

**Columbia River Regional Forum  
System Configuration Team Meeting  
May 18, 2023  
Final Official Notes**

Representatives of Corps, OR, WA, BPA, NOAA, and others participated in today’s SCT hybrid meeting facilitated by Blane Bellerud, NOAA. Ida Royer, The Corps of Engineers, hosted the WebEx to facilitate better note taking.

Draft and final SCT notes are available on the COE’s TMT website under the FPOM link. For copies of documents discussed in the meeting, contact [kathy.ceballos@noaa.gov](mailto:kathy.ceballos@noaa.gov). See the last page of these minutes for a list of attendees at today’s meeting.

**1. Review and approve April Notes**

- The group looked through the notes together and made some minor changes.
- 2022 needed changed to 2023
- Charles Morrill, WA, had minor edits.
- A paragraph needed more clarification that required Andrea Ausmus, CorSource, to listen to the recording to determine what Tom Lorz, Umatilla, had meant.
- After any changes from the recording and discussion between Lorz, Ausmus, Bellerud, and Royer notes will be considered approved.

**2. Update on Budget and Work Plans**

- Royer sent out the spreadsheet.
- Royer sent out the sheet with what they are calling the PBud allocations.
- This is what the administration has suggested for the amount.
- Not necessarily the final allocations – Royer will be working up her chain to discuss potential for reallocating some of that funding.
- First the first cut by the administration for FY24

**a. Budget Caveats**

- PBud is the President’s budget
- It is the administration’s recommendation

- It then goes to Congress
- Deliberate in the House and the Senate
- They will put in their markups
- When they pass the budget that is the final budget
- Royer wanted to add the caveat that Congress can do what they want to the budget amount. Oftentimes it is the PBud is the standard that they are starting from but they can “plus up” or “plus down” the President’s Budget if they choose. Until they pass the budget, it is not final, but the PBud is their best estimate.

**b. FY23 Work plan**

- FY23 did get additional funding
- Total FY23 funding: \$47.4M
- Enough to get everything completed that we intended to complete this year.
- Royer said that she thinks that we are pretty good for FY23.
- Royer also said that we are looking good for FY24 and it is really good news, so we are going to moving forward with all of the projects in the program.

Lorz asked if Congress does not pass budget and we need to go to continued resolutions what level would CRFM be. He asked if we would be at the PBud number or last year’s PBud number.

Royer said that they usually get guidance. In the past they have gone with the PBud amounts but she believes that they will get guidance on that if they in a CR. They will tell us which number to go with.

Steven Sipe, Corps, said that Continuing Resolution tells us what we get, and it is kind of all over the board. It is what Congress says.

Scott Bettin, BPA, asked how much of the budget is for the Columbia versus the Willamette.

Royer said that the PBud FY24 is \$66.67M. Columbia’s portion is \$23.8M.

Royer said that Lorz had sent her his scores and had some questions so she wanted to talk through the scope of FY24 for things. She wanted to make sure that people understood again that we fund things annually.

**c. Scope for FY24**

Line #	Title	Notes
3	Lower Columbia River Juvenile Survival Studies	PIT Trawl funding FY25 in FY24; have funding. Fund a year in advance because we fund over winter maintenance.
4	Avian Island PIT Detection	PIT detection in the estuary, where they go out and scan tags at East Sand Island. The amount is minimal. We also have the analysis and the reporting of that information to generate estimates. Royer thinks that we will be able to fund that component next year with the \$200K
	ESI Predation Rate Estimate	
	Inland Avian Predation	Royer said that the PBud did include a line item to fund the Blalock Island however; we are funding this with the FY23 work plan. Royer said that she does not plan to fund this in FY24.
7	CRS RM&E Flex Spill Evaluation	Royer said that she knows that there is discussion of potentially breaking this out into three studies. She has not done that on the spreadsheet because SRWG is still working through that. She is also not sure what portion the Corps will be paying and/or what portion BPA be paying. She still has it on the spreadsheet because she is still expecting something to fall out of that but she does not know what that is going to look like. Until that process is closer to complete it is hard for Royer to put in individual line item budgets.

