

**Willamette Action Team for Ecosystem Restoration (WATER)
Steering Team Meeting**

June 5, 2018

Location: Fireside Room, Corps' 300 Building

http://www.nwd-wc.usace.army.mil/tmt/documents/FPOM/2010/Willamette_Coordination/

Facilitator's Summary

ACTION	By Whom	By When
Ask Ricardo Walker to present a summary of the TDG data at the next Steering Team meeting.	Ian and	July Steering Team Meeting
Invite Diana Dishman to attend.	Marc	

Participants in the Room: Ian Chane (USACE), Mike Hudson (USFWS), Marc Liverman (NMFS), Kelly Reis (ODFW), Karl Weist (NPCC);

Participants on the Phone: Nancy Gramlich (ODEQ), Tammy Mackey (USACE), Dan Spear (BPA);

Facilitator: Donna Silverberg; **Summary:** Nancy Pionk, DS Consulting

Welcome and Housekeeping

Donna conducted a round of introductions with the group. The group approved their May 1, 2018 summary with additional edits provided by NMFS and BPA.

Managers' Forum June 7th Meeting Agenda

The group discussed and finalized the agenda topics for the June 7, 2018 Managers Forum:

- **WATER Team Project Updates (the “view from the air”):** it was suggested that this topic be shifted to after the presentation on Cougar Downstream Passage. Ian noted that he will report budget amounts for the projects along with the pictures the Steering team saw last month.
- **Cougar Downstream Passage:** Kelly reported that she had consulted with the project managers and understands that, while there is a current plan forward with Trap and Haul, there is also a High Head Bypass team (with cross-over of staff on both teams) that has an interest in incorporating a piped bypass feasibility study. Kelly emphasized the importance of considering this as a tandem approach rather than a later add-on. The group agreed that the managers need to make a decision as soon as possible to prioritize the feasibility study of piped bypass at Cougar so it can run concurrently with the Trap and Haul design process.

NMFS and ODFW both stressed the biological urgency for including the feasibility study alongside the Trap and Haul study design: Kelly noted that the Population Viability Analysis (PVA) for McKenzie Chinook that Bruce McIntosh will present to the managers indicates an unacceptably high possibility of extinction for Spring Chinook. From ODFW's perspective, the region needs to be in front of concerns regarding McKenzie Chinook and there is not time to wait for a trigger to consider piped bypass; NMFS also stressed the 40% mortality rate due to copepods. Group members agreed their task was to prepare their managers to be ready to make a decision to prioritize evaluation of piped bypass concurrent with the current path of Trap and Haul. The feasibility study will consider whether it is doable from a technical and cost perspective, and how it might impact the current timeline.

- **Willamette Falls:** Marc will provide a 1-page handout and fact sheet from Robert Anderson regarding NOAA's Pinniped Task Force.
- **Detroit Public Comment Update:** Ian updated steering team members regarding the recent algae issues experienced within the Detroit Reservoir that led to advisories from the City of Salem regarding cyanotoxins in drinking water. He noted that the Corps did not implement temperature control assessment as previously planned. The Corps is considering what these water quality issues will mean for future planning. He also noted that Kevin Brice will update the managers on what the Corps is hearing via the NEPA outreach process and, in particular, the concerns about economic impact to the Detroit recreation area and the municipal water supply.

Ian shared that the revised estimate for Phase 2 of the Detroit Floating Collector was \$334 million, while the initial estimate in the COP for both phases of the project was \$314 Million. He noted this as an example of the pressure the region faces to make the correct funding decisions at Cougar.

FY19 RM&E Planning Tables

Steering Team members reviewed columns 1 and 2 of the FY19 RM&E Planning Tables. Karl noted that the tables were extremely well done, flowed logically and were an excellent tool for determining the research needed for FY19.

