

System Configuration Team (SCT)

Reasonable & Prudent Measure #26

Meeting Notes

September 30, 1998

I. Greetings and Introductions.

The September 30 meeting of the System Configuration Team was held at the Northwest Power Planning Council offices in Portland, Oregon. The meeting was co-chaired by Bill Hevlin of NMFS and Jim Ruff of the Northwest Power Planning Council staff. The meeting was facilitated by Donna Silverberg and Jacqueline Abel. The agenda and a list of attendees for the September 30 meeting are attached as Enclosures A and B.

The following is a distillation (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 Ceballos of NMFS at 503/230-5420.

II. Continuation of Process to Priority Rank FY'99 CRFM Program Activities.

Ruff asked Mark Walker of the Council staff to comment on the current status of the FY'99 Congressional appropriations process, whether the \$60 million in CRFM funding recommended in the recent Conference Committee report is the final word on this subject or whether there are any ongoing discussions about supplemental funding. I spoke to the Senate subcommittee staff a few days ago, Walker replied; they expected the House would take up the conference report on Monday night, but I'm not sure whether or not that actually happened. Regardless, he said, I expect that to be approved in the relatively near future. My understanding is that \$60 million is the final CRFM number for FY'99; I don't see that number increasing at this point, Walker added.

Silverberg said that, since the last SCT meeting, she has contacted nearly everyone on the committee to see what progress they have made in developing an agency position on the current list of FY'99 CRFM priorities. She suggested that the group spend a few minutes listing the key issues and concerns identified by each SCT participant, to see where these may overlap. If we reach impasse, the IT meets tomorrow, she said; they should be able to promptly resolve any issues we raise.

Hevlin explained that the white spreadsheet (attached as Enclosure C) is the list that was developed at the September 16 SCT meeting. The blue spreadsheet (attached as Enclosure D) is FPAC's list from their meeting yesterday, he said. Before we begin an intensive discussion of the spreadsheet, said Ron Boyce of ODFW, what are our expectations about what we would like to

accomplish today, and what is the time-frame for developing our final list of FY'99 CRFM priorities?

I would hope that we can come fairly close to finalizing our priorities today, replied Witt Anderson of the Corps. My plan is to take whatever we agree to at the end of today's meeting to my senior managers next Tuesday, and I expect that we will be making some decisions such that, as we have planned all along, we will be able to send a letter out to the region in mid-October, laying out the FY'99 CRFM program. So the short answer is that we will develop our list today, Silverberg said. From NMFS' perspective, we would like to see the SCT develop an A-Z list of priorities down to about \$80 million, Hevlin added. We'll see how far we get, Silverberg said.

Hevlin also distributed Enclosure E, the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission's list of FY'99 CRFM priorities.

With that, the group launched into the discussion of its final prioritizations for the FY'99 CRFM program. This final list is reproduced below; items whose priority or funding level changed as a result of the discussion at this meeting have been noted in bold.

Ranking	Equivalent Score	Cost (\$ million)	Cumulative Cost
JDA Drawdown			
Study (S)	600	3.30	3.30
SYS – LSN			
Feasibility Study (S)	600	4.250	7.550
IHB Flow Deflectors			
(I)	600	3.80	11.350
BON PH2 DSM (I)	600	21.90	33.250
SYS – Payback (I)	600	4.0	37.250
JDA – JBS			
Monitoring/O&M			
Safety (S)	600	1.10	38.350
LGR Surface Bypass			
(Critical) (S)	600	1.250	39.60
SYS – Separator			
Evaluation Mothball			
(S)	599	0.10	39.70
SYS – LGR Model	599	0.10	39.80
JDA – 24-Hour Spill			
Tests (S)	451	1.50	41.30
TDA –			
Spillway/Sluiceway			
Survival (S)	435	2.0	43.30
TDA Surface Bypass			
Evaluation (S)	435	0.80	44.10
BON PH1 DSM			
Deferred (I)	407	1.50	45.60
SYS – Adult PIT (S)	400	0.050	45.650
SYS – B2 Fish Unit			
Debris Study (I)	390	0.20	45.850