Erick Van Dyke, OR, said that for the Flex Spill Operation we are using that as an easy terminology from how it was where we started. He said that it has evolved. Van Dyke said that the Corps did an EIS and provided a preferred alternative. NOAA gave them a BiOp and that is what we are operating to right now. Van Dyke said that he thinks that this evaluation seems to be mislabeled or he is not sure what you are after anymore with this.

Bettin said that what Van Dyke said is partially correct but he said that their preferred action is a flexible spill but the court modified it so that is why they are not doing flex spill. They are doing – [Erick interrupted]

Van Dyke said that we are not going to evaluate something that we are not doing.

Bettin agreed that we should get a different name if we can. Some people are really wedded to that term because it is easy to track all the way through.

Van Dyke said that he understands that part, that it was what he was trying to say to start with. It is still used, at times, it is appropriate because it is talking directly to the period, but now we are talking about something else. So somehow, if you are planning on evaluating what we are doing right now, somehow we just need to update it.

Bettin said that he hears Van Dyke and agrees if we can find agreement, as to what the name should be.

Lorz said that settlement spill is the new term that is being used.

Jonathan Ebel, ID, said that it is just operations. He asked regardless of what you call it where does the \$1.7M come from because it is not agreed up on and there is question as to what it is going to be. He said that \$1.7M from an analysis standpoint of data that is already being produced then that is expensive because all the analysis that goes into the CSS Oversight Committee is \$200K, we must be cheap.

Royer said that it is a placeholder and is the PBud input. She said that as we work through that process, she doesn't know that we would allocate that much funding to this project. There are a few places where there is funding provided in the PBud for a line item that they would likely not fund (like Blalock Islands) so they would reallocate to something else. She said that she understands that there is a lot happening in this realm and she will adjust that amount based on what is needed.

Ebel said that there is unfunded stuff in the budget spreadsheet like, McNary PIT detection improvements, which is really part of what we need that has zero funding attached to it.

Royer said that she fully intends to fund that so that is where that reallocation comes in. She has not filled in yet because she needs to vet that with the Administration and she does not feel comfortable getting ahead of that conversation.

Ebel said thank you.

Bettin gave some context that the Performance Standard Studies have cost tens of millions in the past, and this funding amount is actually small.

Ebel said that is because of how you are doing active tag studies at specific dams and the infrastructure that is involved in detection of active tags it would make sense. He said that if we are not trying to create a dataset that is misconstrued as 96% survival rate past the concrete anymore. At least that is Ebel's vision, and that is not where Idaho would like to go with that. The needs are going to be different for this evaluation because it will be a little bit more holistic.

Bettin said that it is either “way low or way high”. This is as good as it gets as a placeholder.

Ebel agreed and said that he understood.

Morrill asked whether Blalock will complete the monitoring of the raised elevation, but the action will continue.

Royer said yes, the monitoring was to verify that it was having the intended effect.

Van Dyke said they have had some evaluation so whether they have had the intended effect is still out there.

Lorz said that he wanted to follow up. John Day pool race has had the intended effect. The terns are not nesting there, that part of the plan has been successful. On the \$1.7M for the spill evaluation line item, Lorz said that if you look at some of the proposals there was some talk about doing some active tag work, whether that is for adult or for juveniles. So that is why this number is probably the \$1.7M, that is just their best guess, but because he does not have the finalized proposals or finalized 1-pager this number is either “way high or way low”. Lorz said that this number is their best stab at it and this is the best number they came up with for a placeholder.

Van Dyke said that he appreciates Lorz’ input [on Blalock Island operations] but there are other parts of the evaluation that also demonstrated that it just pushed birds back upstream and that was not the intended effect that he remembers. He said that the other birds are still out there. He said that this is not the place to argue that and apologized.

Lorz said that their mission was to get them off Blalock Island and then watch where they go. For the most part, they have gone to other locations, so that is true, but it did what it was intended. He said whether there was a biological benefit or not that is a discussion that they could have at another time. He was more curious about the \$1.7M; he was trying to gain clarity on that to make sure that he understood it correctly.

Trevor Conder, NOAA, said that it is an important number because it is ultimately, how much total funding we are requesting. He said that he hopes that that number is high enough to cover what we are going to need for FY24. If it turns out that it is not enough money to do what we need we are going to be short, so it is important to refine that as soon as possible.

