

**Willamette Action Team for Ecosystem Restoration (WATER)  
Research, Monitoring and Evaluation (RM&E)**

July 27, 2017  
Conference Call

[http://www.nwdwc.usace.army.mil/tmt/documents/FPOM/2010/Willamette\\_Coordination/Willamette%20RME/RME.html](http://www.nwdwc.usace.army.mil/tmt/documents/FPOM/2010/Willamette_Coordination/Willamette%20RME/RME.html)

**FINAL Facilitator's Summary**

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>BY WHOM?</b>	<b>BY WHEN?</b>
Review edits to 6/22/2017 Meeting Summary	All	ASAP
Share concept paper with the team.	Fenton	August 3, 2017
Send a statement to Cameron Sharpe and Jim Meyer with the Steering Team's request and copy the RM&E team.	Rich	August 4, 2017

**Participants on the phone:** Leslie Bach (NPCC), Stephanie Burchfield (NMFS), Diana Dishman (NMFS), Mike Hudson (USFWS), Tom Friesen (ODFW), Fenton Khan (USACE), Christine Peterson (BPA), Rich Piaskowski (USACE);

**Facilitation Team:** Emily Stranz and Nancy Pionk, DS Consulting

**Welcome and Approval of Meeting Summary**

Emily Stranz, DS Consulting Facilitator, welcomed the group. The group discussed edits to the 6/22/2017 meeting summary. Stephanie indicated that she had sent the group proposed edits earlier this morning. The group agreed to review Stephanie's proposed edits and email Emily with any concerns. The group will approve the final summary by email.

→ **Action:** The RM&E team, will review the suggested edits to the 6/22/2017 meeting summary and provide comments to Emily by email by COB Friday, July 28th.

**Sub-Basin RM&E Plan Development**

Emily reported that, at their last meeting, the Steering Team discussed which sub-basin should be the next priority for RM&E Plan development. The Steering Team agreed with consensus that the next sub-basin plan developed should be for the McKenzie. However, they wanted input from the RM&E team regarding why or why not the McKenzie should be next before making the final decision. The final decision will be made at the joint Steering Team/RM&E meeting on July 28, 2017.

The agencies discussed their perspective regarding priorities for sub-basin RM&E plan development:

- **NMFS:** NMFS did not have a concern with the McKenzie plan being developed next; their preference, however, would be to develop the North Santiam, South Santiam and McKenzie plans concurrently. Stephanie noted that design decisions must be made in the North Santiam sub-basin in the near future and they are interested in staying on schedule with those decisions. Additionally, it was also important to NMFS that RM&E be conducted both before and after construction.

- Corps: The Corps indicated that it was important to consider near-term questions and actions that need to be addressed. Rich suggested prioritizing the South Santiam basin, then North Santiam, followed by the McKenzie, in part because the planning schedule indicates that more information is needed regarding North Santiam and South Santiam. Rich noted that at this point, there are no design-related questions related to the McKenzie. Additionally, at South Santiam, there is a need to evaluate the juvenile weir in 2018, and research needed regarding the adult passage facility, factors relating to Steelhead decline, and pre-spawn mortality. For the North Santiam, the design process for the juvenile passage is currently active. Research is also needed regarding managing pHOS and pNOB, factors relating to Steelhead decline and TDG.
- ODFW: ODFW's preference is to develop RM&E plans for McKenzie and North Santiam and South Santiam concurrently. If a choice was required, Tom noted that the McKenzie would be acceptable as the first priority, South Santiam second, and North Santiam third.
- USFWS: USFWS supported staggering development of the plans at the three sub-basins or developing them concurrently if plan development could occur in a timely manner. Mike noted that there will need to be an RM&E plan for McKenzie by the time there is passage at Cougar. He stressed that the time it takes to complete the plans is an important consideration: the Middle Fork RM&E plan has taken over a year to complete. Given this timeline, this would put completion of the McKenzie plan out to Summer, 2019. As downstream passage at Cougar is expected in 2021 or 2022, it will be important to have an evaluation plan in place by 2020.
- NPCC: NPCC did not feel strongly on which sub-basin should be a priority for plan development; Leslie indicated that she would support what the group chooses.
- BPA: BPA indicated that it could support McKenzie on a tentative basis; however, there may be a need to consult with Dan Spear when he returns from leave.

