-November 30 period is new this year.

Jay Hesse, Nez Perce, asked for clarification on the operation in the BiOp, which defines a 6-hr nighttime period of 2300-0500. Norris replied the BiOp specified “nighttime hours” and the hours given are approximate. There is a constraint to end 2 hours before dawn from October 15 through November 30. Between December 15 and February 28, the operation can include up to 3 daytime hours. While the operation has typically occurred from 2300 to 0500, the definition of “nighttime” and “dawn” changes with location and time of year, as daylight lessens heading into December 21 and then increases after winter solstice. Hesse asked if the BiOp wording allows for zero-flow 9 hours per day (6 night hours and 3 day hours) starting December 15. Norris believes that is what’s in the BiOp.

Members of the TMT had questions regarding how the Action Agencies would implement the operation defined in the BiOp and what data NOAA used to inform their evaluation.

1. What conditions would keep this operation from being implemented?

Answer: Many variables determine if zero nighttime generation can be run on any particular day. Maintenance can limit turbine capacity. During periods of cold weather, the project may need to generate to maintain heat for project staff, or there may be enough load at night that BPA needs to generate. Transmission maintenance or system limitations can require a minimum generation rate. There may not be enough pool space to store water into the evening and release the next day. These are just a few examples of conditions that could limit the operation.

2. Tom Lorz, Umatilla/CRITFC, asked if NOAA was comfortable with the October 15 start date.

Answer: Claire McGrath, NOAA, replied that NOAA looked at the available data and did not see evidence that would preclude implementing this action. NOAA did not anticipate any measurable impact to adults or juveniles based on the available data. The agency is comfortable with the plan to start on October 15 or a later start date.

3. Charles Morrill, WA, asked why the adaptive management component was not more clearly identified in the BiOp.

Answer: McGrath noted that the BiOp is clear that there will be adaptive management and monitoring of the operations as they are implemented. She cannot offer more information on why the language was the way it was but she will pass on Morrill’s comment, she said.

- i. Lorz added that comment that some of the issue with the BiOp language is that some agencies were not able to provide comments before the document was released. Having to comment after the document is released raises issues that have to be dealt with now instead of before the document is released.
4. Lorz asked what kind of monitoring the Action Agencies are envisioning for this operation and commented that a monitoring plan needs to be in place before the operation begins. Lorz also noted that available PIT-tag data only monitors steelhead and that there are other species of interest. He asked if there is interest in tagging more fish.

Answer: NOAA will monitor using available PIT-tag data and adapt in-season, if needed.

5. Jonathan Ebel, ID, asked if BPA would be open to a more “cautious approach” to zero generation in October that would involve a less than full-scale implementation of zero generation.

Answer: Norris replied that the flexibility given in the agreement is to offset losses from other measures. The BiOp was clear that BPA could use the flexibility. BPA expects to use the flexibility afforded. Norris believes that BPA should use the flexibility given to it and evaluate impacts afterward.

- i. Lorz replied that if the Action Agencies were to implement it and then wait to see if there was an issue that it would pose a challenge. He asked: *How do you know there is a problem if you are not looking?*

6. Emily Stranz, DS Consulting, asked a question from last week’s TMT: *“What will happen to the juvenile bypass system during zero-flow generation and what will the impacts of that be?”*

Answer: The Corps has investigated this and believes there should be no effect on the juvenile bypass facilities. Baus noted there are different definitions of “effect” and his comment refers to effects from an operational standpoint.

- i. Lorz asked that there would have to be some effects to guidance efficiency since flow up the gatewell will not be as high as when the turbines are not running.

1. Answer: Baus noted that Lorz was correct; there may be flow implications. Bettin added that the only water passing the dam will be through the ladder and orifices.

- ii. Lorz further added that flow is an indicator of how well fish are guided into the bypass, asserting there would be an impact and that no one has studied what that impact would be. Lorz added there are certain times of day when fish use the JBS more, which is typically during nighttime hours, so without turbines running, fish will not be passing. He said, “You will be delaying juveniles because they won’t be guided.”

7. Hesse shared two concerns: 1. He would like assurance that water flow through the JBS will be maintained and not stopped during zero generation hours. 2. He is concerned whether or not there will be sufficient power to the system to maintain PIT-tag operations and electronics.

Answer: Baus replied that there will be power and flow to the JBS. Eric Hockersmith, Corps Walla Walla, confirmed this.

8. Van Dyke asked what the impact to station service is during zero flow operations.

Answer: They should be fine since they can get power off grid.