Ebel asked who is requesting what for what. He said that he thinks that is still up in the air.

Lorz said until the Corps resubmits or asks for proposals from somebody we do not really know what is in these. That is the clarity that we need right now to get and find out what

the study is, so we can get comments on to you, so we can get it regionally approved, and ideally move forward. Then we can find out if the \$1.7M will be adequate for that or not. He said he thinks it is the SRWG that is lagging behind on this issue.

Royer said that there is more to come on this and we will revisit this as more information comes in.

Line #	Title	Notes
8	Estuary Habitat Studies Data Transparency and Web Interface	Royer said that last month there were comments about splitting out the different components of the research; she said that we have not done that in the past but she did not have issues with it. There is one funding amount for both. Royer said that she thinks \$2M is a lot so she expects to be able to reallocate a substantial amount of this funding to other projects.
	Estuary Habitat Uncertainties	
9	Bonneville Powerhouse 2 Fish Guidance Efficiency	Requested funding for the completion of the construction. Her understanding is that the construction should be completed early FY24. The Corps provide contract oversight and labor. The Corps lists this as <b>Mandatory</b> because it is ongoing construction. Should be wrapping up next FY.
10	Bonneville Powerhouse 2 Post-Construction Evaluation	This was not included when Royer submitted the budget a couple of years ago; she does expect to reallocate funding. SRWG is discussing what this could look like and so Royer does not have a good budget number. She just knows that it will need some funding.
11	Bonneville PIT Detection	Royer said that she knows that there has been a lot of discussion at FFDRWG and elsewhere. The current plan is to install the prototype at the Ice and Trash Sluiceway. She knows that there have been some hiccups with the design and she knows that Erin is working through some options for that so she is waiting for some kind of a final budget estimate for that. She also suspects that \$50K would not be sufficient for the installation. She thinks that there are still things to work through on this one and so she is keeping her eye on that to see what happens as part of that FFDRWG discussion.

Morrill said thank you and the discussion was, was the prototype the right direction to go, and he thinks that there is support to make it.

Royer said okay.

Lorz said part of the concern he had, and why he had trouble scoring this one, was that it is still unclear on whether if this information will help us with the McNary design. Lorz said that he is still unclear on that. That is why he gave a funky score with an asterisk.

Morrill said that is a good question and a good question for Gabe and Don as well, on whether they still feel that way. Morrill said that his takeaway was that they thought it would be as a prototype but he said that Lorz should get it from them.

Bettin said that he got the same response from them. That it is still good for the prototype.

Lorz said it raises the question, and this is why we need to have it at FDDRWG, what is the prototype at McNary. Lorz listed a few options; slot thing, flat plate, is it something on the TSW weir. Until they know what it is, and they are testing this thing over there, Lorz does not see the connection very well. Lorz said that is a discussion that needs to happen at FDDRWG.

Bettin said that this one would be likely on the TSW,

Conder said that it is embedded inside of a gate and that TSW detector probably would not be that design. It would be on top of the TSW. So it would be a completely different technology and this one only can detect 3' and the TSW has 12'.

Bettin said 10-12'.

Conder asked how this would be used to confirm whether we could use it at the TSW.

Bettin said that we will find that out next year when we continue the discussion. Bettin said that they have been saying that it is useful to them. That is all that he is passing on.

Conder said useful yes but he asked if it is necessary.

Bettin said that we could scrap it all and just not care. They are the experts and that is why we are trying to get the funding to them.

Conder asked why we were trying to get the funding to them at McNary.

Bettin said that is next year.

Conder asked if it was because he had not received confirmation about that.

Bettin said to see what Royer had in her budget.

Lorz said that it would be nice if CRFM got a little more because BPA funds are a lot and there is not a lot of oversight and the rest of the region has very little input or understanding of what is going on. Lorz thinks that this is part of the problem. He said that they are having problems understanding what BPA is doing and what is actually needed and what the path forward is. He said that having better transparency so that his scores could be better and it would be much appreciated.

Royer asked if this would be a discussion topic for the next FDDRWG. She also asked what the question is so she could pass it to Jake.

