

WATER Steering Team Meeting

October 3rd, 2017

Office of DS Consulting

Facilitator's Summary

| <i>Task</i> | <i>By Whom?</i> | <i>By When?</i> |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| Review 9/5 session summary and send any edits and/or approval to ST via email. | Dan and Ian | 10/10 |
| Send the Steering Team a list of O&M baseline M&E activities for prioritizing by basin. | Tammy | Week of 10/16 |
| Develop an O&M budget spreadsheet showing the baseline M&E and hatchery production line items. | Tammy | 11/7 ST meeting |
| Reach out to Steve to see if he is available to provide a Habitat Team update for the November Steering Team meeting. | Dan | 10/30 |
| Provide the 10% drafts of the sub-basin plans to the Steering Team. | Brad | 11/7 ST meeting |
| Update the region on the FY17 Foster adult fish facility study. | Brad | 11/7 ST meeting |
| Check in with Rich regarding the intent of Objective 2 of APH-18-02-SYS; circle back to the Steering Team. | Ian | 10/10 |
| Solicit proposals for any concepts ranked 4.0 or higher. | Ian/Rich | 10/19 |
| Meet within the next two weeks to clarify any additional proposals to solicit. | Steering Team | 10/13 |
| Pull out the concepts that the Corps cannot fund and list them at the bottom of the prioritization spreadsheet with a note why it is not fundable. | Ian | 10/13 |
| Discuss the prioritization process, including how to move forward and agencies' ranking criteria. | Steering Team | 11/7 meeting |
| Send the Detroit outreach materials to the Steering Team email list. | DSC | 10/10 |

Participants in the room: Leslie Bach (NPCC), Ian Chane (Corps), Brad Eppard (USACE), Mike Hudson (USFWS), Kelly Janes (USACE), Marc Liverman (NMFS), Tammy Mackey (Corps), Dan Spear (BPA); Diana Dishman (NMFS – for RME FY18 discussion only)

Participants on the phone: Bernadette Graham-Hudson (ODFW), Scott Snedaker (BLM);

Facilitator: Donna Silverberg; Support: Meghan Lawrence, Emily Stranz, DS Consulting.

Welcome, introductions, & housekeeping

The Steering Team approved the August 10th meeting summary with strong consensus (all 1's and 2's using the Five Fingers of Consensus). NMFS, ODFW and USFWS, approved the September 5th meeting summary, however, the Corps and BPA requested more time for review; they will review and respond with their input via email.

→ **ACTION:** Dan and Ian will review the 9/5 meeting summary and email the group with any necessary edits and/or their approval of the summary by 10/10.

Updates & Process Check-in

Budget Updates: FY18 Information for CRFM and O&M: Ian reported that at this point nothing has changed on the CRFM budget that he provided in September. The Corps expects to receive the first installation of their budget on 10/4; this is the portion that was granted with the Continuing Resolution and includes \$8.3 million for research.

Tammy shared that the O&M budget is \$1.3 million short from what was requested and the baseline M&E is half of what was budgeted in 2017. She will be putting together a list of baseline M&E activities within the next two weeks to send out to the Steering Team, requesting prioritization by basin. Bernadette recapped conversation at the 9/29 Managers Forum meeting, during which the managers talked about regional involvement in reprioritizing the Fish and Wildlife O&M program. Tammy clarified that the region can weigh in on the priority of the baseline M&E and maybe some hatchery production where there is flexibility (flexibility = where there are contracts with options that the Corps can choose to implement or not; for instance, the trout contract has an option of how many pounds of fish are produced. This is an area that the Corps could reach out to the region to provide input). Bernadette was concerned that the 2017 Falls Creek screw trap issue is not repeated, during which a screw trap was funded that the region did not feel was priority and other regional priority screw traps were not funded. Ian explained that that program will not be doing that monitoring anymore, so it will not be a problem. He further clarified that the money for the screw trap was onsite budget, which the region cannot participate in prioritizing.

Tammy requested that the Steering Team focus on prioritizing the basins for O&M, so that when she looks at the O&M budget she can direct the money to the top priority basins. Additionally, the request for a spreadsheet detailing the O&M budget was reiterated. Tammy noted that she can provide a spreadsheet showing the two line items that the region can discuss, however, the O&M budget does not operate like the CRFM, so it will look different.

