

Columbia River Regional Forum
System Configuration Team Meeting
June 15, 2023
Final Official Notes

Representatives of Corps, ODFW, WDFW, BPA, NOAA, and others participated in today's SCT hybrid meeting facilitated by Blane Bellerud, NOAA. Ida Royer, The Corps of Engineers, hosted the WebEx to facilitate better notetaking.

Draft and final SCT notes are available on the COE's TMT website under the [FPOM link](#). For copies of documents discussed, contact Kathy Ceballos at kathy.ceballos@noaa.gov. See the final page of these minutes for the list of attendees of today's meeting.

1. Review and Approve May Notes

- May Minutes approved.

2. Update on Budget and Work Plans

a. Reallocation Plan

- They are actively working on the reallocation plan.
- Royer is hoping that by next month she will have something to share.

Tom Lorz, Umatilla, asked Royer about discussion about whether CRFM could be used at all for McNary Hoists. He asked if that has been discussed at all and if it has whether CRFM would be able make sure that it gets into the FY25 capability budget.

Royer said that it has not been discussed with her. The next budget opportunity would be FY26. She said that she would be starting to put together capabilities this winter. She said that she is unaware of any CRFM items related to MCN hoists.

Lorz said that they had one of the Project Leads or someone from Walla Walla was looking into it and he was wondering if it had gone anywhere. He said that he is surprised that FY25 capabilities are already done and submitted. He said that guesses that O&M will have to shuffle the burden.

Royer said that there is opportunity for FY24 Work Plan. The FY23 is final but FY24 Work Plan is still an option.

3. Discuss FY24 Rankings – *Ida Royer, Corps*

Line 3			Lower Columbia River Juvenile Survival Studies								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
5		M		5		5	5		5		5

- Lorz asked if SCT could have an update, there are a lot of pile dike PIT tag detection structures that are out there. He said if those start working well, that might change their strategy long-term with the PIT trawl.
- Bellerud said that he had took an initial look at those and they are now producing in the thousands of observations. He does not know if they will replace the PIT trawl, but they will make it firmer. He said they are still waiting on them to field the new lightweight one, that could also potentially bump up the number of observations. He said that cable should only take three people so they could potentially even run two boats with the same crew.
- Scott Bettin, BPA, said that NOAA needs to go through their analysis so it will probably be September before there is something.
- Christine Peterson, BPA, said that it would be nice to schedule them to give a presentation here or at FFDRWG or SRWG. She said that the PTAGIS interface makes it really easy to see what detections were so far this year at the different sites and there are some interesting patterns that Gabe Brooks was talking about. He sat on some of the NOAA ground fish crews this week. There are some locations that detect more Chinook and some more Steelhead. Brooks also said that at some locations where they have multiple antennas at the pile dike sites, they were getting a lot of unique detections per antenna. She said that he has a lot of ideas about how to potentially improve next year and potentially make some individual sites detect even more fish. It sounds somewhat promising especially for the traditional trawl versus flexible cable tow it should be interesting to hear from them.
- Bellerud said that if you do not want to wade into PTAGIS, though it is a cave of wonders, DART has a little more accessible PIT tag summary. There is a count and see what is there.
- Royer said that it sounds like there will be a presentation in one of the forums this fall and worst-case AFEP. She said that Jake will coordinate that.

- Trevor Conder, NOAA, said that there is discuss of intent to replace the trawl eventually with the pile dikes and the flexibility array but there is also the intent here to evaluate juvenile survival through the system with this increase in spill. He said initially we should hold off on the idea of replacing and continue to investigate the feasibility of these new methods while adding to our overall detections which help evaluate the spill program, and then after a series of years if we do find out that these are feasible then we can start talking about replace. He does agree that we need additional detections right now and that should be the focus, not just finding a new technology to replace the trawl. He thinks they are both essential for the time being.

Bettin pointed out that this in FY25 work.

Conder said that he is aware, but he is thinking beyond that. He said that they still need more detections in the estuary to drive the estimate up.

Bellerud said that he suspects that it will be an upgrade to the flexible array system rather than replacing the trawl. He said when that happens will get rid of a lot of issues, including the safety issues of dragging a double boat trawl and barely being able to make headway.

- Bettin said that he looks forward to the presentation in the fall.