MCN Extended
Screens (Critical) (I) 386 2.10 47.950
BON Adult Fallback
(S) 386 0.30 48.250
LGR Extended
Screens (I) 369 0.950 49.20
LGS Extended
Screens (I) 364 1.0 50.20
SYS – Turbine
Passage/CAM
Optimization (S) 360 0.250 50.450
BON Surface Bypass
High-Flow Outfall
Investigation (S) 357 0.950 51.350
BON Surface Bypass
B1 Prototype 2nd
Year Test (S) 356 2.30 53.650
TDA Emergency
Aux. Water/Outfall
Relocation (I) 355 0.50 54.150
MCN - IHB Adult
Fallback (S) 352 0.10 54.250
SYS – Gas Fastrack
(S) 348 3.0 57.250
SYS – Gas
Abatement *
Pending ISAB
Report (S) 344 1.120 58.370
JDA Surface Bypass -
- Spillway Weir Test
(S) 340 0.50 58.870
JDA Surface Bypass
– Modified Spillway
(S) 332 0.140 59.010
SYS – B2 AWS (S) 328 0.20 59.210
SYS – Adult Passage
(Lower Col.)
Placeholder (I) 320 1.60 60.810
SYS – Turbine
Passage/BON MGR
Test (S) 316 1.40 62.210
JDA – 4-Unit
Skeleton Bay Study
(S) 312 0.20 62.410
SYS – Separator
Evaluation Testing

(S) 300 0.850 63.260
Lower Col. Feasibility
(S) 290 0.50 63.760
SYS – Aux. Water
(Lower Snake R.) (S) 285 0.10 63.860
BON Flat Plate PIT
(S) 284 0.050 63.910
SYS – Fish Ladder
Temperature Control
(S) 247 0.060 63.970
JDA Ringold (S) 237 0.20 64.170
JDA Extended
Screens (S) 215 4.30 68.470
SYS – Turbine
Passage – MCN (S) 200 1.60 70.070
LGR Surface Bypass
Testing Additive
Devices 200 1.730 71.80
JDA JBS
Monitoring/Juvenile
Fish Improvements
(S) 200 0.750 72.550
JDA JBS
Monitoring/Adult
Fish Improvements
(S) 200 0.20 72.750
LGR Surface Bypass
(Testing M&E) 200 2.90 75.650
BON Surface Bypass
– Behavioral Tests
(S) 200 1.50 7.150
TDA Surface Bypass
Prototype Design 200 0.90 78.050
BON PH2 FGE 200 1.20 79.250
SYS – Spill
Effectiveness/
Optimization (S) 200 1.00 80.250
MCN Extended
Screens – Non-
Critical (I) 200 1.30 81.550
BON PH1 FGE 200 0.50 82.050
JDA – Navigation (I) 0 0.220 82.270
BON Surface Bypass
– B2 Corner Collector
Tests (S) 0 1.50 83.770
BON Surface Bypass

– B2 Corner Collector
Prototype (S) 0 1.50 85.270
BON Surface Bypass
– B1 Phase 2 B71
Prototype
Development (S) 0 1.250 86.520
BON Surface Bypass
– Guidance Curtain
Investigation (S) 0 1.0 87.520
BON Surface
Dewatering 0 0.90 88.420
BON PH2 Gatewell
Cleaning (S) 0 0.750 89.170
SYS – Acoustic (S) 0 1.550 90.720
SYS – Flume JDA (S) 0 2.30 93.020
SYS – Spill Survival
(S) 0 0.0 93.020
LGR JBS (I) 0 0.40 93.420
MCN Fish Ladder
Exits Modifications
(I) 0 0.350 93.770
JDA Flow Deflectors
(1 & 20) (I) 0 0.250 94.020
IHB Flow Deflectors
Adult Evaluation (I) 0 0.20 94.220

Items that received substantial discussion included the following:

Ice Harbor Flow Deflectors. Both Keith Kutchins of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes and Bob Heinith of CRITFC recommended no funding for this item, consistent with their tribes' policy of no further investment in the Lower Snake projects until the 1999 decision is made. Ultimately, because this is an ongoing contract that would cost as much to terminate as to complete, no change was made to the funding level or priority of this item. Kutchins requested a report on exactly how much it would cost to terminate this contract from the Corps.

Bonneville Powerhouse 2 DSM. Heinith said CRITFC recommends breaking this contract and deferring this project; he estimated the cost of breaking the contract at \$5 million. Kutchins said the Sho-Bans oppose funding for this project in FY'99. Again, Anderson said it would likely cost as much to terminate this ongoing contract as it would to allow this work to proceed; others, including BPA's John Rowan, expressed support for this item because of the benefits it will provide. After some minutes of discussion, no change was made to the funding level or priority of this item; Kutchins asked that his objection be noted for the record; he said he will also voice his objection at the next Implementation Team and Executive Committee meetings, although he did not express a desire to formally elevate this issue to the IT at this time.

