

System Configuration Team (SCT)
Reasonable & Prudent Measure #26
Meeting Notes
January 15, 1997

Greetings and Introductions.

The January meeting of the System Configuration Team, held at the National Marine Fisheries Service's offices in Portland, Oregon, was co-chaired by Jim Ruff of the Northwest Power Planning Council staff and Bill Hevlin of NMFS. The agenda for the January 15 meeting and a list of attendees is attached as Enclosures A and B. The following is a summary (not a verbatim transcript) of items discussed at the meeting, together with actions taken on those items. Please note that some enclosures referenced may be too lengthy to routinely include with the meeting notes; copies of all enclosures referred to in the minutes are available upon request from Kathy Mott of NMFS at 503/230-5420.

I. Advanced Turbine Passage Program -- Overview of Study Plan.

The purpose of this presentation is to give you an overview of a project that has been on your spreadsheets for some time now, said John Ferguson of COE. He distributed Enclosure C, titled "Turbine Fish Passage Survival Program FY'97-'99," containing information on the background, purpose, work products, proposed physical and operational modifications, related activities, program benefits, schedule and cost for this effort (see Enc. C for details).

In response to a question, Ferguson said the Corps' Advanced Turbine Passage Program is being closely coordinated with other, related efforts being conducted in the basin, in an effort to avoid duplication of effort. He added that the Corps' PSP (plan of study) for this project will be mailed out next week. What about comments? asked Hevlin. Whatever people have, Ferguson replied. We're proceeding with this; the PSP is obviously being developed, and we'd like to get some feedback from the region. I haven't heard any serious objections put forward today; if none are received during the comment period, the program has been through enough internal Corps review that we're ready to go forward with it. Ferguson said the Corps would be willing to set

up a meeting in early March to discuss this project further, if others in the region feel that would be desirable. I think such a meeting would be helpful, Hevlin said.

Does the budget for this program (\$6 million over three years) include modeling? asked Ron Boyce of ODFW. Yes, Ferguson replied. In response to another question, it was explained that the Lower Granite performance model project came about because Lower Granite's turbines are different than McNary's -- in essence, COE is testing the McNary performance model at Lower Granite to see how well the McNary model can be extrapolated to other projects on the river. This work will be complete in FY'98. Other commenters wondered whether the costs of this program would be counted under the fish cap, or would be incurred by the Corps' turbine rehab program; some further clarification is needed on this point.

II. Discussion of Dissolved Gas Monitoring and Abatement Options for the Upper Columbia River.

Monte McLendon of the Bureau of Reclamation provided an overview of this subject, putting up a series of slides showing the location of the various dissolved gas monitoring stations on the Snake and Columbia River systems, 1993 dissolved gas data at the International Boundary and below Grand Coulee Dam, 1996 daily average flow and spill data for the Mid-Columbia, Snake River and Lower Columbia projects, and 1996 TDG averages for projects on the Upper Columbia, Clearwater and Snake Rivers (this data is reproduced in detail in Enclosure D).

Specific to the Upper Columbia, McLendon said USBR operates monitoring stations at the International Boundary and six miles below Grand Coulee Dam; a third station, in the Grand Coulee forebay, will be installed in March 1997. As most of you are aware, he said, TDG levels in the Columbia coming down from Canada are often very high. The primary reason is the fact that Keenleyside Dam was authorized to contain a power plant, but the plant was never built. Consequently, that project spills a lot of water, and generates a lot of gas. That gas does not dissipate in the still water of Lake Roosevelt, and when we have to spill at Grand Coulee during big water years like 1996, that exacerbates the problem, McLendon said.

McLendon spent a few minutes going through the information contained in Enclosure D. He mentioned that, last spring, during a period when power demand was low, some of the units at Grand Coulee were shut down, resulting in spill and high TDG levels. Partly in response to tribal concerns, he said, we were able to

reduce TDG by spinning the units with no load on them.