Conder said that he does thing that it will be this fall, at least, because the do all the summer research work in the Snake Basin. So they will probably not be able to do anything like that until fall/winter period.

Line 4a			Avian Island PIT Detection								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
5		5		5		5	5		4	4	

- Going out and scanning for tags, relatively minimal effort.
- Conder said that initially he had ranked this as a four, but he also feels that PIT detections are important for the survival estimate so he change his thought on that one to a five.

Line 4b			ESI Predation Rate Estimate								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
2		4		5		4	3		3	3	

- Secondary, utilizing those detections to estimate predation rates, more of a research contract.
- Conder said that this one is not as crucial initially. He said that he is trying to put more contrast in his scores so that if there is a funding issue, we know how to prioritize those. He scored this as a three because he said that this can always be done later.

No Line			Inland Avian Predation – Blalock Island Study								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
		2		3		2	4		3	D	

- Royer said that initially she was not planning to fund Blalock for FY24. She circled back with Walla Walla, and it sounds like it may not be completed in FY23. They did provide minimal FY23 work plan funds, \$10k. They are working to synthesize what they have so they are going to continue. BPA is funding some surveys that in FY23. The Corps think that they will retain a little bit of funding in FY24 to coordinate and keep the topic going. It would be a minimal amount of funding \$50k or less.
- Charles Morrill, WA, said that he provided a mandatory because he thought it was a wrap up of the existing work. He said he thought it would be nothing more than follow up and finishing up whatever report writing had to be done. He thought that it would have to be a requirement to complete that.

Royer said that is the plan to finish that up, but FY24 would be continued coordination more than anything.

Morrill said that he thought that this (FY23) was the last year of actually implementing it. He thought that this would be mandatory – most of the time when the Corps does a project there is a follow up, finishing up, and a report write up. That is why he put 'M' there, thinking it would need to be funded to finish it up.

Royer said that Walla Walla staff plan to put together a summary that would go to a group, possibly FPOM or FFDRWG, she is not sure of the current plan. She will speak to Steve Juhnke about that.

- Conder said that the only reason he thinks that this important is that this Blalock operation is hot on some of the current discussions that we are having in the FMCS and whether to continue that it would be important to inform that with some data. He said that it is important to get the information on this that we do have whether we do the research on this particular year or not. He said that he thinks that we need to sum it up and get an answer for it as quickly as we can.
- Lorz said he would adjust his score to a two because this data only tells us were the birds present or not. He said that because we know that they were not he is struggling to figure out why we need to do more work because we already have Grant County doing prediction estimates for us. He is still trying to figure out what this is going to inform us that we did not already know.

Conder asked how we know that they were not present, he asked if there was any data that we can cite right now that they are not present.

Lorz said that Grant County and there is aerial photography from it already.

Conder asked if we know that the Blalock operation was a total success.

Lorz said from a tern standpoint, the terns did not nest there. They have done it two years in a row. When you flood out the islands the terns do not nest there.

Conder said that he thinks that it is important that the Corps finishes their report that we have been funding. He said it should not be left dangling.

Lorz said if there are plenty of funds, fine, but if we get tight then this one can get delayed.

- Morrill said that the flights showed that there were not any terns nesting there. His takeaway was that the raised water levels took care of the tern nesting on the site. He said that a report is part of that process and the follow up is part of the process. He agrees with Lorz if the birds are not there it is effective. He thinks there should be some follow up documentation for wherever it goes to. He said that he thinks that this process would be mandatory.
- Royer clarified the scope of the “Inland Avian Predation” Project.
 - They will be doing some report writing this FY to summarize the actions and the monitoring that the Corps implemented.

- FY24 there may be additional monitoring by BPA and there is more discussion happening regionally.
- Funding in FY24 would be for USACE staff coordination on inland avian topics.
- If they need to update the Blalock report to incorporate information that comes from BPA or other places.

Morrill asked if the operation is scheduled to continue.

Royer said yes.

Morrill dropped his score to a three, because unless the Corps comes back and says no, we still need additional evaluation, and given what he has heard he does not think that is the current perspective. He said why would we put money into another evaluation in FY24. He said in that case it is not mandatory.

- Conder said that Royer mentioned something about coordinating information that BPA is funding. He asked Royer to share more detail about this.

