

WATER Steering Team Meeting

September 5th, 2017

DS Consulting Office

Meeting Summary

ACTION	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
Provide an update on the September 6 th conversation to the Steering Team via email.	Corps and BPA	Following 9/6 meeting
Circle back to DSC if there is a need to schedule a call to coordinate on the LOP presentation.	Joyce and Marc	Following 9/6 meeting
Connect with Managers re: meeting agenda	Donna	September 12 th (and Sept 22 nd)
Provide the list of “fundable” FY18 concepts to the Steering Team.	Ian	September 12 th
Provide any additional changes to the issue papers to DS Consulting, who will incorporate the edits and provide revised issue papers to the Steering Team ahead of the September 29 th Managers Forum meeting.	Steering Team	September 15
Resolve any “D’s” on FY18 concepts	Steering Team	October 3 rd ST meeting
Provide CRFM funding criteria in writing.	Corps	October 3 rd ST meeting
Review and approve August 10 meeting summary at Oct meeting	All	Oct 3 rd ST meeting

Participants in the room: Joyce Casey (Corps), Bernadette Graham-Hudson (ODFW), Marc Liverman (NMFS), Tammy Mackey (Corps), Dan Spear (BPA), Karl Weist (NPCC);

Participants on the phone: Ian Chane (Corps), Nancy Gramlich (DEQ), Lawrence Schwabe (Grand Ronde), Jason Sweet (BPA);

Facilitator: Donna Silverberg; Support: Emily Stranz (on phone), DS Consulting.

Welcome, introductions, & housekeeping

DS Consulting Facilitator, Donna Silverberg, welcomed the group to the Steering Team meeting. She noted that the purpose of the session is to discuss issues and seek consensus on process, substance and outcomes for efforts that affect participants engaged in the Willamette system.

The group reviewed the August 10th Steering Team meeting summary; NMFS noted that they have additional edits to share and will send them out to the group for consideration. The group will approve the summary at the next Steering Team meeting.

Updates & Process Check-in

Celebrate success (Bernadette’s, that is)!!: The Steering Team congratulated Bernadette Graham-Hudson (ODFW) on her new position as the ODFW West Region Manager. Bernadette is the first woman Regional

Manager in the history of ODFW. Today was her second day on the job. She reported that her previous position will be filled (hopefully) quickly.

Budget updates: FY18 Information (plus, status of O&M) - Ian Chane (Corps) provided a revised FY18 budget and RM&E prioritization spreadsheet. He started by explaining the FY18 budget, noting that the CRFM budget is locked for FY17 and the revised budget reflects the final numbers. However, he noted, there still may be shifts in funds before the end of the year to cover unexpected costs. He reminded the group of a few of the projects that have incurred additional costs for FY17 which have affected the budget (example, the floating island repairs). Ian pointed to substantial budget changes in the Willamette, one being maintenance of the PFFC (instead of removal) and another being an overall reduction in the Willamette RM&E program. There may be funds that can help make up budget lost from RM&E, depending on execution in FY17. For instance, within the Detroit contract there are multiple options, all of which may not need to be funded next year, that could free up funds for RM&E. Ian noted that the Willamette RM&E budget is not broken down to sub-basins; that step will come later in the year.

Ian will report back on the FY17 funds and Tammy Mackey (Corps) will provide an update on the FY18 O&M budget at the October Steering Team meeting.

Status of ODFW & NMFS schedule for conversation on Reintroduction Plans – Bernadette and Marc Liverman (NMFS) reported that ODFW and NMFS are scheduled to meet on September 20th for a Reintroduction Plan work session. They already have an outline for the plans which they will expand on for each sub-basin.

Progress report on Sub-Basin planning (and integration with reintroduction planning) – Two documents were provided for this update: a generic outline for the sub-basin plans and a sub-basin process outline. The RM&E Team requested input from the Steering Team on both the outline and process moving forward; the RM&E Team has already reviewed and approved the generic outline, as well as the check-in points during plan development.