Why isn't spin-no-load an option to reduce TDG throughout the system? asked Steve Pettit of IDFG. Primarily because it's very hard on fish passing through the turbines, was the answer; it also increases wear on the units themselves. It's a tradeoff between increased turbine passage mortality and reduced gas levels, observed one participant -- spin-no-load produces a lot of turbulence and vibration.

McLendon said a steering committee, consisting of members from USBR, the Corps, the National Biological Service, WDFW and the Colville Tribe, has been established to conduct research into the effects of TDG below Grand Coulee, as well as what can be done structurally and operationally to alleviate the problem. Funding for this project, scheduled to begin in 1999, will come primarily from the U.S.G.S. The Bureau also plans to evaluate different ways to release water from Grand Coulee (via drum gate and release tubes at various elevations in the dam) when spill is necessary, looking for the release operation that produces the least dissolved gas.

Hevlin asked whether the Bureau will use the forebay gauge to locate -- and target for release -- layers of lower-TDG water within the reservoir. We hadn't considered that possibility, McLendon replied -- we had intended to measure TDG at the 35-foot depth, to be consistent with the systemwide standard. In response to another question, he said the Steering Committee is still discussing the scope of research activities for 1997 and 1998 -- how much is done will depend on the availability of funding.

Several SCT participants expressed a preference to begin the Grand Coulee feasibility study sooner than 1999. The problem is that we've already submitted our budget for FY'98, said McLendon -- once it leaves our office, there isn't much we can do. The group discussed the possibility of Bonneville funding for this project; McLendon said costs for the various components of the study for FY'99-'00 are expected to total \$150,000. After making a phone call, McLendon reported that it may be possible to redirect \$50,000 to accomplish the operational component of the Grand Coulee study in the spring of 1997. It now looks like it may be possible to obtain \$100,000 in FY'98 funding to do the structural component of the study, he added. We'll put that into the spreadsheet for FY'98, said Hevlin.

And bear in mind that Grand Coulee is just one piece of the gas puzzle in the Upper Columbia, Hevlin continued -- we also need to

look at what we could be doing at the FERC projects, Pend Oreille and Box Canyon.

Dave Ponganis of COE spent a few minutes discussing gas abatement work at Chief Joseph. Currently, the only monitor at that project is in the forebay, he said, so we don't have much current information on TDG levels below that project. There is some information from the 1970s; at that time, the data showed that we could spill up to 25Kcfs at Chief Joseph without increasing gas. Hydraulic capacity at Chief Joseph is 219 Kcfs; at Grand Coulee, 208 Kcfs.

In response to a question, Ponganis said the nearest gauge to Chief Joseph is at Wells Dam, 30 miles downstream. Any plans to install an additional gauge below Chief Joseph? asked Bob Heinith of CRITFC. Not currently, Ponganis replied. As we seem to be entering a wet cycle again, is there any way some O&M funds could be reprogrammed to install a tailrace gauge at Chief Jo? asked Heinith. We can take that back to the district, to see if there's the possibility of doing that this year, said Ponganis. After some minutes of further discussion, there was general agreement that it would be useful to have a gauge, maintained by the Corps, in the Chief Joseph tailrace. That would be a real plus for the coming season, said Hevlin -- it would give us the capability of testing some different spill patterns to see which produces the least dissolved gas.

In response to another question, Ponganis said the Corps had considered installing flip lips at Chief Joseph during the 1970s; a physical model study was done at that time, and would still be valid. How many spill bays are there at that project? asked Ruff. A total of 19, each 40 feet wide, was the reply.

After some minutes of further discussion, Hevlin provided the following summary: the Corps will investigate the possibility of installing a tailrace monitor at Chief Joseph, with the idea of testing various spill patterns to reduce TDG below that project; the SCT also needs to start thinking about what to do about the FERC projects that are generating gas on the Pend Oreille, he said. Rod Woodin of WDFW also requested that the Corps dust off its flip lip study from the 1970s and consider the possible installation of spill deflectors at Chief Jo. At \$400,000 per bay, we're looking at a total of \$7.6 million to install flip lips at that project, if we do all 19 bays, Ruff observed. Ponganis agreed to provide a further update on this subject at the next SCT meeting.

