

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Subject: Final minutes for the 05 December 2017 Willamette Fish Facility Design Group meeting.

The meeting was held in Mount St. Helens Room of the NMFS Offices in Portland, OR. In attendance:

Last name	First Name	Agency	Email
Britton	Jeremy	NWP	Jeremy.P.Britton@usace.army.mil
Budai	Chris	NWP	Christine.M.Budai@usace.army.mil
Burchfield	Stephanie	NMFS	Stephanie.burchfield@noaa.gov
Fielding	Scott	NWP	Scott.D.Fielding@usace.army.mil
Hudson	Mike	USFWS	michael_hudson@fws.gov
Janes	Kelly	NWP-PM-E	Kelly.A.Janes@usace.army.mil
Jundt	Melissa	NMFS	melissa.jundt@noaa.gov
Khan	Fenton	NWP-PM-E	Fenton.o.khan@usace.army.mil
Kirkendall	Keith	NOAA	Keith.Kirkendall@noaa.gov
Kovalchuk	Erin	NWP	Erin.H.Kovalchuk@usace.army.mil
Malone	Kevin	BPA	1976malone@gmail.com
Negherbon	Logan	USACE	Logan.L.Negherbon@usace.army.mil
Pevin	Chuck	BPA	pci@nwi.net
Piaskowski	Rich	NWP	Richard.M.Piaskowski@usace.army.mil
Pierce	Todd	NWP	Todd.M.Pierce@usace.army.mil
Reis	Kelly	ODFW	Kelly.E.Reis@state.or.us
Rerecich	Jon	NWP-PM-E	Jonathon.G.Rerecich@usace.army.mil
Souders	Ryan	NWP	Ryan.D.Souders@usace.army.mil
Taylor	Greg	NWP	Gregory.A.Taylor@usace.army.mil
Walker	Ricardo	NWP	Ricardo.Walker@usace.army.mil
Welton	Brent	NWP	Brent.C.Welton@usace.army.mil

On the phone: Hudson, Malone, Pevin, Pierce and Taylor.

Meeting Purpose:

Finalize previous meeting notes. Provide an update on status of active design projects. Further discuss the CGR 60% DDR draft report, and prep for upcoming public meetings on the Detroit Dam downstream passage project.

All documents can be found at:

http://pweb.crohms.org/tmt/documents/FPOM/2010/Willamette_Coordination/Willamette%20FPT/

1. Final decisions made at his meeting.
 - 1.1. Members need more time to review the November meeting notes. All comments need to be in by 11 December.