- Under the Middle Fork table, Steering team members suggested that the term "sustainable population" in Column 2 be clarified. The group discussed that the goal, upon construction of a facility, is to ensure that the fish population is at a level that is replacing itself.
- It was also suggested that *Habitat Improvement above Foster Dam* be added to Column 1 of the South Santiam table.
- It was suggested that Lookout Point get a tag on it similar to that given to Green Peter.
- Overall, Steering Team members indicated that the small group had captured the appropriate information for Columns 1 and 2 and supported it as a tool for moving forward with FY19 Planning.

Group members also discussed that the tables were meant to identify potential concepts that might be needed, and the next step would be to prioritize and identify funding sources. The RM&E Team will be reviewing draft concept papers at their June 28, 2018 meeting. The intent is to hold a joint meeting with the Steering Team to review and prioritize the concepts for funding. The group agreed to wait until after the June RM&E team meeting to determine the date for the joint meeting (either July 26th or August 7th).

TDG North Santiam

Ian reviewed a handout on TDG Management at North Santiam. He noted that the Corps' evaluation of TDG concluded that there was a high level of TDG in these reaches. Page 1 of the handout discusses the implementation of RPA 5.1 and 5.2 to address high TDG. Page two of the handout displays a bar graph showing the spawning habitat capacity above Detroit, below Minto, and within the Minto/Big Cliff reach, with and without Big Cliff TDG improvements. The Corps' perspective is that additional study regarding TDG was unnecessary as the ultimate plan is to bypass juvenile fish around the reach. Kelly raised a concern that there are non-listed fish in the reach. Mike noted that there is nothing being done to reduce TDG and that the intent of the Steering Team's discussion was to better characterize TDG levels. Ian suggested that this ultimately is an interim fish management decision: now that this condition is known, what should be done? It was suggested that Ricardo Walker present a summary of the data at the next Steering Team meeting and that Diana Dishman also be invited to allow the group to explore the data in greater detail and determine next steps with regard to TDG in the North Santiam Basin.

→ **ACTION:** The Corps will ask Ricardo Walker to present a summary of the TDG data at the July 3rd Steering Team meeting. Diana Dishman will also be invited to attend.

Annual Review of the WATER Guidelines

Donna conducted a survey with the Steering Team that was derived from the goals stated in the WATER Guidelines adopted in April 2017. The survey was similar to the 2017 survey used by the group to measure success towards the goals that matter to the region. The group rated the effectiveness of the Steering Team and the overall WATER process. Donna provided the average score for each goal and compared the 2018 overall WATER process scores with the average scores for 2017 (see average scores attached). She also noted that the group had slightly refined the goals since the 2017 survey.

The Steering Team noted that, in terms of the overall WATER process, 5 out of 7 areas showed improvement in 2018 when compared with 2017 survey results. The areas in which the average scores denoted that Steering Team was performing acceptably well (2.6 or higher) included:

- (A) Provide a forum for information sharing and discussion of operations and configuration of the Willamette Project and the Willamette BiOps and RPA consistent with the ESA and in support of Recovery Plan, or state/inter-agency Conservation Plan goals, while recognizing the unique role played by the Services in decisions related to measures covered in their respective BiOps;
- (B) Ensure broad technical and policy input into planning, funding, and implementing decisions regarding operation of the Willamette Project related to implementation of the Willamette BiOps and RPA or other applicable biological opinions;
- (C) Facilitate open and transparent communication to seek consensus on actions implemented related to the Willamette BiOps and RPA, including system configuration and water quality, tracking progress and the rationale for decisions;
- (D) Provide a vehicle for elevating and resolving disputes associated with the operation and configuration of the Willamette Project to appropriate levels of the involved governmental bodies;
- (E) Identify opportunities for improved coordination and partnerships to increase efficiencies and avoid unnecessary duplication;
- (G) ensure an adaptive management strategy is used effectively to implement actions to benefit ESA-listed species

The areas in which the average scores denoted that the Steering Team was not performing well (2.5 or below) included:

- (F) Increase awareness and include consideration of the implementation of the Willamette BiOps' and RPA actions on non-listed species, cultural and other resources, and the multi-purposes of the Willamette Project;

With regard to the overall WATER process, the group noted that the average score for dispute resolution (D), remained the same over the past two years at 2.6, while the average score for (D) for the Steering Team improved to 3.0. The group assessed that it has been difficult for managers to make decisions on elevated issues, and that the Steering Team might do a better job preparing them for that. Donna noted that this upcoming managers' meeting was handled differently, with almost all planning and prep being done with and through the steering team.