- **ACTION:** Tammy will send the Steering Team a list of O&M baseline M&E activities for prioritizing by basin; she will send the list the week of 10/16.
- **ACTION:** Tammy will bring a spreadsheet showing the baseline M&E and hatchery production line items to the November Steering Team meeting.

Ian noted that activities that do not fall under the CRFM or O&M budget can be tracked on the prioritization spreadsheet and the Corps can ask for unfunded budget for these. He noted that this funding opportunity is a big MIGHT, but there is no harm in tracking and making the ask. Marc wondered whether it was worth the conversation. And Donna reinforced the question, noting that after the last two weeks of meetings it is important for the region to reflect on how much they need to push for specific issues or whether they are pushing for something that is not worth pushing for?

Update from Habitat Team: Dan emailed an update to the Steering Team that included a plan that ODFW and BPA have adopted for mitigation to habitat lost when the dams were constructed. He will continue to bring updates from the Habitat Team to the Steering Team. Donna asked the group whether there was something specific that they were hoping to hear from these updates and Bernadette suggested inviting Steve Gannon (Habitat Team chair) to come to the Steering Team to provide a more complete picture of the HTT, including how it feeds into the BiOp, different funding sources, etc.

- **ACTION:** Dan will reach out to Steve to see if he is available for the November Steering Team meeting.

Progress update on RM&E Sub-basin plans: Brad noted that his team has been assigned to drafting the sub-basin plans and expects to have the 10% draft ready for the region to review by November 1st. The following 50% review date will be determined depending the level of comments received on the 10% draft, thus the rest of the schedule will be squishy. However, the team is dedicated to getting the drafts completed in a timely manner. Brad will provide an update at the November Steering Team meeting and the RM&E Team will discuss the 10%

version in more depth at their November meeting. Then, if desired, the Steering Team can have a more in-depth presentation in December.

→ **ACTION:** Brad will bring the 10% drafts of the sub-basin plans to the November 7th Steering Team meeting.

At the Managers Forum meeting, Kevin said that the plans are no small task and that the Corps is looking for assistance from the region. Mike asked how the region can be of help at this point. Brad noted that the Corps will create a first draft to kick off the process, however, the region will be asked along the way to provide input. At this point, both the RM&E and Steering Teams have reviewed and commented on the generic plan outline.

Progress update on Reintroduction plans: Bernadette shared that there is no update since the 9/29 Managers Forum meeting. Ian requested a similar regional review process on the reintroduction plans as is being used for the sub-basin plans (a similar request was made at the Managers Forum as well). This will allow the region to make sure that the plans are coordinating with each other. Brad suggested that a schedule is also produced. Bernadette noted that the NMFS/ODFW group didn't get that far in the discussion and can discuss the requests at their next meeting (the next session not yet scheduled). **The reintroduction plan update will carry over onto the upcoming Steering Team agendas.**

Facilitation Services Evaluation Results: Donna provided the group the evaluation results and asked them to review and consider the comments. Donna noted that as outsiders to the process, there is only so much that the Facilitation Team can do to help the members participate in the process. For example, helping track and remind the group of action items can only go so far, it is up to the group members to get things done. Marc asked Donna for input on how the WATER teams are doing from the Facilitation Team's perspective. For instance, is the group working towards consensus? Donna explained that consensus takes a lot of effort, and it is clear that everyone is busy. She shared that there are steps that the Facilitation Team thought were being done, however, after last week's Managers Forum meeting, now realizes that there are key pieces missing. Donna gave the example of the issues that were elevated to the Managers for resolution and that some managers were unaware of the decision request. The expectation from the Facilitation Team was that the Steering Team members were briefing their managers on the issues and decision needs.

Reflection on Managers Forum Meeting: This conversation overlapped with discussion on the Facilitation Services evaluation. During the conversation, the group identified ways to improve the process, specifically in preparation for Managers Forum meetings. Donna recapped some changes that the Steering and Facilitation Teams can make:

- more clarity on the agenda (note issues, signal decision needed, etc.);
- help the Steering Team jointly draft any documents going up to the managers; keep these documents brief;
- plan ahead even more; documents need to be finalized at least two weeks ahead of the Managers Forum meetings;
- make sure that the Steering Team has a last look at any documents that are being sent up to the managers;
- in advance of the meeting ask the managers if they are ready to make a decision (note: this is something that both the Steering and Facilitation Team members should do);
- do not hold decision making meetings in September, there is too much going on;
- have a final sit-down with manager to prep them a week in advance of the Managers Forum meeting;
- once the Managers Forum meeting is scheduled, schedule to meet with your manager 30 minutes before the meeting, this allows for up to date briefing (note: this does not take the place of pre-briefing, it is in addition to); and,
- try to help deals get done ahead of time, instead of waiting until a few days ahead of the meeting (if possible).

