Subject: FINAL minutes for the 05 September 2013 FFDRWG BON FGE and trashrake meeting.

The meeting was held in NWP RDP 3rd Floor Meeting Room, Portland OR. In attendance:

Last	First	Agency	Office/Mobile	Email
Bettin	Scott	BPA		swbettin@bpa.gov
Bissel	Brian	CENWP-OD-B		Brian.m.bissel@usace.army.mil
Conder	Trevor	NOAA Fisheries		Trevor.conder@noaa.gov
Ebner	Laurie	USACE-NWP		<u>Laurie.l.ebner@usace.army.mil</u>
Eppard	Brad	USACE-NWP		Matthew.b.eppard@usace.army.mil
Filan	Ben	USACE-NWP		Benjamin.j.filan@usace.army.mil
Fredricks	Gary	NOAA	503-231-6855	Gary.fredricks@noaa.gov
Henrie	Gary	USACE-NWP		Gary.s.henrie@usace.army.mil
Kostow	Kathryn	ODFW		
Lee	Randy	USACE-NWP		Randall.t.lee@usace.army.mil
Lorz	Tom	CRITFC	503-238-3574	lort@critfc.org
Mackey	Tammy	CENWP-OF-TF	503-961-5733	Tammy.m.mackey@usace.army.mil
Medina	George	USACE-NWP	503-808-4753	George.J.Medina@usace.army.mil
Rerecich	Jon	CENWP-PM-E	503-808-4779	Jonathan.g.rerecich@usace.army.mil
Roy	Liza	USACE-NWP		Elizabeth.W.Roy@usace.army.mil
Royer	Ida	CENWP-OD-B		Ida.M.Royer@usace.army.mil
Stricklin	Eric	USACE-NWP		Eric.t.stricklin@usace.army.mil
Traylor	Andrew	CENWP-OD-TF		Andrew.w.traylor@usace.army.mil

Kostow called in.

All documents may be found at http://www.nwd-wc.usace.army.mil/tmt/documents/FPOM/2010/FFDRWG/FFDRWG.html

- 1. B2-FGE. Powerpoint available on the FFDRWG website. Rerecich gave a brief background on how we got to our current situation.
 - 1.1. Review/discussion of 2013 Hydraulic and Biological results. Ebner discussed the model data and results. CFD model calibrated to the 1:12 model. When conducting field tests; found fish in the areas with just wedge wire and not perf plate behind. Found hotspots across the panel when looking at field data. The discovery of hot spots was a shock. Prototype data matched model data really well until we look at the upper two panels. Now the CFD model will need to be calibrated to the prototype instead of to the 1:12 model.
 - 1.2. Ebner said the team would like to alter the porosity of the upper two panels and test with 16-18 kcfs going through the unit. Bettin asked how much flow goes up the gatewell without a STS. No one knew of any measurements taken without the STS. Bettin and Fredricks agreed that there are a lot of fish that pass through the JBS without the STSs, however, the numbers of fish are still reduced than when STSs are installed. Ebner asked about pulling screens from A slot but leaving them in the B and C slots. ERDC will conduct the model test. Fredricks was not opposed to the idea but he was curious about how that flow would affect the other screens in the unit. Eppard asked if pulling screens would be a viable alternative. Fredricks said he thinks it would be since survival through the turbines is good for Chinook. Survival isn't as good for steelhead but steelhead survival through the B2CC is higher. Lorz asked when Unit 11 would return. Fredricks said Unit 11 would be a huge benefit, especially if it were designed properly.
 - 1.3. Ebner resumed her presentation. She stressed the need to establish a hydraulic baseline to work from. Without that, there isn't much to move forward on. Alternatives would be assessed once the hydraulic baseline is determined. Alternatives could include pulling all or just some screens, further modifications to the gatewell environment, etc. Fredricks said the work should be completed prior to the next Performance Standard test.

- 1.3.1. Fredricks asked if it was necessary to go down the path presented.

 What about a flow control structure? He said he was willing to take the hit on FGE if it reduces the turbulence in the gatewell and increases survival.
- 1.3.2. Medina pushed for working through the issues in a systematic manner, as laid out by Ebner. FFDRWG discussed the merits of waiting to get the hydraulic baseline v a flow control structure. Fredricks said waiting another five years to fix the problem is unacceptable. Bettin asked why the turbine couldn't be used as the model. Ebner said the data from the bottom two panels couldn't be gathered due to the lack of strength in the frame. That could be fixed. The other problem with testing in the prototype is that is allows testing of only one condition, part of a unit,
- 1.4. Path forward: investigation of alternatives (short/long term).
 - 1.4.1. NOAA Fisheries does not concur with the proposed path forward. Fredricks wants NWP to cut flows so that when the unit runs at 17K flows up the gatewell are equivalent to running the unit at 15K.
 - 1.4.2. Bettin asked about modifying one of the existing turning veins as a prototype. Once modified it would be allowed to be used in a slot and not returned to previous shape. NOAA was not opposed to this alternative.
 - 1.4.3. After further conversation, NOAA, CRITFC and BPA agreed with the reassessment of alternatives.
- 2. B2 Trashrake. Filan went through a powerpoint presentation. He provided a background on the project and explained why the new Trashrake built in 2004 was never put in service. He also discussed that their findings were that the project was not using the trashrake on a regular basis. Lorz questioned if there would be funding for dredging. Mackey explained dredging has been classified as a routine maintenance activity and it has been added to the Fish Passage Plan as a required activity. There were concerns voiced by many that the O&M fund was already spread too thin.
 - 2.1. Review/discussion of VE report. **ACTION:** Rerecich will send the report to attendees.
 - 2.2. Path forward. Filan presented the DDR recommendations. Fredricks recommended make the cleaning teeth changeable in the event the trashracks are replaced with lamprey spacing. Everyone seemed to be comfortable with the plan to move forward with the DDR recommendations. The recommendations for BON to rake on a regular basis and to do a survey annually to determine if dredging is needed, will be included in the 2014 Fish Passage Plan.