Group members also noted that the group has been working better together over the last several months. They reflected that this may have been due, in part, to turnover on the Steering Team with new people in lead roles, and having the Steering Team determine funding priorities rather than the RM&E team. The

gap analysis that occurred at the joint meeting helped both groups to focus on the real issues. Additionally, the possibility of re-initiation may have taken some pressure off the group.

The group discussed initial lessons learned and insights for working together in the future:

- Small group and offline discussions were useful as they were focused, collaborative conversations with a purpose leading to a conclusion.
- Group members agreed it is helpful to reach out and have direct conversations in smaller groups whenever there is a need to talk to each.
- It was suggested that a more active chair for the Steering Team would be helpful; while Donna and her team does well getting the team together, an active team member as chair would be appreciated.
- The group also discussed their role in preparing their managers to be better able to make decisions on a timely basis. They hope to see the fruits of their labor at the 6/7 meeting.
 - Team members requested that materials be available at least one week before future Managers Forums, to allow team members enough time to adequately prepare their managers for decisions at the Forums.

Donna inquired whether the steering team thought any updating of the Guidelines was needed at this time (since they are to be reviewed annually). Group members agreed that it would not be useful to revise the Guidelines at this time, in light of pending litigation and the likelihood of re-initiation.

With that, Donna thanked the group and adjourned the meeting.

The next Steering Team meeting is scheduled for July 3, 2018 from 12:30-4:30. [NOTE: Time might be changed pending a poll of steering team members to allow everyone an early start to their July 4th holiday.] Location TBD.

This summary is respectfully submitted by DS Consulting. Suggested edits are welcome and can be sent to nancy@dsconsult.co

WATER FORUM
Evaluation of Overall Effort

Please rate how well you think WATER is doing on the following:
(As a time frame of reference, please limit your scoring to the past 6 months)

Rate based on:

1-not well....2-needs improvement....3-fine....4-pretty well....5-very well

	SCORE		
	Steering Team	Overall Water 2018	Overall Water 2017
Include BPA, Corps, NMFS, NPCC, ODEQ, ODFW, and USFWS			
A. provide a forum for information sharing and discussion of operations and configuration of the Willamette Project and the Willamette BiOps and RPA consistent with the ESA and in support of Recovery Plan, or state/inter-agency Conservation Plan goals, while recognizing the unique role played by the Services in decisions related to measures covered in their respective BiOps;	3.2	3.4	3.8
B. ensure broad technical and policy input into planning, funding, and implementing decisions regarding operation of the Willamette Project related to implementation of the Willamette BiOps and RPA or other applicable biological opinions;	3.0	3.4	2.8
C. facilitate open and transparent communication to seek consensus on actions implemented related to the Willamette BiOps and RPA, including system configuration and water quality, tracking progress and the rationale for decisions;	3.0	3.0	2.75
D. provide a vehicle for elevating and resolving disputes associated with the operation and configuration of the Willamette Project to appropriate levels of the involved governmental bodies;	3.0	2.6	2.6
E. identify opportunities for improved coordination and partnerships to increase efficiencies and avoid unnecessary duplication;	3.3	3.3	2.75

<p>F. increase awareness and include consideration of the implementation of the Willamette BiOps' and RPA actions on non-listed species, cultural and other resources, and the multi-purposes of the Willamette Project;</p>	<p>2.5</p>	<p>3.3</p>	<p>2.0</p>
<p>G. ensure an adaptive management strategy is used effectively to implement actions to benefit ESA-listed species</p>	<p>2.6</p>	<p>3.0</p>	<p>2.1</p>