

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

August 7, 2018

Location: Fireside Room, Corps' 300 Building

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

Final Facilitator's Summary

ACTION	By Whom?	By When?
Coordinate with the RM&E Team to finalize concepts and solicit study proposals.	USACE – Ian/Rich	ASAP/ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the revetment study and potential revetment removal. Karl, Mike, Anne, and Steve Gagnon (BPA) • Draft revetment memo to HTT; bring to Steering Team for input. Mike 		September 4 th ST meeting
		September 4 th ST meeting
Invite Greg Taylor, Elise Kelley and Chris Walker to the Sept Steering Team meeting to share information on operations to reduce TDG at Big Cliff.	Ian, Kelly	September 4 th ST meeting
Draft a Gannt chart for the Cougar and Detroit DDR process.	Ian	September 4 th ST meeting
Connect with the Cougar PDT to verify that the 90% DDR will include issues related to HHB and movement of fish into the design considerations. Report to ST	Brad	September 4 th ST meeting
Check with managers about Sept. Managers Forum meeting topics.	Steering Team members	September 4 th ST meeting
Determine internal personnel capacity for an alternatives analysis for Big Cliff TDG fix.	Brad/Ian	September 25 th Managers Forum meeting

Participants in the Room: Ian Chane (USACE), Diana Dishman (NMFS), Brad Eppard (USACE), Mike Hudson (USFWS), Marc Liverman (NMFS), Kelly Reis (ODFW), Karl Wiest (NPCC);

Participants on the Phone: Nancy Gramlich (ODEQ), Tammy Macke (USACE), Anne Mullen (NMFS), Erik Peterson (USACE), Lawrence Schwabe (Grand Ronde), Dan Spear (BPA);

Facilitator: Donna Silverberg; Summary: Emily Stranz, DS Consulting

Welcome and Housekeeping

Donna conducted a round of introductions and review of the July 3rd meeting summary. Pending the fix of a grammatical error offered by NOAA, the Steering Team approved the meeting summary as final. Additionally, the Steering Team confirmed they will continue to hold their meetings on the 1st Tuesday of the month from 12:30-4:30, until further notice.

FY19 Budget Update

Ian provided a FY18 budget update to the group (separate document), noting that this budget depicts where they are now and is subject to change before the end of the year. Ian anticipates they will need to allocate more funding for Cougar and Detroit downstream passage RM&E to help with study needs in FY19. Additionally, there are funds that were previously allocated for a project on the Columbia that will not be implemented in FY18. Those funds will be reallocated to the Willamette.

Ian also provided an update on the FY19 budget. He explained that this tentative budget is based on the president's budget and shows an overall decrease in the CRFM program with an increase in the proportion of CRFM funds allocated to the Willamette. In FY19, close to half of the CRFM budget is directed to the Willamette. Ian noted that this may be a trend; yet, they will have to wait and see how things play out. Furthermore, the 2008 Accords, which funded lamprey work on the Columbia, are coming to an end, so the FY19 budget shows zero funding for lamprey work.

The FY19 budget is not yet finalized for specific sub-basins or projects. Ian expected that the high head bypass prototype cost shown may be a low estimate and more funds may be needed for the Cougar and Detroit DDRs.

Jeopardy Standard

Marc explained that, in the spirit of collaboration as the Action Agencies and Services reinitiate consultation, he thought it would be helpful to refresh everyone on the jeopardy standard and update them on NMFS' current analytical approach to determining jeopardy and destruction/adverse modification. He also asked for input from ST members regarding whether such a presentation might be helpful at the September Managers Forum meeting. (See PowerPoint slides provided via email from DS Consulting prior to the meeting.) He started by sharing the definition of jeopardy (50 CFR 402.02):

"Jeopardize the continued existence of means to engage in an action that reasonably would be expected, directly or indirectly, to reduce appreciably the likelihood of *both* the survival *and* recovery of a listed species in the wild by reducing the reproduction, numbers, or distribution of that species" (emphasis added).