The Steering Team reviewed the outline and offered the following thoughts to pass on to the RM&E Team:

- Keep the document succinct and short; incorporate resources by reference only.
- Briefly summarize what information is already available for each sub-basin.
- Summarize new information since the 2008 BiOp.
- Focus on the questions, information gaps, and methods to fill gaps.
- Provide a “comprehensive impacts” piece to section 8.
- Provide more clarity on when the various pieces are expected to be complete.
- Consider an annotated bibliography.

➤ **AGREEMENT: The Steering Team approved the outline (with the above suggestions) with all 1’s and 2’s using the Five Fingers of Consensus.**

It was noted that the sub-basin plans are intended to provide information to address management decisions. The Steering Team needs to provide input to RM&E about what information is needed. It was suggested that the Steering Team have reoccurring check-ins with the RM&E Team as they develop plans to make sure the plans are shaping up to respond to decision makers’ information needs.

ACTION: The Steering Team will ask for an ‘RM&E plans update’ at each monthly meeting. Additionally, they will have more in depth updates at 10%, 50%, and 80% completion points. The Steering Team penciled out a rough schedule moving forward:

- October: Steering and RM&E Teams joint technical check-in
- November: 50% draft Steering Team review and input
- January (ish): 80% draft Steering Team review and input
- February/March(ish): Final review

The Steering Team was concerned about the workload of adding these plans to already busy schedules. They encouraged the RM&E Team to ask the Steering Team for help or additional time if the workload ends up being too much.

Update from WFFDWG – Stephanie Burchfield (NMFS) reported on the 9/5/17 WFFDWG meeting. She reported that BPA, the Corps and NMFS met to discuss collection efficiency criteria in August. They had a productive meeting and will continue to meet monthly to further the criteria. They are using a similar process to what they used with Detroit, in which the criteria will be negotiated first by the federal agencies, and then there will opportunity for others in the region to weigh in on the criteria via the WFDWG process.

The Detroit PDT is busy working on temperature control and the floating surface collector. They are conducting modelling and, per model results, it appears that the total amount of flow over the floating surface collector will not significantly impact temperature downstream, as was previously expected. This is good news for future fish collection, as they will want to capture as many fish as possible via the floating surface collector. Additional modelling information on fish growth was presented and needs to be examined in more depth.

LOP Authority and EA Update – Dan Spear (BPA) reported that the timing of this Steering Team meeting is unfortunate as the Corps and BPA are meeting tomorrow (9/6) with their legal counsel to discuss the Lookout Point authority, as well as significance under NEPA, power generation impacts, and . Ian added that the Corps’ Division and District counsellors have been talking, but have not reached any conclusions regarding the Corps’ authority as of yet. He noted that the authority issue influences both the Environmental Assessment (EA) and the drawdown, and so the Corps is holding off on any additional modelling of a drawdown into the power pool until after they’ve resolved the authority issues. Ian added that the RPAs need to be implemented, but this must be done within the Corps’ authority. He continued that the authority is an important issue to clarify because it will influence how the Corps can move forward with passage at LOP, which will have a big impact on the 2019 check in.

Dan noted BPA considers cost effectiveness impacts on a dam-by-dam basis. As such, the impacts are weighed both regionally, and at each project. Because BPA has an asset management plan and other costs associated with each dam BPA needs to be assured that it is making cost-effective investments at each project. There is also a related and broader question considering issues associated with operating LOP in such a way that is no longer providing one of its authorized purposes.

Marc questioned why NMFS is not included in the conversation tomorrow, to which Joyce noted that at this point the conversation is between the Corps and BPA as cooperating action agencies (BPA is in the process of becoming an official cooperating agency). She noted that if NMFS Counsel wants to talk to the Corps’ Counsel about being involved, she does not have a problem with that.

Mike Hudson (USFWS) reminded the group that the EA process has been going on for a while (over a year), and the drawdown is included in the Middle Fork RM&E plan. He suggested that, as the other RM&E sub-basin plans move forward, the Steering Team should intentionally consider who needs to be a cooperating agency and get ahead of what potential authority issues may come up so that the region does not have to address them in real-time.

→ **ACTION:** The Corps and/or BPA will provide an update on the September 6th conversation to the Steering Team via email.