JDA JBS Monitoring/O&M Safety. Heinith said CRITFC recommends a lower priority for this item, as well as a reduced budget; given the likely budgetary limitations in FY'99, he

said,

other projects should take precedence. Anderson said the bare-bones minimum dollar amount to which this item could be reduced in FY'99 is about \$250,000, which would cover the O&M safety items and the post-construction evaluation/closeout costs. Boyce said he would like to have further discussion of the funding level and priority of this item with the other salmon managers; after some minutes of discussion, it was agreed to leave funding for this item at \$1.1 million for now, pending the outcome of those discussions.

LGR Surface Bypass (Critical). Kutchins said the Sho-Bans oppose this item, on the same grounds as their opposition to the Ice Harbor flow deflectors. Ruff observed that this option actually represents the closeout costs for this project – there are no modifications or testing planned in 1999. With this understanding, Kutchins withdrew his opposition to this item.

JDA Navigation. The Council and salmon managers objected to this item; no SCT opposition was expressed to changing its equivalent score from 600 to zero.

System Separator Evaluation. Hevlin said NMFS recommends that this item be deferred for a year, pending the 1999 decision between drawdown and transportation. After some minutes of discussion, it was agreed to reduce funding for this item from \$950,000 to \$100,000, to cover the cost of mothballing this system.

System Spill Effectiveness/Optimization. The equivalent score for this item was reduced from 450 to 200, effectively dropping it 36 places in the list of priorities. This decision was based on the fact that spill effectiveness testing at The Dalles and John Day is included in other line-items. Although this is a Biological Opinion item, Hevlin said, since we will be evaluating spill effectiveness at two projects in 1999, we can afford to defer this line-item for a year. Heinith said CRITFC disagrees, and feels this item should remain a high priority. After a few minutes of discussion, NMFS, USFWS, WDFW, ODFW and the Council supported reducing this item's priority.

BON PH 1 DSM. CRITFC and the Sho-Bans oppose spending for this item in FY'99; Hevlin said NMFS supports it. Anderson said a minimum of \$1.5 million is needed to ensure that implementation can take place in 2002; he suggested that the SCT spend some time thinking about the entire CRFM program at Bonneville, to ensure that the best possible use is made of available resources. Ruff agreed, saying that he is nervous about singling out individual pieces of the Bonneville project for deferral without a discussion of the Bonneville program as a whole. It doesn't make sense to do this piecemeal, he said; we need an integrated approach at Bonneville. It was agreed to have this discussion later in today's meeting; ultimately, funding for this item was cut from \$4 million to \$1.5 million, deferring this work for one year.

MCN Extended Screens – Critical. The relative rank of this item was unchanged, but funding was reduced from \$2.37 million to \$2.1 million by deleting the planned hydroacoustic FGE evaluations.

MCN Extended Screens – Non-Critical. Hevlin suggested that the equivalent score of this item be reduced from 386 to 200, essentially deferring it for FY'99. No objections were raised to this course of action.

BON PH1 FGE. At NMFS' suggestion, it was agreed to defer this item for a year; its relative score was reduced from 380 to 200, and funding was cut from \$1.8 million to \$500,000.

MCN-IHB Adult Fallback. At NMFS' suggestion, the equivalent score of this item was reduced from 374 to 352. While this is important work, Hevlin said, we feel there are more important items to fund in FY'99.

System – Adult Passage (Lower Columbia) Placeholder. Again, Hevlin said, this is important work, but NMFS feels it could be deferred for a year. Heinith said he would prefer to keep this item above the \$60 million cutoff line; after a few minutes of further discussion, the equivalent score for this item was reduced from 374 to 320, placing it right in the \$60 million cumulative cost range.

LGR Extended Screens. The score and funding level for this item were not changed; Heinith said CRITFC recommends no funding for this item in FY'99.

LGS Extended Screens. The score for this item was not changed; Heinith said CRITFC recommends no funding for this item in FY'99. After a few minutes of discussion, at the suggestion of the salmon managers, FY'99 funding for this item was reduced by \$200,000, to \$1 million.

System – Gas Abatement *Pending ISAB Report. At the salmon managers' suggestion, the score for this item was reduced to 344. He also suggested that the alternative analysis component of this item be deferred, reducing the FY'99 budget for gas abatement from \$1.83 million to \$1.120 million.