Royer said that there is more information being collected from a BPA contractor. She said that the idea is if the information pertained to this project the Corps would consider that as part of the coordination and discussion about Blalock and whether it was successful. They would fold that into whatever analyses or discussions that are happening.

- Conder said one of the big questions that he has is that they have done this operation, and it is successful but did the birds just jump somewhere else and continue to have a similar effect on the same ESU or a different ESU. This would indicate that it was not a success because you may have less predation at Blalock, but you slowed down the river a little to get there, and you have the same amount of avian predation. He asked if it is being looked at from that perspective. He asked if there was going to be that kind of answer with this enormous amount of funding, \$50k.

Royer said that there are ongoing discussions, and she is not involved in those discussions. She does know that they are happening, and the Corps is a player in those and some of the funding would go to a better understanding of what is happening. She said that she does not know that this funding would go towards any activities.

Morrill said that Conder raised a good point, but if they flooded the island and the birds cannot nest there how would they identify where the birds are going to go. He agrees with his concern but if the birds are not given a chance to land how would they get a sample.

Conder said that he was just wondering if they are landing elsewhere. If there were 100 terns on Blalock Island and zero terns on Crescent and Badger Islands before the operation, and after the operation there are now 100 terns on Crescent and Badger Islands. It would give an indication that the birds jumped over.

Morrill asked if there was some flight survey data from the last three years to help answer that question.

Conder said that was what he was wondering, it is the kind of stuff that he thinks should be pulled in with this money.

- Lorz said that he would give a better score if it could get better information about what this is, but if it is to continue doing aerial surveys confirming terns are not there, he does not think it is worth it. He said that if it is part of a more holistic program then that is something that he can get behind.

Morrill said that he agrees.

Royer said that she does not think that the idea that the Corps is going to start a new program of work. She said that the idea is that they would continue to participate in the discussion about what is happening in that area with birds as it pertains to Blalock.

Conder asked what the BPA thing they are talking about then.

Royer said BPA funded some flights, as Morrill alluded to, some basic monitoring of what is where.

Conder said he thought she said that BPA was doing some additional evaluations and that the Corps might roll that in if it makes sense.

Bettin said that it is likely something that Leah Sullivan would know about, so BPA will have to defer. BPA gave it a 'D' as their score.

- Conder gave a comment saying that they think that we are ready to take the next step.

Morrill said that if they know what kept the birds off Blalock, but is there any information, not just from the Corps but also from the overflights being done, to suggest if there was an increase in either of the other two islands.

Chris Magel, NOAA, said that he agrees. He said that the aerial photos do not give a definitive answer to that. He asked if there has been any thought of tagging birds and getting a more focused look at birds that way, to know for sure that birds are moving from one place to another.

Morrill dropped his score to a two, until he hears more about the background, and what we can do to answer the question of where the birds are going and if there is an impact to other areas. He thinks that there needs to be a lot more discussion.

- Royer said that SCT will revisit this next month. The Corps ranked it with a three.
- Bellerud said that it is possible to radio tag birds, other people do it all the time.

Morrill said that you would have to have tagged birds that have nested on Blalock. If they cannot access that, how are you going to assess whether they moved to another location.

Line 7			CRS RM&E Flex Spill Evaluation								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
3		5*		3		3	5		5	5	

- Morrill gave the score of five with conditions because he is not sure where it is going. The system monitoring is an extremely important element. The next thing that we get back in the SWRG process is supposed to be the opinions from the Corps, NOAA, and the Action Agencies, and that will define what they do with this or what action they propose to take on this. Morrill said that he has a lot of concerns about the who, what, when, where the proposal would entertain. He said that he is not totally comfortable with where this is going to wind up. He does not think that the Corps is the one to implement a lot of the work that we are talking about, but he does not know what the outcome is going at point in time with their return from all the comments that were submitted by all his colleagues. That is why he put it as conditional.
- Conder said NOAA gave it a five, he agrees that there are unresolved issues that need to be settled. In terms of evaluating this spill program that is still of the utmost importance right now.