Marc noted that case law solidified that both the survival and recovery of a listed species needs to be considered in jeopardy determinations. He also provided the definition of destruction or adverse modification (50 CFR 402.02):

"Destruction or adverse modification means a direct or indirect alteration that appreciably diminishes the value of critical habitat for the conservation of a listed species. Such alterations may include, but are not limited to, those that alter the physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a species or that preclude or significantly delay development of such features."

Determining jeopardy is largely a qualitative exercise, as many of the variables cannot be quantitatively measured. When assessing whether a proposed action will result in jeopardy, NMFS has considered:

1. Status of the species;
2. Environmental baseline;
3. Effects of the action; and,
4. Cumulative effects.

NMFS' 2008 Willamette BiOp used this approach and determined the Proposed Action would cause jeopardy and adversely modify critical habitat for Upper Willamette River Chinook and steelhead because: the action did not adequately address impacts from dams and other instream structures; it impaired access to and quality of critical

habitat; did not address temperature control adequately; and among, other reasons, continued hatchery practices that did not support self-sustaining populations. He clarified that less than 1% of NMFS' consultations end with jeopardy determinations. Marc noted that, since the 2008 BiOp, there is new information to inform the upcoming determination, ongoing litigation, and NMFS' analytical approach has changed to incorporate and evaluation of both "exposure-response-risk" and climate change on the species and habitat (see slides for more detail).

The group discussed the relationship between BiOps and Recovery Plans, noting that the last Recovery Plan for the Willamette is from 2011. A more recent 5-year species review provided updates on the best available science. The Recovery Plans provide Broad Sense Recovery Goals, with specific timelines. Marc noted that due to the viability of the UWR steelhead (which according to the VSP scores are on the brink of extinction), the Recovery Plan will be important to consider in the upcoming consultation.

Both the Corps and NMFS emphasized that they want to make sure the upcoming BiOp is comprehensive and done well. The group agreed that an update on NMFS' approach should be shared at the September Managers Forum, including a Department of Justice schedule update, if possible (see below).

Follow-up on RM&E Prioritization and Information Needs

The Steering Team reviewed the results from the July 26th Steering and RM&E Teams prioritization exercise and noted that there seems to be more alignment on the concepts this year than in the past. The process, which began by looking at needs on a basin-wide and sub-basin by sub-basin and culminated in the graphic depiction for prioritization, was a benefit to the overall decisions they need to make. In terms of next steps, the Corps expressed a need for more conversation on JPL-18-02-SYS (*Willamette Project Dam Passage Latent Mortality*) and APH-19-04 (*Evaluate interim management strategies for adult UWR Chinook Salmon at Big Cliff and Detroit dams: optimizing above-dam spawner distribution*) before any proposals are solicited for these concepts. Also, it was noted that a proposal is not necessary for FMWQ-18-01 (*Evaluation of habitat benefits associated with USACE revetment modification, including potential cold-water refuge enhancement*) as the group has identified an alternate path forward (see below).

The group acknowledged that JPL-11-05-FOS (*Evaluation of Foster Dam Juvenile Fish Passage*) was ranked the highest; however, depending on whether summer steelhead can be used as surrogate fish, the study may or may not be feasible in 2018. All were comfortable with a proposal being solicited so that this study can move forward when fish are available.

Some thought JPL-19-01-LOP and JPL-19-02-LOP should be combined into one study proposal to allow for either operation to be tested, depending on the water year. Both of the operations still need to have ResSIM and HydSIM conducted.

The Steering Team agreed that, with the exception of the three concepts previously mentioned (JPL-18-02-SYS, APH-19-04, and FMWQ-18-01), all of the ranked concepts should move forward into proposals. The Corps agreed to do a brief cost and timing analysis on the concepts and begin to solicit proposals for the concepts. The group agreed that if there is sufficient funding, all of the proposals (except the three noted above) should be implemented. The Corps agreed to keep the RM&E Team in the loop regarding proposal solicitations in case the RM&E Team has input on timing, needs, and potential researchers.