Lorz said that is the problem because they are using a Bonneville project to talk about a McNary project. He said that next FDDRWG they will be doing both, so the question is how is the prototype at Bonneville going to inform the prototype at McNary. He also asked what the prototype at McNary looks like so that Lorz can understand how they are connected.

Conder said that it is not only that but how it is going to benefit detection at Bonneville. He said that has been the way that it has been sold; detection at the Ice and Trash Sluiceway, improve overall detection at Bonneville Dam, improve the survival estimate. It is borderline passing the straight face test for both of those objectives. He does not know if it is. He said that they need to sell them on that, it is questionable.

Morrill said that originally he agreed with that.

Royer said that originally the EDR recommendation was to open all of the Ice and Trash Sluiceway gates. The idea was to tackle the automatic gates first because that would be easier and then move from there to the fixed gates. The intent with this prototype, if it works with them would to put it on the automatic gates and then from there tackle the fixed gates. She said that is the trajectory of the project.

Conder said they knew that but they still have the problem of the fixed gates. He said they still do not know whether or not this is the right way to go. He said that maybe the exit chute is the best way to go. It is still kind of an unknown there and then if there was a transition then they agree that it is somewhat iffy; we are just going to use this to test out the McNary thing. Conder said that is a completely different problem all together. He said that you could get some information but not necessarily everything that you need to understand that problem, so it is iffy there as well. He said that it is iffy on both. He asked if we are just going to go for it, it is kind of weird.

Bettin asked if Conder ever thought if they could put auto gates in 1A and 1B. Bettin said that there is a chance that they could outfit all five gates with auto gates.



Conder said that he do not want to put auto gates that are 2 - 3' at 1A and 1B, and if that is where Bettin is going with this Conder said that he is absolutely opposed.

Bettin said that there is a chance that they will find that they have a deeper read range; that is why they are testing it.

Conder asked if they are going to drop gate 3 down to 5' and see if you can detect at the top. He asked how they would know; it could be at the bottom.

Bettin said that is why they are testing so that they can figure out what the read range capabilities are of this type of antenna.

Morrill's perception discussions at FDDRWG with Jake was the ability to get the number the number of detections will be very costly and is, in Morrill's opinion, still is a high degree of uncertainty that this is the best route to go at Bonneville. The discussions about doing it as the outflow of the Ice and Trash have many technical difficulties in addition with some structural elements that makes that uncertain as well. He said that he thinks there are many questions around the whole thing and he would defer to the experts on what makes the most sense and what are we getting out of this for the dollar invested.

Royer heard Morrill's concerns. She said until Erin has more conversations about the BON project and options for installation she does not really know whether the price will be more than what was originally intended. She said that the jury is still out on the cost for this. She thinks that we could still hopefully figure something to make it reasonable. We will hopefully figure something out in the next couple weeks and relay that information. As far as the ITS chute, she has heard a lot of discussion about the option there, but she has not really seen any hard facts that would say there is an option there that is cost effective and we will get really good detections. If that comes out, she said yes, let us have another conversation. She said that she has not heard anything definitive.

Morrill said that they have not heard anything either.

Conder said that he okay with testing this prototype at 3A with BPA funding it. He said that he is okay providing limited funds to install and support the installation. He said maybe it is useful, he will buy into that and maybe we will get some useful information out that he does not know if this is going to work at 1A and 1B. He said that he is not supportive of restricting the flow over 1A and 1B to accommodate a 3-5' read range over an antenna.

Royer said that we will have more discussion at FDDRWG and we will see what evolves.

Line #	Title	Notes
--------	-------	-------

<b>12</b>	Bonneville Serpentine Weir Modifications	This is the redesign of the Washington shore serpentine section. Right now, the design is being funded out of the Lamprey program and we are planning to fund the construction portion under the main CRFM program in FY24. Royer does not think that it will cost a full \$10M but we are waiting on a final cost estimate from the team. That is the plan moving forward.
-----------	--	---

Bettin asked if “Main” CRFM means the “Columbia” or is it still the “Lamprey”.

Royer said that it would be under the “salmon” dollars, it would not be under the Lamprey program funding.