Line 8a			Estuary Habitat Studies – Data Transparency and Web Interface								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
1		2		4		3	3		3	3	

Line 8b			Estuary Habitat Studies – Estuary Habitat Uncertainties								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
1		4		4		2	4		3	3	

- Royer said that Jonathan Ebel for IDFG ranked the sheet for only one estuary so we will need to revisit with him to see if he wants to split it out.
- Conder said that it is important but in term of priorities it is not as pressing as some of the other stuff. He said that NOAA scored it as a two and a three. He said that he is still burnt on the web interface thing because we have funded that for three years and NOAA is constantly opposed and have had comments on that. CRFM has funded millions of dollars on and got completely burned on it and nothing happened, nothing was gained, and no information was shared with the ONCOR interface.
- Magel said that he was chatting with some of those in the Corps in the estuary area and they were not happy about the web interface either. Magel said he knows that we are burnt but he thinks that it might be worth bumping up the score. He said that he knows that they are working a different interface than Encore or trying to find an alternative to better work with that data than the uncertainties piece. From Magel's perspective, now that he is plugged into the estuary, he said that they might consider bumping each of the scores up one. He can agree that the web interface is not the best, but the uncertainties would be worth pursuing. They are in the middle of working through their synthesis memo and trying to get some of their updates pushed through.

Conder said that would be fine. He said that it something that he would expect from someone working in the estuary. He is said to bump them up one, three and four.

Magel said that he understands what Conder is saying about the web interface. He said maybe this is the year that they put their foot down and try to get more of a concrete answer about it. Being new, Magel has not had a lot of the back story. Knowing that there have been multiple years of funding that they have not gotten a product that were happy with. Magel said that is important to know.

Royer said that we can revisit this next month if NOAA wants to confer behind the scenes and come up with a new score.

- Morrill said that the web interface has not been successful and discussions around that will try to pull it together. He would give that a two at this time. There is value to it, but they have not proven that they can do it effectively. The estuary work he would give the lower part of four.

Line 9			Bonneville Powerhouse 2 Fish Guidance Efficiency								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
4		M		4		3	M		M	M	

Line 10			BON Powerhouse 2 Post-Construction Evaluation								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
4		5				4	5		5	5	

Line 11			Bonneville PIT Detection								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
3		5*		5		3*	3		3	4	

- Morrill said that Washington put a condition for that score because he was not sure what the level of support for using the one gate for prototype to learn from and potentially use in other places. He understands that the Corps is not interested, nor is the technology feasible of total detection off the exit to the sluiceway, according to Gabe at the last meeting. Morrill would like to know more clarification on where we think we are going with that and what the support for among other for this is. He thinks there is pretty strong support for using it as a prototype but beyond that he is not sure.
- Conder gave the score of a three. He agrees that improved PIT-detection and that the ITS should be wired are important. He does not feel that it is more important than detection at McNary or that there should be a lot of resources spent of one single auto-gate. Conder does want PIT-detection at Bonneville, but he thinks that there are other priorities right now.

Line 12			BON Serpentine Weir Modifications								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
4		1		4		5	1		5	5	

- Lorz asked if it is completely CRFM or is Lamprey dollars too.

Royer said that it would be completely CRFM.

Lorz said that he would be safe and not put a score. He said that Lamprey would give a score of five, but he has not heard from them. He said to put Umatilla down for five and he will confirm with them.

- Morrill said that it was part of a commitment to the Tribes to get that done so he understands that it would not entail CRFM funding. His view is that was a requirement and a commitment from the Corps and the Action Agencies to the Tribes with the understanding that it would not impact adult PIT-detection or adult passage.

Royer said that the project as we are scoring would be out of the “salmon pot” because the intention was that it would be a cost-share between Lamprey and Salmon because it is in our proposed action for the Columbia River EIS. CRFM has not funded the 50/50 split for the design efforts so we are planning to fund the construction out the salmon dollars.

Morrill said that he would want to stew on this because he thought that the primary purpose of the whole project was to improve lamprey passage and not impact adult

salmon passage and detection. He would like to discuss more with his colleagues before he settles on a score.

- Conder said that this is a big issue. They were told that the project was going to be split this whole time. The benefits to the salmonids are minimal at best, potentially detrimental. He said that it is an unknown whether there will be a benefit and it could potentially take them backwards. There is a risk for the salmonids, it hopefully will not go that way but there is a risk. Just the construction issue alone is a risk, there could be a delay to Washington shore being up and running because of this. That itself is a risk. Conder said that something could go wrong, and Washington shore could completely shut down for an entire year. It is a risk, one that is likely not to happen but could. The benefits that CRFM would get out of this are minimal. The travel time for salmonids is already relatively quick through that system, the fish do not seem to have a problem. There are not piles of salmon and steelhead loaded up beneath that section, they get right through it. Conder said that this is a lamprey thing, Lamprey should fund it – at least a significant portion of it. He said that it does not pass the straight face test at all, and we are having to sacrifice other mitigation activities to allow for this massive sum of money. It is great for Lamprey, but they should be funding a significant portion of this. NOAA dropped their score to a one until they hear that Lamprey will be funding a portion of this.