The group discussed elevating issues in more detail. The elevation papers need to be short and succinct; if additional details are needed, that should be provided in a pre-briefing from staff. The managers should come to the meeting prepared to make a decision and not need a presentation during the meeting (as it is difficult to gather information and make a decision in such short a timeframe). The issue should be generally outlined with statements clarifying the differences between the camps. When looking for a decision, Steering Team representatives need to do a better job of briefing their manager. It was noted that it is the Steering Team's responsibility to know what issues need to be worked out ahead of the meeting; they need to work to identify those issues and where the facilitators are needed, request them.

It was noted that the WATER forum is for gathering input, however, a lot of the decisions will require separate federal family discussions.

On an optimistic note, Mike pointed out that the meeting did move in a productive direction as issues were raised and are on a path forward with coordination. And the Steering Team has identified ways to better position for resolution next time. Also, there was discussion around the RPA and ESA that suggested that not everyone was on the same page at first, however, by the end the region seemed more aligned on the need for action. The group noted that the Steering Team needs to make progress on the two elevated issues before the next Managers Forum meeting.

FY18 CRFM Prioritization Conversation Continued

The Steering Team reviewed the updated FY18 Prioritization spreadsheet, which now clarifies the concepts that can and cannot be funded with CRFM funds. They walked through the concepts that are eligible for CRFM funds and for which a member had previously ranked with a "defer" to see if an updated ranking was appropriate. Ian noted that not all "defers" need to be changed into numbered rankings, as there are times when a member will use a D because of an internal agency preference not to rank.

Ian added that due to a project that did not go through in Walla Walla District, the Corps is able to execute additional funding for CRFM and will fund the Detroit PDT work in FY17 instead of FY18. Thus there will likely be some extra money in FY18 that can go towards another project.

- Foster Adult Fish Facility PDT – OR had previously deferred on this because although they feel that it is a high priority to get the collection facility working better, there are still studies that are identifying the issues with the facility. OR would like to see the results of the current studies before work is done to address the problem.
 - Ian explained that the idea is to take the information at hand and have engineers and biologists review and discuss, then reengage with region. While this project is active and exploring a post construction issue, the studies can be funded with CRFM. Later, any work on the facility will be funded through O&M. At this point, the Corps needs to figure out if there is an issue with the structure, which may require more research.
 - The group was interested in a report back on the FY17 study results, noting that the water chemistry data is expected to be included. It was noted that the sooner this information is available, the better the PDT can incorporate the data. Ian assured the group that the PDT will not start the work until the information is ready for them.
 - **ACTION:** Brad will update the region on the FY17 study at the November Steering Team meeting.
 - **OR updated their ranking to a 4 and requested more information on what the PDT is doing.**
- JPL-15-02-SYS: *Evaluate the feasibility of in-stream juvenile fish trap and haul above WVP dams* – The Corps had previously deferred on this pending the regional workshop that took place in September. Ian needed clarification that the study was focused on the Middle Fork, which it is. The group clarified and

Ian affirmed that the work does not need to physically take place in the Middle Fork, however, is intended to inform the Middle Fork Head of Reservoir.

- **The Corps updated their ranking to a 4.**
- JPL-18-02-SYS: *Willamette project dam passage delayed mortality* – The Corps had previously deferred on this concept.
 - **The Corps updated their ranking to a 1.**
- FMWQ-18-04-SYS: *“SWIFT” concept* – All members had previously deferred on this, as the concept paper had not yet been drafted at the time or prioritization.
 - **OR updated their ranking to a 4; Grand Ronde updated their ranking to a 3; NMFS updated their ranking to a 3; USFWS updated their ranking to a 4; BPA updated their ranking to a 4; and the Corps updated their ranking to a 4.**
- FMWQ-18-03: *TDG below Big Cliff* - All members had previously deferred on this, as the concept paper had not yet been drafted at the time or prioritization.
 - **OR updated their ranking to a 4; Grand Ronde updated their ranking to a 4; NMFS updated their ranking to a 4; USFWS updated their ranking to a 5; BPA updated their ranking to a 4; and the Corps updated their ranking to a 4.**
- JPL-17-08-CGR: *Evaluation of nets to influence the behavior and distribution of juvenile spring Chinook in Cougar reservoir cul-de-sac* - NMFS, ODFW, and USFWS had previously deferred on this, pending review of the USGS report on the effectiveness of nets and collectors throughout the region.
 - Ian affirmed that the Corps is designing the structure with the capability for adding nets.
 - Mike noted that if structure is being designed to allow for nets, it pushes the need to study it out a bit.