Bettin said the Columbia then.

Royer said that she considers Lamprey as Columbia as well.

Lorz asked if there were dollars set aside for Lamprey and he wanted to make sure that it was not coming out of that pot of money but make sure that it was coming out of a CRFM allocation that the Corps are allocating for because this is to meet your portion of that construction.

Royer said correct.

Ebel said asked if any of the construction was being paid through the Lamprey part of the agreement. He asked if it was a cost share or if it is all Salmon money.

Lorz said that construction would all be Salmon money. The design, which was \$3 – 5M, was all Lamprey. The Corps front-loaded it saying they were going to use Lamprey money to do the design work and that kind of stuff. This was only supposed to be an eight or nine million dollar project, it is now more than that, so the share on the Corps side got bigger because the construction was not supposed to cost this much. We will know more when we get the final number.

Royer said we will get a final cost estimate and whenever anything goes out to bid, that is always the wildcard.

Bettin asked if it is correct that Lamprey dollars are CRFM dollars.

Royer said yes, but they are tracked separately and they do not mix Lamprey and Salmon funds.

Bettin said with Ebel’s comment about the contribution it is all CRFM dollars it is just two different pockets of CRFM.

Ebel said yes, it is making a decision allocating it amongst the benefits of different groups of fishes. Ebel said that he is looking at it. It is almost half the allocation of the Columbia in FY24. He just wanted the clarity.

<b>Line #</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>13</b>	The Dalles East Fish Ladder Emergency Auxiliary Water Supply	The team will be completing DDR and initiating plans and specs in FY24. There was a hefty allocation for this project. Originally, the intent was to carry the funding from FY24 to FY25 for construction in FY25. They are not expecting to execute \$4.2M on this project next FY. The estimated capability was \$350K for the design efforts.
<b>14</b>	John Day Ladder Cooling	They are planning to initiate the EDR next FY, there is funding allocated for that.
<b>15</b>	John Day Mitigation	They did receive a FY23 work plan to get this project back off the ground. There is funding in FY24 to continue the study and move that forward.
<b>16</b>	McNary Adult Ladder Cooling Structure	They are planning to initiate design next FY.
<b>17</b>	McNary Avian Deterrence	Same; Royer said that she knows that there is a feasibility report so she expects that the design process to be more accelerated from the other projects.
<b>18</b>	McNary PIT Detection Improvement	Planning to fund PIT detection improvements, it was not included in the original budget submission but they do plan to allocate some funding for this project and this would be to initiate that EDR. She is envisioning something like what they did at Bonneville where you look at: what are options, costs, and boosts in detections. Doing that analysis with the available information.
<b>19</b>	Ice Harbor Turbine Passage Survival Program	Royer said that she knows that there has been a delay in that schedule. She needs to get with NWW, they might need some minimal funding to complete this work for contract oversight. Royer does not have a final budget estimate; she does not think it will be substantial. The Corps lists this as <b>Mandatory</b> because it is ongoing construction.
<b>20</b>	Lower Monumental Adult Ladder Cooling Structure	They are also planning to initiate the design process for the Lower Monumental Adult Ladder Cooling Structure.

21	Little Goose Adult Ladder Temperature Mitigation	They also have the line item for the Little Goose Sluice to allow fish to exit that cooling structure so hopefully we can get that completed enough by FY24.
----	--	--

Van Dyke asked if John Day cooling structure was on the list.

Royer said that it is.

22	Lower Granite JBF	Royer said that this project should not need any funds in FY24 they should be wrapping up that work, but they have some minimal funds to close out the project. Royer lists this as <b>Mandatory</b> but it would be very small if any funding needed to close that out.
23	Lower Granite Turn Pool Gate	They received FY23 work plan funds to initiate design efforts and then the intent was to try and complete that in FY24.

Ebel asked when this would come back to Walla Walla FDDRWG. He said that there needs to be some thought that goes into how we deal with how we equip this thing with PIT detection so that we can adjust how our reascension models work. So if the turn pool gate has changed that allows fish to go back down the ladder without exiting the ladder it is actually changes how we look at fall back and reascension . He said that he did not know if that has come up before. If not, he will make sure to go to Walla Walla FDDWG and make sure that it is at least acknowledged.