Royer said that they have been funding it completely up until this point.

Conder said right, the evaluation but not the construction.

Royer said the design efforts, we have been designing this for a number of years and that has not been free.

Conder asked if no Salmon dollars went into the design effort.

Royer said no. \$200 k went in from the FY23 workplan out of the Salmon budget and that was the first time that we have received funding for. Everything else has been funded by Lamprey.

Conder said as it should be and there should be a portion of that Lamprey funding going to construction as well. This is a huge benefit for lamprey.

Royer said that this is the same funding scheme ratio that we did for John Day when we redid those ladders. She said that we are not reinventing the wheel.

Conder said that except he was told that it was going to be 50/50 on the construction. Now he is being told it is 100/0.

Royer said no because construction includes the design efforts. To construct something, you have to design it, so when we say 50/50 it is the whole kit and caboodle.

Conder asked if the design efforts were \$10 M.

Royer said no, it was a few million. It is not exactly 50/50 but it is not exactly 100/0 either.

Conder said that it is quite a bit short of 50/50.

Royer said that she will not be able to say how much because they will not know how much the construction will cost until we bid it.

Conder asked what went into the decision to make the construction 100% Salmon dollars. He asked why Lamprey made that change. He asked if they ran out of money for Lamprey and want to do something else. He asked who made that decision.

Royer said that we have the PBud amount of \$66.67 M and with that funding amount we can afford to fund it at 100%.

Conder said that they get off when we have items in the budget that are not getting funded.

Royer said in the PBud amount yes, but we are planning to reallocate assuming the administration buys off on that; reallocate to all the projects that are listed. She said that this project is a priority for the administration.

- Morrill said that if the administration is that concerned about lamprey, they can give the lamprey more money. After hearing the discussion, he said that Washington will also rank this as a one. He does not think that those funds should be coming out of the Salmon funds. This was brought up as Lamprey-funded project for a lamprey passage. He said that the risks that Conder identified are real. That money that would come out of the Salmon funds could go toward needed improvements for fish; adult salmon, smelt salmon at McNary and other spots. Washington will go with NOAA on this. This is mandatory, it is an obligation from the Corps and BPA to the tribes but it should not come out of the Salmon funds.

Line 13			The Dalles East Fish Ladder Emergency Auxiliary Water Supply							
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA

4		4		4		4*	4		5	5
---	--	---	--	---	--	----	---	--	---	---

Line 14			JDA Ladder Cooling							
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA
4		3		5		4	4		4	3

Line 15			John Day Mitigation							
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA
D		M		5		4	3		4	4

- Idaho deferred to downriver interests.

Line 16			MCN Adult Ladder (South) Cooling Structure							
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA
4		3		5		5	4		4	3

Line 17			MCN Avian Deterrence							
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA
4		4		5		5	4		4	4

- Lorz said that he was disappointed that NOAA ranked this as a four.

Conder said that there are more important things than this. He said that it is not a large scale improvement, but a score of four is still pretty high.

Lorz said that they will talk.

Line 18			MCN PIT Detection Improvements								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
5		5				5	5		3	4	

- Conder said that they are five.
- Royer said that Corps ranked it a three.

Conder asked if the rank of three was coming from the policy level. He said that he thinks their Policy groups need to talk if that is where it is coming from.

Royer said that she is trying to remember the discussion on that and because she cannot she is hesitant to explain. She will revisit with the and try to remember their rationale or reasoning that went into that.

Morrill said that he would appreciate that because it is counter intuitive when we are pushing hard to try to put together a funding proposal to evaluate the effectiveness of those spills. He said that it does not make sense to him.

Conder agreed and added that SWRG proposal is a key region and is essential to have that collection site for Upper-Columbia and Mid-Columbia fish.