The group also discussed two concepts that the Corps clarified **do not** fall within CRFM parameters.

- APH-18-02-SYS: *Objective 2: Evaluate what improvements might be made to increase collection efficiency at Minto Fish Facility, and evaluate pHOS below Minto Dam after improvements are made that lead to increased collection efficiency* – Ian noted that assessing pHOS should be a hatchery or O&M item. Additionally, because there has not been an issue identified with collection at the Minto facility, the Corps is unsure of what needs to be evaluated. Although the facility has not been evaluated, there are no observed issues with collection. The group wondered whether there was sufficient information to determine if there is an issue with collection. If an issue is found in the collection at Minto, the project is viable for CRFM funding, if not, it potentially could fall under baseline M&E. The group noted that the pHOS data collection objective is redundant with those in other concept papers and requested a check in with Rich on the intent of this objective.
 - **ACTION:** Ian will touch base with Rich on this concept and get back to the Steering Team by 10/10.
- APH-09-01-CRG: *Evaluate strategies for reintroduction of adult UWR Chinook at Cougar Dam* – Ian noted that reintroduction actions cannot be funded under CRFM.

The group discussed the use of the “D” as a ‘do not fund’ option. Some felt that the RM&E Team should first rank the concepts based on the scientific merit and then the Steering Team can add the policy and funding lens to the rankings. There was also interest in further clarifying how the agencies are applying their ranking to the concepts. The group agreed to revisit the prioritization process at their meeting in November. There is interest from some in having a prioritized list of concepts based solely off of whether or not the information is needed to comply with the RPA and inform management decisions. This would be a pre-policy/funding prioritization that would alert the region to work needed and thus need to seek out additional funding sources. Ian agreed to provide a list of the concepts that the Corps cannot fund, including rationale as to why (see action item above).

- **ACTION:** Ian will pull out the concepts that the Corps cannot fund and list them at the bottom of the prioritization spreadsheet with a note why it is not fundable; he will do this by 10/13.
- **ACTION:** This list will then be ranked by the RM&E Team based off whether it is scientifically needed to comply with the RPA and inform management decisions.
- **ACTION:** The Steering Team will discuss the prioritization process at their November meeting, including how to move forward and agencies' ranking criteria.

Based off of the Corps' assessment, there are 13 FY18 RM&E studies that are fundable with CRFM funds; at this point it is unclear whether the \$8.1 RM&E budget will cover all of those projects. The Corps will review the concepts and estimate costs to get a better idea of which concepts will move to full proposals. In the case of limited funding, the region was interested in how the decision will be made to request proposals; for example, how will they determine funding for a project that ranked 3.0 with high support from the Corps and low support from others, versus another concept that was ranked 3.3 with high support from others but low support from the Corps? **The group agreed that at this point, everyone is comfortable moving the concepts that are ranked 4.0 or higher AND are eligible for CRFM funding on to proposals; there are a total of 7 that were ranked 4.0 or higher:**

1. JPL-11-05-FOS
2. JPL-15-04-LOP
3. JPL-17-04-LOP
4. APH-18-03
5. FMWQ-18-03
6. JPL-15-02-SYS
7. FOS Adult Fish Facility PDT

This will allow the RM&E Team to begin their work in reviewing proposals at their October 26th meeting. Additionally, the Steering Team will meet within the next two weeks to review the remaining concepts and determine any additional proposals the region would like to see move forward. Brad reminded the group that developing a proposal does not ensure funding of a project.

- **ACTION:** The Corps will solicit proposals for any concepts ranked 4.0 or higher. The Steering Team will meet within the next two weeks to clarify any additional proposals they would like to see developed.

The Steering Team briefly revisited CRFM funding parameters. It was noted that **CRFM funding can only be used to:**

- inform a decision on construction design (including research needed for design);
- construct something;
- post effectiveness monitoring (is the structure working?); and,
- post construction modifications and assessments.

CRFM funding cannot be used for reintroduction planning.