- **Action:** The Corps will look to see if there are any concepts that need to be addressed ASAP, if so, they will reach out to the RM&E Team to flag these for immediate review prior to soliciting proposals. The RM&E Team will make sure that the concepts are complete and provide any additional input/comments to the Corps that need to be included prior to soliciting proposals.
- **Action:** The Corps will solicit proposals for the agreed upon concepts.

In regard to FMWQ-18-01 (*Evaluation of habitat benefits associated with USACE revetment modification, including potential cold-water refuge enhancement*), the Steering Team agreed that an effort to try to move the conversation on revetments forward would be helped by a memo to the Habitat Tech Team (HTT). This concept was deemed to be outside of the CRFM funding parameters, however, is required by the RPA. The Steering Team would like to see if there is anything that the HTT could do to address the information needed. The group discussed the HTT's funding limitations, as well as the current revetment removal project that the team is developing. A sub-group of Karl, Mike, Anne, and Steve Gagnon will meet to discuss the current and potential revetment projects. Mike will then draft a memo for the Steering Team to review prior to sending it to the HTT.

- **Action:** Karl, Mike, Anne Mullen, and Steve Gagnon (BPA) will connect (Karl will set up a meeting) to discuss the revetment study and potential revetment removal.
- **Action:** Mike will draft a memo to the HTT, for the Steering Team to review at their September meeting.

The group tabled their conversation on the policy approach to address information “placeholders” that were noted on the RM&E planning tables. **They will discuss the placeholders at the September meeting. The Federal Family was also encouraged to discuss the policy issues at their next Federal Family meeting.**

Lookout Point Follow-Up

Ian and Brad shared that the Corps is in the process of finalizing the LOP memo, which clarifies how they made the determination that the deep drawdown is not within their authority. Marc noted that he asked the NMFS attorney to connect with the Corps attorney regarding the conclusion. Marc requested that the Corps provide information regarding:

- What does substantial compliance with the Chief's Report mean?
- How have Chief's Reports been modified in the past?
- What can we do to seek authority?

If available, Ian will provide an update on progress at the September Steering Team meeting.

North Santiam TDG

The group revisited and clarified the Steering Team's request of the Corps regarding possible solutions for TDG downstream of Big Cliff Dam. The group clarified that they would like the Corps to start by determining whether there is sufficient personnel capacity at the Corps to conduct an alternatives analysis. The Steering Team is requesting this first step in case there is a need to do an alternatives analysis in the future, knowing that it takes some time to coordinate these efforts. If the Corps determines that they are not able to do an alternatives analysis, this issue should be raised again with the Managers. If there is sufficient personnel capacity, the Steering Team would like the Corps to do a 30,000' alternatives analysis of options to address TDG at Big Cliff, assuming no budget constraints.

The Steering Team reiterated that TDG levels in the reach downstream of Big Cliff are too high and a Managers' level conversation regarding how to prioritize and potentially fix the problem in the future would be helpful. The issue of TDG at Big Cliff was raised to the Managers at their September 2017 meeting, at which point the Steering Team asked for RM&E studies and a WFPOM taskforce to determine operational ways to lower TDG. Through the course of the year, it was determined that there is sufficient information on the issue and studies were not needed. The WFPOM taskforce has done what they can to ease impacts from operations and scheduled outages. (Note: Greg Taylor will be asked to attend the September Steering Team meeting to explain the complexities and tradeoffs. It was suggested that Chris Walker and Elise Kelley will also be included in this conversation.)

- **Action:** Brad and Erik will meet to discuss internal Corps personnel capacity for an alternatives analysis.
- **Action:** Brad will invite Greg Taylor, Elise Kelley and Chris Walker to the September Steering Team meeting.

High Head Passage Team/Cougar Downstream Passage Update

Ian and Brad reported on the progress from the Detroit High Head Bypass Team (HHB) and the Cougar Downstream Passage Team (DSP). They shared that the groups are busy and there are going to be multiple reviews coming up. They shared the following schedule:

- An update on the HHB 60% design parameters should be ready for the September or October WFFDWG meeting.
- The Cougar DSP DDR is scheduled for regional review in November;
- The 60% DDR for HHB should be ready for WFFDWG review in December.
- There will be two DDR reviews for Detroit in January.