Morrill said that it is also a critical look at the major reach section from Lower Granite to McNary and McNary to Bonneville for all the stocks, both Upper Columbia and Snake River stocks.

Royer said that she will report back next month.

Line 19			Ice Harbor Turbine Passage Survival Program								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
1		M		5			M		M	M	

- Royer said that this should be in closeout next FY. It is listed as mandatory; she does not think that they will be funding but she said that we want to list it in case it needs minimum funds to close out.
- Conder said that they are okay with a mandatory. There has been so much research that has gone into that, and they want to know if that new runner design is a winner, like it looks like it will be from all the flow going through it. Bead Track Analysis and Sensor Fish Analysis all indicate that it is working as expected but NOAA wants to continue to have a more thorough evaluation because as the units are redesigned, we want to know if that is the right path or not for turbine survival. Conder said that it could be, so they find it important. So, it is a mandatory or a five.
- Royer pointed out that Idaho noted that “using the 2008 scoring criteria, this project has a relatively low expected survival improvement (most fish go through the spillways), therefore receives low priority.”

Line 20			LMN Adult Ladder (South) Cooling Structure								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
5		3		5		4	4		4	3	

Line 21			Little Goose Adult Ladder Temperature Mitigation - Fish Egress Project								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
4		4		5		4	4		3	3	

- Royer said that Corps gave this a three because they have not seen any negative impacts to fish.

Line 22			Lower Granite Juvenile Bypass Facility - Phase 1a (Gatewell to Separator), Phase 1b (Outfall)								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
5		M		5			M		M	M	

Line 23			Lower Granite Turn Pool Gate								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	
3		4		5		4*	5		4	4	

- Conder said that it is in the BiOp and so gave a score of five.

			IHR Adult Ladder (North) Cooling Structure								
IDFG	ODFW	WDFW	Nez Perce	Yakama Nation	Warm Springs	Umatilla	NOAA	USFWS	CORPS	BPA	

4						5	4		3	2
---	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	---	---

- Royer said that the Corps gave this a three for priorities in FY24.
- Bettin said that BPA gave a score of two in FY24. He said that he would rather figure out the upstream first.
- Conder asked if the Corps will be doing a packet for the other three projects: John Day, McNary, and Lower Monumental. He asked if they would be grouped into a single document or if they would have an individual document for each one.

Royer said that they would be separate.

Conder said that he was wondering if it would be more efficient to have all three of them together, and then even include Ice Harbor.

Royer said in talking to Walla Walla District, McNary will be different because of the way the forebay is structured so that design effort might be a little more involved. John Day is Portland District; it is possible to form a cross-district team but for right now the plan is to keep them separate. There will be communication across the teams and utilization of information across districts. They will try to work that within the Corps. There can be efficiencies there and by the time they get to Ice Harbor she thinks that will go quick.

Conder said that Ice Harbor is similar to McNary in that there is not as much cool water available but there is a super-hot lens on top that they are trying to prevent from holding fish from holding fish up. He does see it as crucial as the rest of them to get fish in the Snake migrating. He said that he would prefer to see it done at the same time for that amount of money. He said that it goes back to the serpentine section at Bonneville, it is sucking money and that money could be going to something that is absolutely crucial for salmon passage during warm temperatures getting fish through these projects. When you have 74° in the fish ladder, and you could have 70° and pass fish. Instead, you have 74° because of that surface lens coming through, this would prevent that from happening during those July periods and that is a real fish benefit. That is avoiding extinction and trending toward recovery. The serpentine section is not. Conder said that SCT should be focusing on this, not delaying it for another couple of years when it is just as efficient to get it in there.

Royer said that the only other issue is that this is a Walla Walla project and there are resourcing constraints. She said that they have a lot of work within the Corps right now and not enough people to do it. She said that she can talk and see if there is enough

similarity to try and see what options exist. She is not sure how feasible it will be, but she will ask the question.

Conder said that you would think that combine all those \$750k, get all four projects done in the same document all the initial sections, similar language and the specifics of each project broken out in the more detailed sections, you should be able to get it done for the same amount of money. He added one more thought, that he would go into more at FFDRWG, he said that he wanted to put out there that as much as we like to say that Lowery Shower worked there are better options with diffusing that water in those exit sections, they have seen some problems. He said that he hopes that these new designs have a diffuser that distributes that water rather than a shower.

