CENWP-OD 4 April 2017

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Subject: Draft minutes for the 04 April 2017 Willamette Fish Facility Design Group meeting.

The meeting was held in the St. Helen’s Conference Room at the NOAA offices in Portland, Oregon. In attendance:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Last name** | **First Name** | **Agency** | **Email** |
| Askelson | Sean | NWP | [Sean.K.Askelson@usace.army.mil](mailto:Sean.K.Askelson@usace.army.mil) |
| Burchfield | Stephanie | NMFS | [Stephanie.burchfield@noaa.gov](mailto:Stephanie.burchfield@noaa.gov) |
| Dishman | Diana | NMFS |  |
| Fielding | Scott | NWP | [Scott.D.Fielding@usace.army.mil](mailto:Scott.D.Fielding@usace.army.mil) |
| Graham-Hudson | Bernadette | ODFW | [Bernadette.n.graham-hudson@state.or.us](mailto:Bernadette.n.graham-hudson@state.or.us) |
| Hall | Elizabeth | NWP | [Elizabeth.M.Hall@usace.army.mil](mailto:Elizabeth.M.Hall@usace.army.mil) |
| Janes | Kelly | USACE | [Kelly.A.Janes@usace.army.mil](mailto:Kelly.A.Janes@usace.army.mil) |
| Khan | Fenton | NWP-PM-E | [Fenton.o.khan@usace.army.mil](mailto:Fenton.o.khan@usace.army.mil) |
| Kirkendall | Keith | NOAA |  |
| Kovalchuk | Erin | NWP | [Erin.H.Kovalchuk@usace.army.mil](mailto:erin.h.kovalchuk@usace.army.mil) |
| Negherbon | Logan | USACE | [Logan.L.Negherbon@usace.army.mil](mailto:Logan.L.Negherbon@usace.army.mil) |
| Piaskowski | Rich | NWP | [Richard.M.Piaskowski@usace.army.mil](mailto:Richard.M.Piaskowski@usace.army.mil) |
| Pierce | Todd | USACE | [Todd.M.Pierce@usace.army.mil](mailto:Todd.M.Pierce@usace.army.mil) |
| Richards | Natalie | NWP | [Natalie.A.Richards@usace.army.mil](mailto:Natalie.A.Richards@usace.army.mil) |
| Schwabe | Lawrence | Grand Ronde Tribe | [Lawrence.Schwabe@grandronde.org](mailto:Lawrence.Schwabe@grandronde.org) |
| Spear | Dan | BPA | [djspear@bpa.gov](mailto:djspear@bpa.gov) |
| Tarbox | Erica | NWP | [Erica.M.Tarbox@usace.army.mil](mailto:Erica.M.Tarbox@usace.army.mil) |
| Walker | Ricardo | NWP | [Ricardo.Walker@usace.army.mil](mailto:Ricardo.Walker@usace.army.mil) |

On the phone: Askelson, Negherbon, Pierce, Richards, Schwabe and Tarbox.

All documents may be found at http://www.nwd-wc.usace.army.mil/tmt/documents/FPOM/2010/Willamette\_Coordination.

**Meeting Purpose:**

Review status of projects, discuss downstream fish passage performance criteria and adaptive management plan for Cougar Dam, plan Cougar DS passage workshop.

**Agenda:**

1. Review of the February 14th and March 7th meeting notes
   1. February 14th – The design team does recognize the concerns of NMFS of the velocities downstream of the weir and will continue to work on this. The COE doesn’t have the same understanding as NOAA about the weir box. The weir box will be in the EDR for Detroit. The true issue is making sure that criteria is achieved. The COE wants to wait for the Cougar project to be further along to decide criteria for Detroit. In the meantime, Detroit Phase 1 continues and NMFS doesn’t want the project to be so far along that it is too late to change course. A meeting will be scheduled for this issue.
   2. March 7th – NMFS needs one more week for commenting on the notes.
2. Review current project status
   1. General project schedule table – The Detroit 90% EDR has been sent out for review and comments are requested by the end of April. The appendix came out in a separate email link. The review of the 30% DDR of the Detroit temperature tower is scheduled for May. The next review for Cougar (30% DDR) will be this summer (4 July to 3 August) and a workshop will be scheduled beforehand. The contract for the Foster Fish Weir will be awarded this fall with the weir scheduled to be in place by spring. Fall Creek adult facility is under construction.
3. Cougar Downstream Passage DDR
   1. Review performance criteria and adaptive management plan for Cougar Dam [Handout] – The Performance Criteria for Cougar Dam Floating Screen Structure (FSS) was developed by COE, BPA and NMFS and distributed to FFDG. The documents defines the metrics and the criteria that COE will design towards. Specifically, the criteria are 95% fish collection efficiency and 98% survival for all life stages. The document explains the process that the COE will use to measure the rate of success for achieving the performance criteria and clarifies the adaptive management application. Table 1 outlined the steps that the COE will take if the collection efficiency of 95% is not met with the original design. NMFS pointed out that if a major modification is not in the original design, the only way it will be added is if the collection is less than 70%. After construction, negotiations can and will be made for minor changes. Any risks/concerns that are essential to meet criteria need to be brought up during the design phase. Kirkendall said that any adjustment for the FCE< 70% is not in the original budget and it is unknown if the COE will come up with the additional money; that is why the original design is so important. Participation from the group leading up to the 90% DDR is vital because the 90% will contain all the elements to be constructed. The 30% & 60% DDR and EDR is the time to discuss risks and important elements. NMFS main concern is with the collection efficiency and Piaskowski said that PDT considers it the main concern as well. An important aspect of the project is the new facility start up often referred to as a “shake down period” in order to adjust hydraulics or operational concerns. This shake down period will be in the first spring and testing will start in the fall. Graham-Hudson asked if the criteria of injury and mortality rates are added together for Table 2 but they are not; it is either/or. Based on the description of the post evaluation monitoring and testing, a facility may be necessary. The testing is described but the facility or way to collect the fish is not. It has yet to be determined what type of facility is needed to complete the testing. The document discusses both tagged fish and monitoring. This is an important aspect for the PDT to design. Collection for the testing will have to be designed into the final plan. A mobile facility is one solution. Each alternative in the EDR will address how the monitoring will occur. If monitoring is ongoing through the life of the facility then it should be a major design concern. Periodic testing is critical to the facility.
   2. Discuss objectives and date for a Cougar DSP Workshop – There was a presentation from PDT at the last meeting with the preliminary concepts. By June, the team will have developed some options to be discussed at a workshop. The workshop should include biological criteria, hydraulic criteria, operations, intake elevations, reservoir elevations and fish conveyance (trap and haul vs. volitional passage). Before the workshop, the PDT will pass out the agenda and any additional information for people to review. The CFD modeling should be completed by June. PDT notes were requested by NMFS but no answer has been given yet. The notes taken at the workshop will be incorporated into the 60% DDR. There will be a May meeting for the Detroit 30% DDR tower and possibly another workshop will be set up before the 60%. The Cougar workshop is scheduled for June 6th at the USACE and the Detroit 30%DDR Temperature Control Tower is May 2nd at ODFW Salem office.
4. Next Steps
   1. Upcoming reviews