Ian noted that there may be some flexibility in the Detroit schedule such that they could alleviate the review stack-up in December and January.

Also, the Cougar DDR will not incorporate the HHB; instead, they will be able to plug it into the plans and specs, with the goal of preventing the HHB from interfering with the Cougar DDR schedule. Ian noted that he plans to develop a Gantt chart to illustrate the DSP, HHB and copepod design schedule. This schedule would signal check-in points and pivot points, and could be used to share messages with the Managers. [*Note: updated timeline was provided at the 10/2 Steering Team meeting and is reflected here.*]

- **Action:** Ian will draft a Gantt chart for the Cougar and Detroit DDR process. He will aim to provide it to the Steering Team for review at the September 4th meeting.

Steering Team members expressed concern around the Cougar DSP PDT and whether or not they are including a potential volitional bypass option in their design. Brad and Ian shared that they are considering the best location in the dam to put the port for a downstream passage pipe and that this will be in the 90% design report. The actual passage structure would be included in the HHB design report. Steering Team members asked that Brad confirm this path forward with the PDT.

- **Action:** Brad will connect with the Cougar PDT to verify that the 90% DDR will include issues related to HHB and movement of fish into the design considerations and report back to the Steering team.
- The group also agreed that a check in on HHB should be included on the agenda for the September Managers Forum meeting.

Regional Messaging

The Steering Team discussed important messages that could/should be shared with the region regarding their efforts in the Willamette Basin and implementing the RPA. They noted that there is risk associated with the passage projects and additional funding may be needed down the road. The group echoed managers' sentiments that regional messaging is important to help illustrate the importance and value of these efforts. Collaboration and the community-wide benefits were noted as themes to highlight in messaging, as well as both the environmental and ecosystem benefits of the RPA efforts. The Steering Team developed draft language, which they will continue to refine before it is shared with the Managers at their September 25th meeting. The group brainstormed the following messages:

- The region has been working together to design, operate and maintain a river system for water quality and supply, fish, energy, wildlife, recreation, and communities living nearby.
 - We are working together to restore multiple benefits, while preserving multiple uses.
- We are committed to working together to develop an RPA that provides for dams, fish, and the systems in which they may thrive.
 - We are committed to an RPA that will ensure we can have dams and salmon together; we believe that managing one while recovering another is not mutually exclusive.
- The region has been working together, discussing, and designing AND may have found a need for add-ons that support safe passage for endangered species.
 - These add-ons may require additional funds now and will require a secure budget to maintain them.
- Needs more discussion: What is the worth of a viable Chinook and steelhead population in the Willamette Valley? What is the value of all of the authorized purposes that these projects provide?
 - Note: the group mentioned working with a group like EcoNorthwest to capture the broad economic impacts of a restored salmon run and healthy river system.

September Manager’s Forum Agenda Development

The Steering Team agreed that the Managers Forum meeting should be held at the CRITFC Celilo Room, if possible. They discussed potential meeting agenda topics, including:

- High head bypass status – provide a path forward with key check-ins and timeline.
- Consistent regional messaging – provide suggested messaging developed by the Steering Team and ask managers to discuss/refine (see above).
- Jeopardy presentation and re-initiation status update from NMFS and DOJ

Other Potential Topics:

- North Santiam TDG below Big Cliff – depending on progress and outcomes from the Corps’ internal conversation – TBD at the September 4th Steering Team meeting.

Steering Team members agreed to check in with their Managers regarding additional/potential agenda items prior to the September 4th Steering Team meeting.

→ **Action:** Steering Team members will check with their managers for topics and bring ideas back to the September Steering Team meeting.

Team Updates

Group members provided updates on the WATER Teams:

- The Habitat Tech Team will be reviewing projects in October.
- Ian will provide the RM&E Team with a list of the FY18 funded projects.

With that, Donna thanked the group for a productive session and the meeting was adjourned.

NOTE!!!!!! The next Steering Team meeting will be on September 4th from 12:30-4:30 at the
➡ ODFW Salem office, in the Steelhead Room ◀

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