In summary, there was not one sub-basin that all team members agreed should be the next priority for development; however, all agreed that South Santiam would be a logical option. There was also interest in developing more than one plan at a time or staggering development to get all three plans developed sooner than later.

It was suggested that team members review the priority decision with their respective Steering Team managers in preparation for further discussion at the joint meeting tomorrow. The group agreed that after the choice for plan development is made, Rich will create a plan outline for the RM&E team to consider and provide input.

- **Action:** Mike will report out to the Steering Team that the RM&E Team did not feel that one sub-basin in particular should be the top choice; however, the team agreed that the South Santiam is a logical next step.
- **Action:** Pending the Steering Team's decision, Rich will create an outline of the next sub-basin(s) plans for the RM&E team to review and provide input on.

### **Steering Team Request for Concept Development**

Emily reported that the Steering Team requested that the RM&E Team develop a study concept to look at redd depth and gas levels below Big Cliff Dam. They would like this concept to be designed for FY18 before the South Santiam study is complete. Fenton offered to update a concept that was previously developed for below Detroit Dam; he will share a draft with the team next week and revise the concept with input from the RM&E team. The group agreed that this concept should be put on the list of concepts

being discussed at the joint meeting tomorrow; however, it should not be ranked until the concept is developed.

→ **Action:** Fenton will draft the concept and share it with the RM&E team the week of July 31st.

### **Steering Team Request for Information regarding habitat below Big Cliff**

Emily reported that the Steering Team requested that the RM&E Team (and others in the region) provide professional opinions on the following question: Given the information that we have, how good is the habitat below Big Cliff?

Mike noted that the Steering Team had originally considered conducting a habitat study. However, it was noted that there are experts who have knowledge of the quality of the habitat who can provide information on existing data and conditions.

RM&E team members identified several different aspects of the habitat that could be considered: spawning habitat, modeled spawning, juvenile habitat and physical habitat such as pools and riffles. Mike noted that the Steering Team's focus was on TDG as it relates to spawning habitat, redds, and rearing habitat. He indicated that the Steering Team wants to better understand the value of this habitat. The information provided by local experts would clarify whether there is enough information to assess the value of the habitat, or what additional information is needed to make a decision regarding TDG.

The group recommended that Cameron Sharpe (ODFW) and Jim Meyers (NMFS) could provide information from their research on spawning habitat. Cameron has data on Chinook redds in the reach and Jim has data on redds, and spawning and rearing capacity.

The group agreed that the team will clarify what information the Steering Team needs and how they would like it presented (short written summary, presentation?) at the joint meeting tomorrow.

→ **Action:** Pending input from the Steering Team, Rich will send a statement to Cameron and Jim with the Steering Team's request and copy the RM&E team.

### **Process Discussion Regarding Ranking of FY18 Concepts at Joint Meeting**

The group discussed a process question by NMFS regarding the ranking of concepts that will occur at the joint meeting. In reviewing concept papers, NMFS has identified certain objectives that they would advocate strongly moving forward on and others that they would not advocate moving forward on. They questioned whether the Steering Team should be asked to rate the concepts by objective? It was noted that while it was important for the Steering Team to be aware that these conflicts exist, it was unlikely that the Steering Team will have time to consider detailed objectives at the joint meeting. It was suggested that the RM&E team get clarity from the Steering Team on their information needs. This may give the RM&E team an understanding regarding which objectives address those needs and the team can tailor the objectives to meet the information needs. It was also suggested that the group identify concepts where there are no disagreements regarding objectives and that those concepts be ranked first. If there is additional time, the two teams may be able to discuss the objectives in greater detail.

Emily thanked the group for their discussion and reminded them that they will be meeting again tomorrow with the Steering Team from 9:00-3:00 at the CRITFC Office.

**The next RM&E team meeting is a joint meeting with the Steering Team on July 28, 2017**

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