III. John Day and Ice Harbor Spill Deflector Installation

Schedule and Updates.

COE's Mike Mason reported that four flip lip installations - spill bays 4-7 -- are now complete at Ice Harbor. We were working on bays 3 and 8 when high flows forced the contractor out of the water, Mason said. He didn't have time to get his bulkheads out, and they were washed away. The contractor hasn't been able to get back into the water until just this morning, Mason said; he is currently looking for his bulkheads. He has been given a window of reduced flows from today through Sunday to find them. We don't know yet whether or not he will be able to complete the other four bays this spring; if flows cooperate, it's still a possibility that we'll get all eight installed by March 31, Mason said. It was observed, however, that this work will have to stop if there is any spill at the project.

It sounds like you need to gather more information before we can discuss this further, said Hevlin. Once you have it, why don't you put together a one-page sheet outlining the available flip-lip installation options available this spring, fax it out to the SCT and FFDRWG memberships, and set up a conference call next week so that we can make a decision. If you can't get on the phone, you'll have a chance to comment on the written options summary, Hevlin added.

When will a decision be made on whether or not to install deflectors on the remaining two bays -- 1 and 10? asked Ron Boyce of ODFW. They'll be talking about that at the next FFDRWG meeting, Mason replied. In the meantime, the Corps is moving forward with the planning process to do those two bays, plus the training wall extension, in 1998. The final decision about whether or not these projects will go forward has yet to be made, however.

Moving on to John Day, COE's Bob Willis reported that the protest of the contract was disallowed. The contractor started bulkhead construction in December; we expect to have bulkheads on site no later than early March, Willis said. We're in negotiation with the contractor over his claims for the delays in the award; we still don't know how that will end up. The bottom line is that it looks like we may get flip lips installed on three or four bays at John Day by April 30; the remaining 14 will be installed prior to the 1998 migration season.

In response to a question, Willis said that, under this contract, work can continue even while John Day is spilling, as long as the spill is kept two bays away from the work site.

IV. Ice Harbor Dam Turbine Rehabilitation Status.

The status of this report, said Mason, is that it's almost complete -- we'll be at the 95% mark by January 31. They're looking at a lot of different rehabilitation options; a number of significant issues have been identified, focusing on water availability, drawdown etc. The goal is to complete the report and ship it upstairs by March, in an effort to get it into the funding cycle as soon as possible. The first year it will be possible to get funds appropriated for this project is probably FY'99, Mason added. In response to a question, he said the report will include a cost-benefit analysis.

What's the status of Unit 5? asked Boyce. I think you're all familiar with the story there, Mason replied -- we've put together an independent panel, consisting of representatives from USBR, General Electric and BC Hydro, to do what's called a root cause analysis. It appears that human error was responsible for the most recent outage -- apparently, a 3/4" socket was left somewhere in the unit, and that's what caused the problem. Because there has been such a history of problems with Unit 5, however, the Corps feels that a root cause analysis is needed. We may need to do a partial rewind, we may need to do a full rewind, Mason said -- we just don't know at this point. The bottom line is that we're going to use expedited contracting to ensure that the unit is back on-line as quickly as possible; however, Unit 5 is definitely off-line for this migration season.

It was agreed to place this item on the February SCT agenda for further discussion.

V. Bonneville Dam Multi-Year Work Plan -- Progress Report.

As you recall, at the last SCT meeting, we had presentations on three different multi-year work plans for Bonneville Dam, Hevlin said. At the conclusion of those presentations, there was a request for some survival or FPE estimates associated with each of the alternatives. We also put together a subgroup meeting to clarify areas of agreement and disagreement among the plans, and to see how many of those disagreements we could resolve, Hevlin said.