Royer said that the intent is to look at more comprehensive suite of options. She said that she agrees that we should continue this discussion in FFDRWG.

- Royer will try to talk internally about Inland Avian Predation.

Avian is not something that Royer is not involved in so she will loop back with the team that are more experts and try to define the scope a little bit. SCT will discuss this next month and we can revisit scores as needed.

- Royer will also discuss about McNary PIT and loop back next month.

Royer reminded everyone that this is a living document and we will update scores as we go.

- Royer will hopefully be able to fill out the FY24 allocations field by next month.

Conder added that when Royer presents the score of one on the Serpentine section and people ask why. He said it is not that NOAA is opposed to constructing and supporting that for Lamprey and the small benefits that can incur to salmonids. It is that it is the concept that the construction is solely funded from Salmon dollars. That is the part that NOAA is rejecting. They are mid-line on the project, and will support it, but the idea that all \$10M of the construction is coming from Salmonids is what they are pushing back on. He asked that Royer pass that on. Conder said that he will do the same.

Royer said that she made note of that in the spreadsheet as well.

Pile Dike Pit Tag detections from PTAGIS as of 6/15/2023																
Species Name	Site Code	Value	Count	Species Name	Site Code	Value	Count	Species Name	Site Code	Count	Species Name	Site Code	Count			
Chinook	PD5	2,446	50.8%	Chinook	PD6		3,662	69.2%	Chinook	PD7	215	71.7%	Chinook	PD8	357	78.8%
Coho	PD5	480	10.0%	Coho	PD6		205	3.9%	Coho	PD7	32	10.7%	Coho	PD8	18	4.0%
Sockeye	PD5	95	2.0%	Sockeye	PD6		89	1.7%	Sockeye	PD7	2	0.7%	Sockeye	PD8	2	0.4%
Steelhead	PD5	1,798	37.3%	Steelhead	PD6		1,339	25.3%	Steelhead	PD7	51	17.0%	Steelhead	PD8	76	16.8%
total		4,819		total			5,295		total		300		total		453	
	PD5	4,819														
	PD6	5,295														
	PD7	300														
	PD8	453														
	Pile Dike Total	10,867														
	Trawl	9,876														

Screenshot 1: Bellerud's share of PTAGIS

Bellerud shared some good news. He said that they have more pile dike detections than trawl detections.

The pile dike total is now 10,867.

The trawl is 9,876.

This did not split adults and juveniles or anything else. Bellerud also added that there is always a potential for some error but this a good rough look at it. He said that, like Peterson said, there does look like a little bit of a trend toward more chinook and fewer steelhead as a proportion than the trawl. He said that that will take more data and looking at it to see.

PD5 and PD6 both have around 5,000 counted.

He considers this good news, and it is always fun when another site comes online.

Morrill said that he had been talking with Gabe earlier and he has a lot of optimism that could be good benefits like that. Morrill said that it is great that the data suggests that it is accurate.

Bellerud said that they are batting 500 for high/low but they are deliberately orienting the antennas in certain ways, so he does not think that it is entirely random.

Morrill said that they did reorientate the antenna to improve performance.

4. Ongoing Topics

- PTAGIS
- avian wires at McNary
- improved pit tag detection (especially below BON, BON and MCN)

- Flex Spill Evaluation (no funding has been identified).
- PIT trawl - Are operations funded?

Next meeting: July 20, 2023 (Hybrid)

NOAA offices at 1201 NE Lloyd in Portland (11th floor)

Today's Attendees:

Name	Affiliation
Christine Peterson	<i>BPA</i>
Scott Bettin	<i>BPA</i>
Ida Royer	<i>Corps</i>
Matthew Eppard	<i>Corps</i>
Blane Bellerud	<i>NOAA</i>
Chris Magel	<i>NOAA</i>
Dana Bethea	<i>NOAA</i>
Kelsey Swieca	<i>NOAA</i>
Trevor Conder	<i>NOAA</i>
Kate Self	<i>NW Council</i>
Tom Lorz	<i>Umatilla/CRITFC</i>
Charles Morrill	<i>WDFW</i>

Minutes by Andrea Ausmus, CorSource Technology Group LLC, Contractor for Bonneville, AMausmus@bpa.gov (971-373-1288). Please send any requested edits to Kathy Ceballos, NOAA, kathy.ceballos@noaa.gov.