[Facilitator's Note: Via edits, NMFS noted that the Corps has also indicated that work related to instream flows and operational fish passage can be funded through CRFM.]

Detroit Project EIS - Public Involvement Plan

Kelly Janes, USACE, presented the Corps' public involvement plan for the Detroit project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). She explained that the Corps wants to have leadership level conversations with regional partners, conducted by Kevin Brice the week of October 23rd. The intent of these leadership meetings is to go over the alternatives, impacts, and to get buy-in on key messages before the Corps goes out to the public. Kelly will be

reaching out to partners soon to set up these meetings. Kelly asked that the Steering Team help reinforce her efforts in getting on manager's schedules.

Leslie noted that staff will also need to know the key messages as they will potentially be the ones attending the outreach events. She suggested that holding meetings with leadership and staff at the same time might be helpful. Kelly explained that the current approach was suggested by people in the valley who stressed that it is vital that leadership is well aligned. All materials and updates are being provided at the staff level through WFFDWG and now the Steering Team. Additionally, Kelly shared that the Corps has a communications packet that will be provided to regional partners to help with alignment.

This is a time sensitive issue, as the Corps will start NEPA public scoping in December 2017 (for those who attended the 9/29 Managers Forum meeting, the materials provided at that time stated scoping would be in November 2017, however, the Corps decided to push it out a month due to the tight schedule).

Furthermore, this is expected to be controversial publicly. There are four options that the Corps is exploring:

1. Full drawdown for two years
2. Partial drawdown to build base (like a Japanese skyscraper)
3. Cofferdam option
4. Building completely in the wet – no drawdown

However, at this point they are expecting that the best option will include a drawdown. This will cause issues publicly, as the community of Detroit relies heavily on the reservoir. Additionally, there are likely to be environmental impacts with flow, sediment, impacts to Minto Adult fish facility, and such. The Corps has decided to go with an EIS for these reasons.

The drawdown would be a temporary drawdown for construction, however, may last up to two years. The EIS will include scoping, however the Corps wants to reach out to key stakeholders and community members prior to public scoping because they know there will be controversy on the drawdown. Kelly asked the Steering Team to connect with her if they have ideas on key stakeholders to contact. Dan suggested looking into public representatives who may have homes around the Detroit area, they would be good to reach out to ahead of time. Additionally, if agencies want to attend the stakeholders meetings, please reach out to Kelly. A list of the key stakeholders are included in the communications packet.

Kelly reviewed the public scoping schedule which includes public scoping in two locations around December 14th; the scoping will be in an open house format. She requested a federal/family/state/tribal front, with everyone providing the same key messages, including the need for the impact and eventual benefits. Ideally, they will have staff members from the region attend to help address questions. They would be needed for 3-4 hours the evening of these events. Kelly will send out copies of the draft outreach materials to the region for input and refinement in November.

Dan noted that at the time that the 2008 BiOp came out the general thought was that the reservoir would not be drawn down and that the community of Detroit has not yet been told there will likely be a draw down. The Corps goal is to get the word out sooner than later to help allow the community to plan ahead.

→ **ACTION:** Kelly will send the materials that she provided to DS Consulting to send out to the Steering Team email list.

Regional Updates from WATER Members

BPA: Dan shared with the group that he has heard some misconceptions regarding how BPA assesses the impact of an operation to power generation. He clarified that BPA have an internal process that they use for assessing impact: first they analyze power impacts through RESSim and then Hydsim. Then they look analytically at any other impacts, followed by an official statement with their determination. He cautioned the group, that until the official

statement is provided, there is no determination of impact made. This is the formal path that BPA takes to allow them to understand the impacts of an operation.

No other updates were provided.

Next Steps

The Corps will work to update the FY18 Prioritization spreadsheet and get the updated version to the Steering Team by 10/13. They will also begin getting proposals on the agreed on concepts. DS Consulting will schedule a follow-up meeting to continue the discussion on additional concepts to turn into proposals. The Corps, ODFW and NMFS will continue with progress on the sub-basin and reintroduction plans respectively. And the group will reconvene at their regular meeting time on November 7th to discuss prioritization, budgets, progress on plans, and potentially more from the habitat team.

A follow-up meeting will be scheduled by 10/13; following that, the Steering Team will meet on November 7th from 12:30-4:00 at the **NEW DS Consulting Office located at 221 SE 11th Ave, Suite 211 (in the Troy Laundry Building).**