Issue Elevation and Resolution Process

Donna provided two draft issue resolution papers, prepared by DS Consulting, for the purpose of this conversation. These were developed by looking at what the RM&E team had drafted in the past and meeting summaries since early this year. The group reviewed and discussed the draft issue papers in preparation for the Managers Forum. It was noted that the lack of written criteria about how and when CRFM funds can be used is problematic for the region because they continue to guess at what might or might not be funded. This continues to cause tension because WATER members do not have sufficient information by which to make or influence decisions.

→ **ACTION:** The Corps will provide a description of CRFM funding criteria in writing.

Ian noted that CRFM funds originated on the Columbia for fish passage. Once these funds were brought into the Willamette, there were other actions that needed to be funded because there were fish above and below the dams and no passage. For this reason, the Corps temporarily allowed funding for projects that they typically would not fund with these monies (for instance, spawning surveys above dams). Marc explained that he is looking for more transparency and clarity about the CRFM funds; there are actions in the RPA that are not being funded and should be. Ian said that the Corps' top priorities are the actions that have immediate fish benefits, which is why research projects are often sidelined. The Corps cannot stop construction once they have started.

Issue 2 (Annual parentage analysis, spawning surveys and screw-trapping) – Marc observed that from the NMFS perspective, CRFM and O&M funds are first allocated to Corps priority projects, and then other priority projects are considered. Tammy noted that she would seek regional input on production and M&E (baseline monitoring) funds in the future. Ian noted that there is still confusion from the Corps' point of view as to whether the studies within this issue paper are planned for this or the next BiOp. CRFM cannot fund efforts for the next BiOp. The Corps must be clearly within the parameters of their funding mechanisms, so as not to risk losing those funds.

The group suggested the following additions to the issue paper:

- Add “Annual parentage analysis, spawning surveys and screw-trapping” to the issue description.
- List the specific RPAs that pertain to the issue.
- Clarify that some RPA RM&E measures are unfunded.
- Clarify that the region has not had input into priorities for O&M (however, will be able to provide input on production and baseline monitoring).

Issue 3 (Green Peter outplanting, parentage, spawning surveys and screw trapping)? – Ian noted that per the BPA, Corps and NMFS' agreement, passage at Green Peter was not included in the COP and thus there is not funding allocated for it. It has been suggested that passage at Green Peter will be included in the next BiOp, which cannot be funded with CRFM monies. Stephanie noted that they

are not asking for passage to be added to the COP, they are requesting information to help inform near term management of the Middle Fork.

The group suggested the following additions to the issue paper:

- Clarify that this information would be used to help inform passage decisions in the Middle Fork and would inform decisions that will need to be made for the 2008 BiOp.
- List the specific RPAs that pertain to this issue.

→ **ACTION:** The Steering Team will provide any additional changes to DS Consulting by Sept 15th. DS Consulting will incorporate the edits and provide revised issue papers to the Steering Team ahead of the September 29th Managers Forum meeting.

FY18 RM&E Prioritization Conversation Continued

The group reviewed and prioritized FMWQ-18-03 and FMWQ-18-04-SYS which were developed by the RM&E at Steering Team’s request. Stephanie reported that these concepts were drafted and refined by the RM&E Team and there is general support from the RM&E Team for these concepts.

FMWQ-18-03 - Bernadette requested measurement and information about the distance downstream TDG can be detected; for example, how far downstream do the high levels of TDG persist? The region weighed in with their ranks using the 1-5 scale previously agreed on: 1 is low and 5 is high; they also had the option of using a “D” which signals a “defer” for more information/discussion or an entity choosing not to take a stance on a concept.

- Corps: 4
- BPA: 4
- Grand Ronde: 4
- NOAA: 4
- NPCC: indicated strong support (4)
- Oregon: 4
- USFWS: 5

FMWQ-18-04-SYS – There was inquiry as to how this concept is different than or related to Res-SIM results? This concept would use a team to help assess those results and develop a framework and tools to use for decision making. They will work to develop a model that strengthens relationships with flows in the tributaries.

This concept would initially be paid for by CRFM. CRFM can fund the development of these tools to inform instream flow needs; however, ongoing costs of using of the tools would need O&M funds. Tammy noted that the O&M budget has been decreasing annually and expressed concern about the longer-term sustainability of the project. Stephanie explained that once the tool is created, those managing the system would know the relationships and could use the information, so they may not need to run the model very often. Mike noted that as this project moves forward into a proposal, they will need to be clear that the outcome should be a tool that helps managers make informed decisions, not a continued facilitated framework. The Steering Team would like an opportunity to review the proposal to make sure that scope for outcomes does not include an ongoing need for facilitation of the framework or tools developed.