We agreed on some things and disagreed on others, said Gary Fredricks of NMFS. In the end, we probably disagreed on more important things than we agreed on. Actually, I didn't see it

that way, said Heinith -- we did manage to come up with a list of things we all agreed were important. There was some disagreement about the prioritization of specific items on the list.

Among the items agreed to: the need to investigate modifications to reduce fallback, and the need to investigate gas abatement measures at Bonneville. SCT and perhaps IT need to have further discussions about the prioritization of the gas abatement prototype at Bonneville, Heinith added. A third item agreed to was the need for the regional research facility; a fourth item agreed to was the hydroacoustic monitoring project to look at spill efficiency. It was also agreed that we would investigate a forebay guidance device for spill efficiency improvement, not for surface collection, Fredricks said. A sixth item agreed to, at least tentatively, was that we should not install a high flow outfall at Powerhouse 1, he continued -- it would make more sense to place that downstream of the spillway. And a seventh area of agreement was not to bring survival estimates back to this group, added Ferguson. That's correct, said Fredricks -- we agreed that it would be impossible to construct a valid survival estimate for any of the future configuration alternatives.

Fredricks said several major differences between the approaches were identified at the meeting. For one thing, NMFS is advocating the development of a surface bypass system at Bonneville; CRITFC does not support this measure. Operationally, there was disagreement about the priorities for Powerhouse 1 vs. Powerhouse 2. Not to put words in your agency's mouth, said Heinith, but from CRITFC's perspective, it appears that NMFS is advocating a "full meal deal" approach -- a wide array of options that would cost \$250 million-\$300 million at Bonneville alone. The tribes don't believe there's enough money to support that type of approach, and advocate a greater emphasis on increased spill efficiency and adult passage improvements at Bonneville. Our top priority is to meet the 80%-95% performance standard by 2001, he said.

In response to a question, Fredricks said NMFS is backing off somewhat on surface collection at Bonneville. What we're basically advocating is that we do the extended-length screens, we improve guidance, install a surface bypass system, and that we investigate surface collection -- on the latter measure, we're not totally supportive of what's been proposed for FY'98, but we're not necessarily against it, either, said Hevlin.

In response to a question, Boyce said Oregon supports the Bi-Op configuration for Bonneville Dam. However, we haven't sat down as a state and developed a position on these three specific

alternatives. Ditto for Idaho and Washington, said Steve Pettit and Rod Woodin.

The main difference I see between our approach and the tribes', said Bob Willis of COE, is the issue of Bonneville outfall relocation. The deadline for award of that contract is July 1997, and we need to come to resolution on the outfall relocation issue as quickly as we can. Also, we advertise the '98 surface collection prototype contract in April '97, he said, so again, we need to make a decision fairly quickly.

Essentially, then, the tribes are saying that the money COE is proposing to spend on outfall relocation and DSM improvements could be better spent on other projects, such as adult passage improvements, said Hevlin. That's correct, Heinith replied. And the larger issue is opportunity costs under the fish cap, observed Witt Anderson -- if we commit funding to the wrong course of action now, that will preclude our ability to do other needed projects later. Sure, said Heinith.

From NMFS's standpoint, if, when the budget comes back to us, we have enough funding to do both the surface collection and the prototype, we would probably prefer to see both of those pursued, Hevlin said. That's the within-year question, said Anderson -- the tribes are raising the broader point of opportunity costs. We could spend a lot of money on the approach NMFS is recommending, and that could eat up a lot of the money available for projects throughout the system.

When you look at the smolt-to-adult survival data, the evidence is very strong that even in high flow/high spill years, spill is the best route of passage, said Heinith. There are a lot of uncertainties about both the effectiveness and the safety of the extended-length screens for fish. The tribes feel strongly that we need to go full speed ahead, and focus our priorities on spill. So from your point of view, at PH1, we should move ahead with surface collection and awarding that contract, but the outfall relocation, screen installation and surface bypass should not go forward? asked Willis. That's correct, Heinith replied.