System – Gas Fastrack. At the salmon managers' suggestion, the score for this item was reduced from 360 to 348.

BON Surface Bypass B1 Prototype Second Year Testing. At NMFS' suggestion, funding for this item was reduced from \$4.3 million to \$2.3 million.

BON Surface Bypass Behavioral Tests. At the suggestion of the salmon managers, the score for this item was reduced from 355 to 200, essentially deferring it for a year.

TDA Emergency Auxiliary Water/Outfall Relocation. At NMFS' suggestion, the score for this item was increased from 352 to 355, to ensure that it stays above the funding line.

TDA Surface Bypass Evaluation. At the salmon managers' suggestion the score for this item was increased from 351 to 435; its budget was decreased from \$1.8 million to \$800,000, to allow for the FPE and spill effectiveness evaluations only.

System – B2 Aux. Water Supply. At NMFS' suggestion, the score for this item was decreased from 350 to 328.

TDA Surface Bypass Prototype Design. At NMFS' suggestion, the score for this item

was reduced from 350 to 200, on the basis that surface bypass investigations at Bonneville should be a higher priority in a limited-funding year.

JDA Surface Bypass Modified Spillway. At NMFS' suggestion, the score for this item was reduced from 345 to 332; while we agree that surface bypass is important at John Day, Hevlin said, the high daytime spill efficiency we saw last year at John Day means we may not need to modify the spillway at that project.

BON PH2 FGE. At the suggestion of the salmon managers, the score for this item was reduced from 341 to 200

JDA 4-Unit Skeleton Bay Study. Heinith said CRITFC would like to see this project funded in FY'99; after a few minutes of discussion, at NMFS' suggestion, the score for this item was reduced from 340 to 312.

LGR Surface Bypass (Testing & M&E). The score for this item was reduced from 326 to 200, at the suggestion of the salmon managers; Boyce said that, in his opinion, the information needed to assess the effectiveness of the Lower Granite surface collector is already available, and that no further study is required.

System – Turbine Passage/CAM Optimization. At NMFS' suggestion, the score for this item was increased from 320 to 360; we feel this is important, so that units equipped with extended screens can be operated at peak efficiency, Hevlin said.

System – Turbine Passage/MCN. The score for this item was reduced from 315 to 200, at the suggestion of the salmon managers.

LGR Surface Bypass Testing – Additive Items. The score for this item was reduced from 314 to 200, at the suggestion of the salmon managers.

JDA JBS Monitoring/Juvenile Fish Improvements. The score for this item was reduced from 311 to 200, at the suggestion of the salmon managers.

JDA JBS Monitoring/Adult Fish Improvements. The score for this item was reduced from 310 to 200, at the suggestion of the salmon managers.

Hevlin said NMFS requests the following additional score adjustments: JDA extended screens testing from 215 to 358, System – emergency auxiliary water (LSN) from 285 to 324, and System – fish ladder temperature control from 247 to 315. Heinith said CRITFC recommends that B1 surface bypass make the funding cut in FY'99; he listed several other items (System – real-time temperature monitoring network, FY'99 cost \$100,000, Chief Joseph spillway deflectors, FY'99 cost \$3 million, lamprey-salmon screen impingement/passage evaluation, FY'99 cost \$600,000) that should also be funded in 1999. Anderson said the Corps would like to see the score for the B2 corner collector prototype raised to at least 200.

Mary Lou Soscia of EPA raised a general concern about how Clean Water Act-related

items fit into the overall CRFM funding scheme. So far, there are no implementation items and nothing related to temperature on the list for funding in FY'99, she said, despite the fact that good-faith commitments have been made by the Corps and the states to work together on Clean Water Act issues. If this list goes forward, we will have to go back to those good-faith discussions and say those commitments have been violated.

The group discussed specific projects, such as CRITFC's proposed real-time temperature monitoring network, whose implementation would be viewed as a positive step by EPA. In response to a question from Kutchins, Ruff suggested that the new temperature assessment team would probably be the best venue to introduce new temperature-related project proposals. It was agreed to discuss this suggestion, as well as the other suggested changes and additions to the FY'99 CRFM program, at a half-day SCT meeting on October 5.

III. Next SCT Meeting Date and Agenda Items.

The next meeting of the System Configuration Team was set for Monday, October 5, from 9 a.m. to noon at NMFS' Portland offices. Meeting notes prepared by Jeff Kuechle, BPA contractor.