Royer said that she could touch-base with Chuck. She said that she thinks that it will be on the FDDRWG agenda. They did just restart this PDT, so they have not gotten very far, so there is time to discuss this design. She will let Chuck know to add this to the agenda.

Bettin asked if Lower Granite has an entrance and an exit PIT detection.

Ebel said it does but the way it works is the fish cannot go back down. Currently if the fish pass the trap, they cannot go back down the ladder, but if that gate is changed, Ebel said he believes that will allow the fish to go back down the ladder without having to exit it.

Conder said that could always occur, so they do not change their metric, their fall back retention. The way that you would calculate that when trapping is occurring or not occurring is the same method.

Ebel said he would have to pencil out how that calculation would work because it would depend on the passage at that gate, and if the fish passes that gate, it is a one-way street to the exit. Fall back and ascension when you incorporate it into adult abundance estimate at Lower Granite you have to account in your adjusting the window counts. You need to account for that reascension because all of a sudden, if you allow fish that pass the trap and they can go back down, or pass the trapping area and then go back down without exiting the ladder, they can go past the window again but there is no tracking of that.

Conder said that he understands that but right now the way method is calculated; it is sequential passage through a series of antennas. Depending on where those antennas are, if you have three antennas in line and you get that upstream movement through those three antennas that confirms they went upstream versus going downstream. He hears what Ebel was saying but he does not think that factor is going to affect the fallback reascension rate, but it is worth looking into and we can do that.

Ebel said that they will need to figure it out too because they do the abundance at Lower Granite estimate. They have set up their models for the configuration of the dam and/or ladder as it is now and it is going to cause some complexity that they will need to think about and they will need to figure out.

Ebel asked about the hidden cells he found when copy/pasting. He asked why the real-estate transaction and litigation expenses were grayed out and then hidden.

Royer said her intent was that she did not want to delete it for a few reasons. She is not currently expecting to provide funding to these projects but she said that there is a lot in flux. She did not want to delete them from the spreadsheet and then suddenly find out that they require funding. She has them on the spreadsheet but they are not currently in her calculus for funding.

Ebel said that it makes sense.

Van Dyke asked if she thinks that they might reappear at some point.

Royer said that she does not know that that will happen. She does not expect it to happen.

Bettin pointed out a few out of date acronyms on the spreadsheet for the projects.

### 3. Discuss FY24 Rankings – *Ida Royer, Corps*

- Provide scores and collate at next SCT meeting.

Morrill asked if the first seven line items are mandatory, Line # 3 – 7 would be essentially mandatory.

Royer said that the Corps would be potentially ranked a five if we were funding limited and had to make hard choices. She is just trying to provide some transparency, from the Corps side of Mandatory, like construction, the Corps cannot default on their construction contracts. Those are the three “M” mandatory projects. Aside from that, if we are funding limited Royer said that she thinks that we would have that discussion. It gets into the continued discussion about the scores and the ranking. There was the scoring sheet that Lorz sent out that we could revisit. She is not tracking that these are all mandatory but certainly the Corps would rank them high.

Morrill said that he is a little confused on that, when he thinks about how to rank some of these.

Lorz told Morrill to not to treat them as mandatory and to rank them as he would. If the Corps later calls them mandatory, they will automatically be funded but Lorz said that he would score them as if they were a regular project so that it will get your input in that way.

Van Dyke said there are changes about how they address the requests and comments of adding ideas to the list; Morrill’s point out ideas about mandatory and how that is disseminated, we are not ranking in this meeting and are sending it to Royer instead. He asked if there is an active change in the way that we run SCT that he had missed or will they still be able to have input on what is provided on the list and work together as this group to rank what is on the list.