After some minutes of further discussion, Hevlin suggested that the Bonneville Dam workplan subcommittee schedule another meeting, this time including representatives from Oregon, Washington and Idaho, to further define the issues that need to be resolved: outfall relocation, screen installation etc. We also need to develop schedule and cost information for the tribal option (spill, adult passage improvements and possibly additional work on the surface bypass prototype), for the "conventional"

(screening and bypass systems) approach, and one that represents NMFS's "full meal deal" approach, suggested Ruff. That will give us a place to start. And the states need to make a decision about their recommended alternative, said Hevlin -- that's going to have a big influence on which alternative is ultimately chosen.

So we'll develop cost and schedule estimates for each of these three general options, said Hevlin. It was also requested that, to the greatest extent possible, some background information on the biological impacts associated with each option be developed. Who's going to do that work? I think it's incumbent on the groups that are advocating each of the options, Fredricks suggested -- we need to do it for our approach, Bob has already done it for the tribes', and the Corps needs to do that for their approach. Perhaps we can discuss those biological considerations at the subgroup meeting as well, suggested Ruff.

It seems to me, he continued, is that what it comes down to is, do we pursue surface bypass? Do we pursue screens? Or do we pursue both, which would obviously be the most expensive option. I think that's right on, said Hevlin -- I think we're all in agreement that gas abatement and a lot of the other measures people have put forward are important to do if possible -- the most important question we have to decide is whether or not to include the surface bypass system. If we were going to frame this for the IT, they would need a comparison between the options that include improving bypass and FGE in the near-term, and the option that relies on surface collection and spill. That's the kind of information the subgroup needs to develop, for presentation at the next SCT meeting.

So we'll set up a Bonneville Plan subcommittee meeting to frame up the bypass options at Bonneville, at which time we'll lay out schedules and estimated costs for several of those options, said Ruff: conventional bypass improvements, hopefully leading to reduced spill; spill passage with surface bypass prototyping and gas abatement. We'll also try to address risks and uncertainties -- biological pros and cons -- for each option. After a few minutes of discussion, the Bonneville subcommittee meeting was scheduled for 9 a.m. Tuesday, February 11, at COE's Portland District offices.

VI. FY'98 Mainstem Construction Work Plan Prioritization.

Mike Mason distributed Enclosure F, the most recent SCT measures spreadsheet for the Columbia River Fish Mitigation Project, dated 1/14/97. There have been a number of changes made

to this document since the last time you saw it, said Ruff; I think the time has come to hold a separate meeting just to discuss FY'98 budgetary priorities. Mason pointed out that the "States' Priorities" section has been relocated in this year's spreadsheet; also, significant changes to last year's program have been highlighted in bold. With the addition of John Day extended-length screens and other measures, the FY'98 budget tops out at about \$127 million, up quite a bit from last year, he said.

Other SCT participants agreed that a meeting to discuss the FY'98 program is needed; after a few minutes of discussion, it was scheduled for Friday, January 24 from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

VII. Anadromous Fish Evaluation Program (AFEP) and Fish Facility Design Review Work Group (FFDRWG) Updates.

Rudd Turner distributed Enclosure D, AFEP's schedule for coordination for the 1998 Program. Touching first on the FY'97 Program, he said the revised proposals had been sent out in November; few written responses were received, and the District is moving out on the '97 program -- surface collection work, gas abatement studies, bypass studies etc.

For 1998, Turner said, the SCT has been working from a spreadsheet, trying to get its FY'98 priorities in order. At AFEP, we've been trying to stay in synch with that, and to lay out as early as we can what the full 1998 AFEP program will look like. A 1998 AFEP studies planning meeting has been scheduled here in Portland for February 24-25 with the Studies Review Work Group (SRWG); the purpose of this meeting is to provide input on the one-page research summaries being developed for inclusion in the five-year spreadsheet showing how the AFEP program will lay out. Those documents will be discussed at the Feb. 24-25 meeting, and then there will be a 30-day review period after that? asked Boyce. That's correct, Turner replied. And if the agencies or tribes had a study that wasn't identified in one of your one-page summaries, they could bring that to the meeting as well? asked Ruff. Yes, Turner said.