The region weighed in with their ranks using the 1-5 scale previously agreed on:

- Corps: D
- BPA: 4

- Grand Ronde: 3
- NOAA: 3
- NPCC: indicated limited support (2)
- Oregon: 4
- USFWS: 4

→ **ACTION:** Joyce will inform the Steering Team about the Corps ranking on FMWQ-18-04-SYS.

→ **ACTION:** The Steering Team members agreed to resolve any “D” rankings by the October 3rd Steering Team meeting.

Given all of this: which projects move forward for proposals?

Corps’ funding information

Ian had to leave at this point in the meeting, so the group did not hear a report out regarding which projects were compatible with Corps funding sources. Donna noted that DS Consulting will work with Ian to get the funding details and will provide it via email to the Steering Team.

→ **ACTION:** DS Consulting will get the list of “fundable” concepts from Ian and send it to the Steering Team.

Prepare for September 29 Managers Forum Meeting

The Steering Team worked together to draft the September 29th Managers Forum meeting agenda. They agreed on the following:

1. What have we accomplished from the BiOp? -
2. Should we have annual reporting? If yes, which team? - *NMFS*
3. Reintroduction Planning status –*NMFS and ODFW*
4. Sub-basin Planning Update - *Corps*
5. Hatchery baseline monitoring funding lessons learned – *Marc and Tammy*
6. Issue Elevation -
 - a. RPA measures lack funding source for Annual parentage analysis, spawning surveys and screw-trapping
 - b. Green Peter reintroduction studies lack funding source for outplanting, parentage, spawning surveys and screw trapping
7. LOP deep drawdown – *Marc, Ian and Dan*
 - a. High head dam info from last time – Kratz?
8. Big Cliff TDG briefing – *Diana and Ian*
9. Status on summer steelhead and HGMP litigation - *Joyce*
10. Corps Updates - *Ian*
 - a. Cougar Downstream Passage Design Options and update on workshop
 - b. DET temperature Issues
 - c. Reminder of 5-year planning process
 - d. RM&E Cycle – next meeting: highlights from tech review

Marc reported that NMFS is working on developing a PowerPoint presentation for the LOP deep drawdown briefing. NMFS plans to address the history of the situation and why the issue is important from different perspectives. He noted that it would be great to get confirmation from the Managers that they support this moving forward in 2018 if it is not possible in 2017. It was noted that there may be a need for a conference call to discuss the LOP presentation further after the 9/6 Corps/BPA conversation.

- **ACTION:** Joyce and Marc will let DS Consulting know if they need to coordinate a call to discuss the LOP presentation.
- **ACTION:** Donna will meet with regional Managers to discuss and confirm the September 29th meeting agenda.

Regional Updates from WATER Members

BPA: Dan reported that as of this morning the Bonneville Dam was unaffected by the Eagle Creek fire. Additionally, Jason Sweet reported that Governor Brown went on a tour of Willamette habitat projects with BPA Administrators and state officials that went very well.

ODFW: Bernadette reported that the Cascade, Oxbow and Bonneville Hatcheries have been evacuated of people due to the Eagle Creek fire and, at the Oxbow Hatchery, they released fall Chinook early (1 month) because they were having trouble maintaining suitable water temperatures and conditions due to debris from the fires.

Corps: Tammy reported that the Willamette Hatcheries contracts have been awarded to ODFW. The trout hatcheries' management contracts have not yet been awarded.

Next Steps

The Steering Team will continue to clarify which FY18 RM&E concepts should be developed into proposals, and the Corps will note which studies they see as "fundable" with either CRFM or O&M sources. The group will work together to prepare for the September Managers Forum meeting and DS Consulting will work with Managers to confirm the agenda. The Corps and BPA will circle back to their partners after their legal counsels discuss the LOP draw down.

The next Steering Team meeting is October 3rd from 12:30-4:30 at the DS Consulting Office.