2. Fall Creek construction update: Contractor is making good progress. The ladder has been checked for rough spots. The construction should finish on time. **ACTION: Richards will reach out to Brown to schedule a site visit.**
3. Foster – On schedule. The weir should be delivered in the middle of February and be ready to go by March.
4. Cougar Downstream Passage 60% DDR discussion
 - 4.1. Status update – The value engineering study is complete and the team is evaluating the alternatives right now. The team is also working on a scope of work for the physical model. A rough schedule for the model is the contract awarded around the end of February and built in the spring or summer. Britton wanted to know if there were questions on the 60% DDR Report so far. Jundt would like updated CFD modeling of the forebay and Burchfield would like to know more about the evaluation and monitoring plans. Burchfield also asked about the plan for the holding tanks. Negherbon said the plan is to have the six sorting tanks below deck which drain to a hopper. A crane then lifts the hopper to the amphibious vehicle. Hudson requested more information on capability of the facility to pass adult bull trout downstream and Pacific Lamprey passage. Taylor said that there is a disposition table in effect already where the bull trout would be put in the forebay but the facility can have capability for the future. ODFW would like the facility to have the ability to capture and move any fish that could be caught in the system. Budai stressed that this design is for ESA listed species. Some of the options from the VE Study were discussed. An option for reducing the rock excavation was to rest the FSS on a platform. The bend in the design was highlighted as a concern from the fish biologist. Operational changes were suggested such as when flows are over 1000 cfs in winter, release no more than 500 through the TCT to reduce the impact of competing flow but then the dam is not functioning as a flood control structure. A flexible entrance is another adaptive management technique. Malone asked about the entrance to the RO but that is not part of this team's assignment. Jundt has a list of adaptive management techniques that are somewhat informal that she would like to pass on to the team. Burchfield said that one of her written comments is that the adaptive management language is not the same for all items. Adjustments are included in the original budget but modifications are not. **ACTION: A meeting will be set up to discuss the modifications/adjustments.**
 - 4.2. Power Point presentation on the bend design for the primary and secondary screens. [This was not available on the web meeting. The presentation has been posted to the website]. In the transition between the primary and secondary screens, there is a radius bend with an R/D of 5 and added a lead up & follow up distance. The radius criteria came from NMFS for bypass pipes but is actually for debris not fish passage. Negherbon asked the group for concerns about the bend. There are concerns about sticks getting caught in the bend and not being able to get in to remove them. The cross sectional velocity is about 2.5-3.0 fps. The CFD model will become more extensive and a physical model will be made. The velocities around the bend should be fine and it is not expected to create any turbulence. The design is for about 400cfs. The model will pick up all slow spots or turbulence. The issue the team is looking for is fish behavior not hydraulically because they can pick up the hydraulic issues in the modeling. Jundt said she thinks the bend is more likely going to be a maintenance concern with debris rather than a fish behavior issue. Velocities increase in this area. There are not

any other examples of this kind of bend to give evidence either way of a problem or not. If the bend is eliminated then the entrance would stick out further into the forebay. It is a major design feature that would change everything if it were to change. There were some concerns about velocities changing between the screens, especially if the primary screens are run hot.

5. Detroit Dam downstream passage public meeting preparation

5.1. PDT status update – Since the last discussion, the PDT has been analyzing the flow into the tower with a weir type entrance and it is not looking favorable for fish passage inside the tower in the CFD modeling. The size and/or configuration is not working to meet the downstream velocities. The PDT recommendation is stay focused on the SWS design and maximize the performance of the floating screen structure. The 60% review will include the weir box results and it has been deprioritized. A presentation will occur at the January meeting. The 60% review schedule for the tower is around January. **ACTION: Rerecich will confirm the date.** The overall 5 year schedule has not changed.

5.2. Public meeting in Salem - The first of the two meetings is on 14 December. The agenda was presented. The meeting will be a hybrid open house starting at 4 where the boards are set up in a certain path. At 5:00pm and 6:00pm, Ament will provide a 15 minute overview. Questions will be addressed in the EIS not at the meeting. The boards will be semicircle around the room with chairs in the middle.

- 5.2.1. 1. Welcome board
- 5.2.2. 2. Project board to start (PAO person)
- 5.2.3. 3. The NEPA schedule (switch to the end) staffed by Janes.
- 5.2.4. 4. EIS board about what goes into it (stays near the NEPA schedule)
- 5.2.5. 5. Downstream Temperature board staffed with ODFW and NOAA
- 5.2.6. 6. Fish passage lack of downstream passage staffed with ODFW
- 5.2.7. 7. Temperature Control Alternatives – These are preliminary options to help in understanding of the alternatives. Staffed with Rerecich and Taylor.
- 5.2.8. 8. Downstream passage alternatives staffed with Rerecich and Taylor
- 5.2.9. 9. Construction Alternatives – how difficult is the coffer dam.
- 5.2.10. 10. Construction Staging staffed with a cost engineer. There is a possibility of building a temporary road instead of using the recreational area.
- 5.2.11. 11. How to provide comments – due date 8 January.
- 5.2.12. The COE is requesting the presence of law enforcement at the meeting. Name tags were suggested for all attendees. Janes will send out information for anyone attending the meeting.

6. Next Steps

6.1. The next meeting was scheduled for January 2nd but has been moved to January 9th.