Following the February meeting, Turner continued, North Pacific Division will send a letter to the Region, containing the one-page summaries and other detailed information on the 1998 AFEP program. There will be a 30-day review period after that; on May 1, the Corps will initiate its Request for Proposals process. The rest of the FY'98 AFEP schedule is detailed in Enclosure D.

Moving on, Ferguson said FFDRWG had met on December 19; there

were no unresolved issues, to be addressed by SCT, identified at that meeting. The FFDRWG members did decide to defer work on blocked trash racks at The Dalles from 1997 to 1998, Ferguson said. A lengthy discussion ensued, centered on the hydroacoustic evaluations needed to support the blocked trash rack work at The Dalles, the adult passage problems at Bonneville and the possibility of reprogramming some FY'97 funding. It was agreed to convene an SCT subgroup to address these issues, and the overall FY'97 budget, prior to the next full SCT meeting on February 12; the subgroup meeting was set for Wednesday, February 5 at 9 a.m. in the Corps' Portland District Headquarters. That meeting would probably be the appropriate venue to talk about the "softness" issue -- areas where we think there may be an opportunity to reprogram funds from one project to another, Anderson said.

Returning to his report on the December FFDRWG meeting, Ferguson said another major discussion item was 1997 blocked trash rack work at Bonneville Dam; in the course of this discussion, the agencies and tribes identified three areas of concern: applicability of the results from the FY'97 work to results from previous years, funding, and fish impacts. Moving on to Bonneville 1 FGE, Ferguson said this work is on schedule, and spent a few minutes describing the planned 1997 test configuration. The next discussion item was The Dalles rehab; the main message there, said Ferguson, is that minimum gap runners are not included in The Dalles rehab, at least not at this time. The Dalles sluiceway outfall study is moving forward, he added; the next FFDRWG meeting is scheduled for February 14.

One thing I've been discussing with John, said Heinith, is the possibility of using some of the reprogrammed FY'97 funding to augment the planned 1997 adult telemetry studies to allow tracking of chinook and steelhead up into the tributaries to try to get an idea of spawning success and distribution. He distributed Enclosure E, a short document entitled "Lower Columbia River Radio Telemetry Study Update," which describes the proposed research expansion in detail.

After a few minutes of discussion, Heinith asked individual SCT members to state their positions on CRITFC's proposed changes to the 1997 radio telemetry study work. Oregon needs a little more information about how this work would fit into the overall context of the study plan, replied Boyce -- I would suggest that it be reviewed further by the SRWG before SCT is asked to make a decision on it. Hevlin said NMFS was satisfied with the study design as it was originally agreed to, but added that he has no

objection to further discussion of the adult radio telemetry work at the SRWG level. Hevlin's main objection to CRITFC's proposed study changes was the curtailment of the lamprey tagging program in favor of sockeye tagging -- there was real interest in lamprey passage, we have a chance to get more information on lamprey, and I haven't heard anything so far that convinces me that the sockeye information would be more valuable than the lamprey data, he said.

We're talking about 200 additional tags, said Heinith -- from my point of view, every additional tag we get up on the spawning grounds is extremely valuable. Hevlin suggested that Heinith make this argument before the Studies Review Work Group.

The other issue is the blocked trash racks at Bonneville, said Heinith. Our position hasn't changed; when is this issue going to be raised to IT? I'd rather see it ended here, Hevlin replied -- NMFS does not support this project, especially during the spring period. It's hard to see why you would spend this money to obtain the kind of information you're going to get during the summer. Unless the Corps wants to raise this issue to IT, I see it as basically being killed for FY'97.

We're letting the contract for that project -- it's been in the program all along, replied Willis. This was a program and schedule that was laid out years ago -- it's a piece of information we need to support a surface bypass decision at that project. We see the two as apples and oranges, Heinith said -- a blocked trash rack is not going to provide much useable information when the time comes to design a surface bypass system at Bonneville.