Royer said that she does not understand Van Dyke’s comment because there have been many discussions in this group about how to rank. Originally we did do it in the meeting, and then the group decided that for efficiency they would send Royer their scores and she would compile them. It does not matter who collates them and if people want to rank in the meeting that can be done as well. She will not change anyone’s score because the group will go through the scores together in the meeting and she tries to put all the comments in the sheet. Royer said that if SCT wants to change she is open to that. It had just seemed like everyone felt like it was more efficient to sit down with their agencies and come up with their scores themselves and then send that. If we want to do that at the

meeting, she is open to discussing that. As far as mandatory, the Corps has always, as far as Royer has been aware, ranked ongoing construction as mandatory. There have been some changes about the ranking of the numbers because it is up to each agency to determine what you think is right and then we can have a discussion as a group on the ranking system. Royer said that she is trying to provide transparency about what the Corps considers mandatory so there are not any surprises. She did put that on the sheet when she sent it out so that people could be aware of what Royer considers mandatory and the rest, the rankings help her understand the relative importance if CRFM becomes funding limited.

Van Dyke said thank you for the official statements but Lower Columbia River Juvenile Survival Studies has been ongoing for a long time whether that is mandatory or not has been hard to reconcile. The description that Royer is using for Bonneville Powerhouse being mandatory is not always consistent trying to understand how that functions in her process. Van Dyke said that these discussions are necessary to get to an understanding. Adding things to this list has been one of those things that he finds difficult to comprehend why something might be on the list as a placeholder but never is addressed again, other than putting it into place as a placeholder. He had noticed that with the last three questions that it had gone to the process again and getting a clear understanding of what the plan is, is helpful. Knowing that they are going to go over what the ranks are at some point is comforting to note. He added that he was thankful for the extra information.

#### **4. Ongoing Topics**

- McNary Hoists

Lorz asked if we have gotten a response back; at the SCT meeting, there were internal discussions about McNary hoists would be funded if at all through CRFM. He asked if there was any resolution on that. He said that if there were he would have assumed that we would have seen something, maybe not for FY24 but ideally for FY25.

Royer said as far as she is aware those discussions are happening in FPOM. She also not aware of any CRFM funding. If those discussions evolve and there is a component that would be CRFM funded then they would bring it to this group and add it to the list for rankings. Until that point, those discussion will be relegated to FPOM because currently she is not aware of anything that is CRFM funded.

Lorz said that they could argue all they want about that but there is some discussion about getting the hydraulic models up to speed. He asked if that would be O&M or if that CRFM.

Royer said that one is gray. She said that she would have to understand more of the specifics. She said that it could potentially be CRFM.

Lorz said that when we did the flexible array originally, we used CRFM to get people down there to look at the new programs, which we are essentially doing at McNary with these hoists going out and that kind of stuff and having new spill patterns. We want to use that model to verify that. That is what he was suggesting at the very least in his ranking. Lorz said that he is also still pushing to use CRFM to cover the hoists because if we are going to try to use O&M to cover the hoists that is a train that will never come to station and he is not excited about a 15-year time frame to repair hoists. He is going to continue to be a pain and keep making that comment.

Royer said that is fair. As far as the hoists themselves, she said good luck; she does not think that Lorz will get very far with the funding authorities. The modeling though, she has not heard anything about that being required but if that comes her way she will share that.

Lorz said that he would gladly argue authorities.

**Next meeting: June 15, 2023 (Hybrid)**

NOAA offices at 1201 NE Lloyd in Portland (11th floor)

**Today's Attendees:**

Name	Affiliation
<b>Ida Royer</b>	<i>Corps</i>
<b>Charles Morrill</b>	<i>WDFW</i>
<b>Blane Bellerud</b>	<i>NOAA</i>
<b>Christine Peterson</b>	<i>BPA</i>
<b>Jonathan Ebel</b>	<i>IDFG</i>
<b>Scott Bettin</b>	<i>BPA</i>
<b>Tom Lorz</b>	<i>Umatilla/CRITFC</i>
<b>Steven Sipe</b>	<i>Corps</i>
<b>Trevor Conder</b>	<i>NOAA</i>
<b>Steve Junke</b>	<i>Corps</i>
<b>Erick Van Dyke</b>	<i>ODFW</i>



*Minutes by Andrea Ausmus, CorSource Technology Group LLC, Contractor for Bonneville, [AMausmus@bpa.gov](mailto:AMausmus@bpa.gov) (971-373-1288). Please send any requested edits to Kathy Ceballos, NOAA, [kathy.ceballos@noaa.gov](mailto:kathy.ceballos@noaa.gov).*