9. Ebel pulled up some older data from 1975-1995 for additional context. Bettin noted that the dams at some projects may have had 3 turbines during that period instead of 6.

10. Swank questioned how the operation would affect bull trout and noted that SRWG might be the best place to investigate that concern.

11. Stranz relayed another question from last week’s meeting, asking what the load and economic benefits of the operation would be.

Answer: The economic benefits are variable based on power market conditions. When there is a net positive benefit and conditions exist to allow for zero-flow

generation, BPA utilizes it. At nighttime people typically use less energy and power, thus prices are lower. There is a need as integrate renewable resources during other hours when there is increased generation.

12. Tom Iverson, Yakama Nation Fisheries, wondered about the justification for zero flow starting in October this year as opposed past years, where he thought there was a limit to it starting no earlier than December 1.

Answer: Norris noted that, to the best of his knowledge, prior BiOps have not addressed zero generation directly.

Answer: McGrath added that per the ESA consultation, NOAA is given a proposed action by the Action Agencies, which it evaluated. It does not make changes to the proposed action but instead evaluates the proposal. Based on NOAA's evaluations, it did not see evidence of a substantial or measurable effect to juveniles or adults.

- i. Lorz inquired what NOAA used for coho and Chinook juveniles in its analysis. He added that without seeing NOAA's analysis and without it being in the BiOp, that he is having trouble understanding how NOAA came to the conclusion it did about impacts.
  1. McGrath is not prepared to answer that question today but will loop in her colleagues who completed the analysis. She added that she was not sure how that information would inform the decision for today's meeting about whether or not to implement the SOR.

Following today's discussion, the TMT members and Action Agencies were polled on SOR 2020-06. Morrill requested that Action Agencies provide their responses first as their responses could influence the responses of the salmon co-managers: \*

Agency	Vote
Army Corps of Engineers	Object
Bonneville Power Administration	Object
Bureau of Reclamation	Object
NOAA Fisheries	Abstain
US Fish & Wildlife Service	No Objection
Washington	Support. Will elevate the issue to RIOG.
Oregon	Support. Will elevate the issue to RIOG.
Idaho	No Objection
Montana	Abstain
Nez Perce Tribe	Support. Will elevate the issue to RIOG.
Umatilla Tribe/CRITFC	Support. Will elevate the issue to RIOG.
Colville Tribe	No Objection
Warm Springs Tribe	Support
Kootenai Tribe	Absent
Spokane Tribe	Support

*\* This SOR polling process was unlike other recent TMT polling on SORs because the polling responses outlined in the TMT Guidelines did not align well with the needs of the situation. As a result, parties that supported the SOR elevated the Action Agencies objection of the SOR to RIOG. The TMT will continue conversations to clarify and refine the SOR polling and elevation processes.*

Based on the polling responses above, the SOR will be elevated to the Regional Implementation and Oversight Group (RIOG).



The Corps will not implement the SOR. The joint Record of Decision (ROD) for the Columbia River System Operations (CRSO) EIS was signed on Monday, September 28. The ROD included the zero generation operation with a start date of October 15, as did the BiOps by USFWS and NOAA. The Corps plans to implement those operations as noted in the BiOps and the biological assessment in the ROD. The Corps will not implement the SOR because it is outside the scope of the operation as described in the ROD.

TMT members provided the following additional comments for the record:

- **WA**: Morrill supports elevation to RIOG as it sees expanded zero generation operation as a significant biological concern. WA expressed that it empathized with the Corps' decision but felt the issue needed to be elevated to RIOG.
- **Colville Tribe**: Sheri Sears, Colville, stressed the need for a monitoring to assess and evaluate the operation.
- **USFWS**: Swank shared that USFWS analyzed this action in their BiOp but only for bull trout. Analysis of bull trout passage on the Snake River is very limited due to the very low numbers of bull trout detected at the projects, he added. He expressed a desire for additional monitoring to assess whether or not this expanded zero-flow operation would impact fish. Swank added that his baseline is to determine whether an operation benefits fish, which would be to have upstream and downstream passage at all times. Anything restricting that may have an impact, he noted, adding that he does not have a good sense of what that impact would be in this situation, which is why his agency did not object to the SOR.
- **ID**: Ebel added that current data analysis – with all of its potential flaws – does not support using adult steelhead-based criteria for commencing zero generation operations. ID believes that the criteria should better match biological concerns for not only adult steelhead but also fall Chinook and coho adults as well as juveniles. Given the lack of uncertainty of the biological impacts and lack of a solid monitoring plan, ID believes it is premature for BPA to implement zero generation operations on October 15. ID believes it is prudent to delay implementation until a monitoring plan is agreed upon and in place. ID also expressed that it would be prudent for BPA to only implement the early operation at one dam until impacts have been better and more thoroughly assessed.
- **Nez Perce**: Given that the Corps is not implementing the SOR, the Nez Perce believes the issue should be elevated to RIOG. The Nez Perce expressed concern over the Corps justification for not implementing the SOR (specifically that the Corps said they could not implement it because it is inconsistent with the BiOp). Hesse said that his belief is that the heart of the TMT process is to consider changes in operations that have been documented and in most cases considered in the BiOp. If the Corps' position is not to consider changes just because they aren't included in the BiOp, he questions the full process and believes the issue should be elevated to RIOG. Hesse thinks there are other justifications for why the SOR was not supported that were not mentioned at today's meeting. He would like those to be expressed by the individual voting members. He added that he thinks "alliance voting" seems to be occurring and should be avoided.
- **Umatilla**: Lorz added that the Corps' response also took him by surprise since an operation being in a BiOp is not necessarily a justification for implementation. He said he is perplexed since the TMT is supposed to be adaptively managing operations. He noted that the group needs clarity that would come from elevating the issue.

- **WA:** Morrill also asked if there is a realistic opportunity for TMT members to have any influence over the choice of the Action Agencies in today's discussion. He asked if RIOG has the authority to tell the Action Agencies what to do. Stranz said RIOG is the key to finding out.
- **OR:** Van Dyke commented that the expanded zero flow operation has serious flaws associated with it. OR believes this is a major concern for fish passage protection. He noted that the process seems to no longer be about regional coordination. From his view, the process has turned into a conversation that ends with a statement from one group about what they are going to do. He noted that this is a serious issue that needs broader regional conversation.

In response to comments by the Nez Perce and OR regarding alliance voting, the Corps noted that the reality of the ROD is that it was a joint document signed on behalf of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps, and BPA. Baus hears the comments raised by the Nez Perce and OR but there are times when the agencies work in partnership. Since all three agencies signed the ROD, it would make sense that their polling responses would be consistent with one another, he noted. Julie Ammann, Corps, added that part of the TMT process is elevation. The Corps received guidance from its policy team on the SOR and the next step for TMT is elevation, if it does not agree with the Corps' decision. The TMT process does not take away the decision-making authority of the Corps, she noted.

One point of discussion at today's meeting was the lack of a monitoring plan. McGrath noted she would be willing to set up a subgroup to discuss monitoring options in-depth. She will send an email to FPAC to get the ball rolling and plan to revisit the issue at the next FPAC.

### 3. Draft Water Management Plan – Doug Baus, Corps

The development of the 2021 Water Management plan will follow the same schedule as in previous years. The draft will be posted by October 1 and comments are due by October 31. The Corps will then compile comments and post a new draft online. The holidays can be a difficult time to reach people and coordinate so the Corps requests comments as soon as possible. Comments should be sent to Doug Baus and Lisa Wright at the Corps, Joel Fenolio at Reclamation, and Tony Norris and Scott Bettin at BPA. Specific language and changes are preferable to general critiques that require interpretation.

#### **Today's Attendees:**

Agency	TMT Representative
Army Corps of Engineers	Doug Baus, Julie Ammann, Lisa Wright
Bonneville Power Administration	Tony Norris, Scott Bettin
Bureau of Reclamation	Joel Fenolio
NOAA Fisheries	Claire McGrath
US Fish & Wildlife Service	Dave Swank
Washington	Charles Morrill
Oregon	Erick Van Dyke
Idaho	Jonathan Ebel
Montana	Jim Litchfield
Nez Perce Tribe	Jay Hesse

Agency	TMT Representative
Umatilla Tribe/CRITFC	Tom Lorz
Colville Tribe	Sheri Sears
Warm Springs Tribe	Jen Graham
Kootenai Tribe	Absent
Spokane Tribe	Brent Nichols

**Other Attendees (non-TMT members):**

Corps – Alexis Mills, Aaron Marshall, Laura Hamilton, Eric Hockersmith, Chris Peery

BPA – Melissa Haskin (CONTR, FLUX Resources, Notetaker)

Clearing Up – K.C. Mehaffey

Columbia Basin Bulletin – Mike O'Bryant

DS Consulting – Emily Stranz (Facilitator), Colby Mills

Portland General Electric – Ruth Burris

Public Power Council – Shane Scott

Yakama Nation Fisheries – Tom Iverson