After a few minutes of discussion, NMFS, CRITFC and Oregon all objected to running the blocked trash rack experiment at Bonneville during the spring; CRITFC and Oregon also objected to the experiment during the summer months. Hevlin said that, given the magnitude of opposition to this project expressed at today's meeting, the Corps will need to go to the next forum above SCT -- the Implementation Team or Executive Committee -- if they want approval to proceed. Some minutes of additional debate yielded a Corps decision not to let the contract for the 1997 blocked trash rack test at Bonneville Dam.

VIII. SCT Multi-Year Implementation Plan (MYIP) Status Report.

Ruff distributed Enclosure G, the most recent draft of MYIP Chapter 3, covering the Mainstem Construction (SCT) Five-Year

Work Plan (copies of this lengthy document are available upon request from Kathy Mott at 503/230-5420). This draft has been sent out for agency and tribal review, said Ruff; comments are due back to CBFWA by January 29. He added that the main change to this version of the document is inclusion of new material covering CRITFC's recommended system configuration alternative; this information can be found in subsection 3.4.

IX. Other.

Heinith requested SCT discussion of a project, submitted to CRITFC, to conduct an independent review of future construction improvements at the federal projects on the Columbia and Snake Rivers. Boyce requested a discussion of the overall Gas Abatement Program goal.

Also, said Hevlin, I requested a summary of how normal 1997 operations will be changed for construction and research. Appendix B of the Fish Passage Plan provides detailed information on 1997 operational requirements for research activities, replied Anderson. You should all be reviewing that plan and submitting comments to the Corps, he said. Jim Athearn is working through the Fish Passage Plan with the Technical Management Team; if anyone else has comments on the FPP, we'd like to hear them, Anderson said.

Boyce said FPAC will be submitting its comments on the FPP on January 21 -- the question is, how will those comments be addressed? he asked. Rudd Turner replied that any technical comments would be discussed at the TMT level; any policy questions will probably be referred back to SCT, at least initially. In response to a request from Hevlin, Anderson said that once all comments are received on the Fish Passage Plan, the Corps will develop a list of any outstanding issues that need to be resolved.

One other thing, said Hevlin -- at its last meeting, the IT made the following assignment to SCT:

? To prepare a list of anticipated issues in the FY'98 Corps budget, and a plan for development of a final recommendation. The issue list in the mainstem construction chapter of the Multi-Year Implementation Plan is a good starting point, but should be refined to focus on expected 1998 funding issues. Special attention should be given to ensure that issues of a policy nature, or that otherwise may need to be addressed by the IT, are included.

? The issue of the scope and schedule for John Day drawdown studies, and their effect on a potential decision to proceed with extended STS installation at John Day Dam, should be detailed for discussion at IT.

The issues list needs to be in IT's hands no later than February 4, so we need to get moving, Hevlin said. When we have a chance to go through the FY'98 budget item-by-item on January 24, I'd like people to speak up and identify any issues they see. After that, we need to develop a plan as to how we're going to reach a final recommendation on the FY'98 budget. The second part of the assignment tasks us to conduct discussions about multi-year priorities at John Day similar to those we've been having about Bonneville Dam, he continued.

Hevlin said he and Ruff would note any issues raised in the course of the Jan. 24 FY'98 budgetary discussion, and would flesh those issues out in written form in time to submit them to the IT by Feb. 4.

XI. Upcoming SCT Meetings and Agenda Items.

The next full SCT meeting will be held Wednesday, February 12 from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. at NMFS's Portland headquarters. Supplemental meetings were set for Friday, January 24 (to discuss the FY'98 CRFM budget), Wednesday, February 5 at 9 a.m. in the Corps' Portland District Headquarters.(possible reprogramming opportunities within the FY'97 CRFM budget) and 9 a.m. Tuesday, February 11, at COE's Portland District offices (Bonneville subcommittee). Meeting notes prepared by Jeff Kuechle, BPA contractor.